

**Evaluation of a Social Media Simulation for Decision-Making in the Training of  
Intelligence Analysts**



*This report is submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Psychology  
(Organisational and Human Factors)*

School of Psychology

University of Adelaide

November 2022

Word Count: 8000

**Author's Note:** This manuscript has been prepared for the Computers in Human Behaviour journal which allows for APA 7 reference style, and has been prepared to meet the journal's guidelines. At present, the manuscript has been written according to the Master of Psychology thesis requirement of 6000-8000 words but will be edited prior to submission to meet the specified journal's word limit requirements.

### **Declaration**

This dissertation contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University, and, to the best of my knowledge, contains no materials previously published except where due reference is made.

I give permission for the digital version of my dissertation to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search, and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the School to restrict access for a period of time.

██████████

November, 2022

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	5
Abstract.....	7
1.0 Introduction.....	7
1.1 Overview .....	7
1.2 Hybrid Warfare & the Grey Zone .....	10
1.3 Misinformation and Disinformation.....	11
1.4 Wargames for Decision-Making .....	12
1.5 Simulations for Training and Social Media Simulations .....	13
1.6 Naturalistic Decision-Making Theory.....	15
1.7 Present Research .....	17
2.0 Method .....	18
2.1 Participants.....	18
2.2 Materials.....	19
2.2.1 Social Media Simulation .....	19
2.3 Measures.....	19
2.3.1 Demographic Information .....	19
2.3.2 Decision-Making Process, Lessons, and Insights.....	20
2.4 Procedure.....	21
3.0 Results.....	21

3.1 Analysis.....21

3.2 Qualitative Results .....22

3.2.1 Influences on Decision-Making.....22

3.2.1.1 ‘The Delivery of Important Information Regarding the Wargame Scenario’ 22

3.2.1.2 ‘Prior Experience’ .....23

3.2.1.3 ‘The Quantity and Speed of Information’ .....24

3.2.2 Insights and Lessons Learnt .....26

3.2.2.1 ‘Greater Awareness into Misinformation’ .....26

3.2.2.2 ‘Greater Awareness into the Difficulty of Managing Multiple Profiles’ .....27

3.2.2.3 ‘Useful Tool for Training’ .....28

4.0 Discussion.....29

4.1 Theoretical Contribution .....30

4.2 Applied contribution .....32

4.3 Limitations and Future Directions.....32

4.4 Conclusions .....34

References.....35

Contribution Statement.....42

Instructions to Authors for Chosen Journal .....43

Appendix A. Copy of Survey provided to participants.....56

### **Acknowledgements**

This research would have not been possible without the Defence Science and Technology Group (DSTG) Graduate Industry Placement Program. I am grateful to have been offered an opportunity to work with a group of such knowledgeable and talented individuals.

I would like to thank each of my supervisors for their endless support and guidance. I am sincerely grateful for all your time, effort, and expertise that you have shared with me.

I would also like to thank my friends, family, and partner for their endless support.

(Title page for journal submission to Computers in Human Behaviour. Please note that some details have been amended or excluded to preserve anonymity.)

**Evaluation of a Social Media Simulation for Decision-Making in the Training of**

**Intelligence Analysts**

Author Names: ██████████

Corresponding Author: ██████████@student.adelaide.edu.au

Affiliations: The University of Adelaide

Declaration of Interest: None

Funding: This work was supported by Defence, Science, and Technology Group (Graduate Industry Placement Program)

## **Abstract**

The rapid evolution of technology has given rise to new threats such as the spread of misinformation and disinformation on social media. Therefore, it is vital intelligence analysts have high quality training that teaches them effective decision-making when faced with these potential threats. Wargames and interactive simulations have been found beneficial in training and education. However, there is little research specifically assessing social media simulations, and how they can be beneficial for the training of intelligence analysts. Using Naturalistic Decision-Making as a guiding theoretical framework, this study examined the decision-making processes of users during a wargame that utilised a social media simulation. Hence, providing insight into how the social media simulation tool can be used to train intelligence analysts to make effective decisions when faced with potential threat. The present study was exploratory and utilised qualitative data extracted from semi-structured focus groups from 21 participants who either worked or researched areas of interest to intelligence analysts. Results revealed that participants decision-making was largely influenced by the rapidity in which they could receive the information and their prior experience, thus demonstrating support for the intuitive style of decision-making. The practical implications of the present study are discussed and recommendations for future research within the area are outlined.

*Keywords:* Wargames, Social Media Simulations, Intelligence Analysts, Decision-Making

## **1.0 Introduction**

### **1.1 Overview**

The rapid growth of social media networking sites and media sharing technology has led to a dramatic shift in how information is distributed and shared (Mayfield, 2011).

Classified information can be leaked and exposed to millions of people within minutes, and damning images or information can be shared with devastating effects (Mayfield, 2011).

While technology provides a method to connect or share with others, the rapidly growing cyberspace also means that individuals and organisations can become vulnerable and exposed to attacks from both state and non-state actors including activists, non-governmental organisations, protest groups, regular citizens, and governments (Agrafiotis et al., 2018; Shirky, 2011).

Intelligence analysts play a vital role in national security and defence by protecting military forces, governments, and the public from these threats (Gookins, 2008). Intelligence analysts are experts responsible for gathering and screening open-source intelligence (OSINT), which is information that is unclassified, freely, and publicly available, such as social media posts (Akhgar et al., 2017). Through social media, intelligence analysts can monitor certain communities, groups, or individuals who may pose a threat to national security. Further, they can analyse data that may suggest the occurrence or a growing risk of violent behaviours or events such as organised riots (Tropotei, 2019). When faced with a potential threat, intelligence analysts must quickly generate an appropriate course of action or decision, or immediately report their analysis to decision-makers (Chin et al., 2009; Elm et al., 2004).

Intelligence analysts operate in extremely demanding environments. In addition to dealing with complex and large volumes of information, which can often be false or irrelevant, intelligence analysts also face time constraints and high levels of pressure. Failure to correctly identify or assess a threat, can result in detrimental consequences such as destruction and the loss of civilian lives (Chin et al., 2009; Elm et al., 2004). For example, intelligence analysts have often been heavily criticised for not anticipating mass casualty events such as the September 11 attacks (Hedley, 2005).



Due to evolving technology, intelligence analysts are now faced with tackling new and complex types of threats such as hybrid warfare and tactics that fall in the ‘grey zone’, which are defined as strategies that do not cross the threshold of kinetic warfare (Dowse & Bachmann, 2019). For instance, an example of grey zone tactics includes the spread of misinformation and disinformation for influence on social media. Misinformation is information that is wrong or misleading regardless of the intent, whereas disinformation is information that is deliberately falsely created to cause disruption or manipulate public opinion (Azad & Haider, 2020; Stahl, 2006; Wither, 2016).

Given the rise in these types of threats, it is crucial that intelligence analysts have high-quality training in which they are taught how to make quick and effective decisions when faced with these threats. Wargames have been used for centuries within the military to teach better decision-making and can be defined as, “any type of warfare model or simulation, not involving actual military forces, in which the flow of events is affected by and, in turn, affects decisions made during the course of those events by "players" representing the opposing sides” (Perla, 1990, p. 274). Through wargaming, it is believed individuals gain greater understanding and insight into their own decision-making processes which in turn leads to better-informed decision-making in the future (Perla & McCrady, 2011).

A wargame that uses a social media simulation would allow the decision-making processes of intelligence analysts, and how they respond to threats on social media such as misinformation and disinformation, to be observed in a low-risk environment. Research suggests that social media simulations have been found effective in training and teaching new skills (DiFranzo et al., 2019; Gordillo et al., 2021; Reeves & Crowther, 2019), however, there is little research into how social media simulations can be used to train individuals to improve

their decision-making on a tactical, operational, and strategic level in the national security and defence systems.

Using Naturalistic Decision-Making Theory (Klein et al., 1993) as a guiding theoretical framework, the aim of the present study was to examine the decision-making processes of users during a wargame that uses a social media simulation as part of the experiment. The findings will inform how social media simulations can be used to train intelligence analysts to make effective decisions when faced with potential online threats such as misinformation and disinformation.

## **1.2 Hybrid Warfare & the Grey Zone**

Rapid advancements in technology and globalisation have forever changed warfare within the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Azad & Haider, 2020). In the last few decades warfare has evolved from traditional forms of combat to unconventional yet powerful methods that can cause devastating effects. Hybrid warfare is a term often used to capture the complexities of these modern-day warfare approaches that often do not involve open or physical hostilities, and do not always have obvious intentions (Dowse & Bachmann, 2019). Hybrid warfare is a combination of both conventional methods of warfare and grey zone tactics. Its purpose is to discredit or disrupt the opposing side without crossing the threshold of war (Dowse & Bachmann, 2019).

It is the ambiguity of the grey zone that makes warfare conducted within this realm so powerful. The intentions behind the actions are often blurry and therefore are very much open to interpretation. Producing an appropriate response to these forms of attacks is no easy feat for military forces and intelligence analysts (Banasik, 2016). Should they decide that the action is not intentional, unable to confirm who conducted the operation or believe it is not worth responding to, they run the risk of not tackling a threat that may end up having significant repercussions (Dowse & Bachmann, 2019). However, if they miscalculate the risk

of threat and exaggerate the threat, they may then face the consequence of “blowback” which refers to the unintended consequences of an operation that are felt by those responsible for the initial operations and sometimes the population of the government (Porche et al., 2017). Therefore, it is not just the military who are vulnerable to the repercussions of these newer types of warfare but also the country’s civilian population. This is particularly relevant when considering the impact of grey zone warfare in a society that is heavily dependent on technology, and therefore vulnerable and exposed to online influence campaigns (Agrafiotis et al., 2018).

### **1.3 Misinformation and Disinformation**

One form of grey zone warfare is the creation and spreading of misinformation or disinformation for influence (De Ridder, 2021; Lewandowsky et al., 2013). Misinformation and disinformation can have significant and detrimental real-life outcomes as evident in the case of Russia’s interference in the 2016 U.S. Elections. During this period, Russia was accused of running influence campaigns by setting up troll farms and online bots to generate millions of fake Twitter and Facebook accounts and posts that comprised of politically biased information (Badawy et al., 2018; Ohlin, 2016). This caused significant real-life impacts such as the swaying of election results, and instability in the U.S social system through social polarisation (Levy & Razin, 2020). Ultimately, this was the result of many social media users failing to distinguish fake posts and circulating false information to their online audience who in turn were likely to do the same (Figueira & Oliveira, 2017). Therefore, making the spread of false information increasingly difficult to stop (Stahl, 2006).

Misinformation, even when shared with pure intents, can be just as harmful as disinformation. For example, some people such as conspiracy theorists do not believe they are operating under malicious pretence but are providing a community service by revealing and distributing information that has been covered up by governments or organisations (De

Riddler, 2021). However, while shared with the best intentions, false information can still result in violent outcomes such as in the case of PizzaGate.

PizzaGate is a conspiracy theory that was initially circulated during the 2016 U.S. Election period, which alleged that Hillary Clinton was running a child sex-trafficking ring in the basement of a local pizza bar called Comet Ping Pong Pizzeria located in Washington, D.C. (Bleakley, 2021). This conspiracy theory quickly went viral on social media and led 28-year-old, Edgar Maddison Welch, to drive from North Carolina to Washington to conduct his own investigation accompanied with weapons. Welch thoroughly searched the restaurant, threatened staff, and fired his weapon more than once. However, failed in finding any evidence of the supposed sex-trafficking (Guadagno & Guttieri, 2021).

This example highlights that misinformation and disinformation on social media, even when shared with good intentions can have violent consequences and poses significant risks. Thus, it is crucial that intelligence analysts can quickly and successfully identify misinformation and disinformation that may have the potential to cause detrimental real-life impacts.

#### **1.4 Wargames for Decision-Making**

Through wargaming, players are presented with an artificial representation of a scenario or conflict for the purpose of teaching a particular goal or skill through activity (Al-Elq, 2010). By undertaking a role as an active participant rather than a spectator, players navigate the scenario by following a set of rules and procedures and making a series of decisions that ultimately affect the outcomes (Perla, 1985). Much in the same way that Aviation Training Devices are used to train pilots to fly in adverse conditions (Bernardes et al., 2015), wargaming has been used for decades within the military for education, training, and research purposes (Perla & McGrady, 2011).

The purposes and benefits of wargaming are multifaceted with one of those key advantages being its ability to provide a fascinating window into human decision-making processes and human interactions for the purpose of strategic advantage (Reddie et al., 2018). For instance, through wargaming, designers can observe how players interact with one another, how they rationalise, justify and execute decisions, the challenges and issues faced, and the information required for players to make effective decisions (Perla & Barrett, 1985). This research can then be used to provide insight into the complex dynamics of warfare and the processes of decision-making, and how military personnel can be trained to make better informed decisions (Perla & Barrett, 1985).

Furthermore, although wargames are synthetic, the high level of engagement and concentration required may feel very real for players as they are encouraged to make decisions while also justifying and explaining their decision-making to others (Perla & McCrady, 2011). By taking responsibility for those decisions and facing the consequences of their choices, whether it be positive or negative, players may gain greater understanding and enlightenment into their own decision-making processes. Ultimately, leading to better decision-making in the future (Perla & McCrady, 2011).

During wargaming, players can also learn from one another whilst exchanging ideas and information, and engage with unexpected and uncommon situations which they are forced to confront and learn from despite it being uncomfortable or foreign (Page 2016; Perla & McGrady, 2007). Hence, wargaming allows for military forces to practice and prepare for how to respond to potential future threats, and examine their own learning and decision-making processes for the purpose of improving these mechanisms (Page, 2016).

### **1.5 Simulations for Training and Social Media Simulations**

One form of wargaming is interactive simulations in which users are presented with a representation or abstraction of a certain environment or activity which the user learns about

through their interaction with the simulation (Chung, 2016; Reddie et al., 2018). Simulations are commonly used within defence for training, to teach specialised skills, and to support better decision-making (Chung, 2016). For example, one such simulation used by defence is Operation Flashpoint, Virtual Battlefield Systems (VBS1), which is currently being used to train and support military forces operating in tropical wet seasons in Darwin (Carpenter & White, 2005).

There are many benefits to the use of simulations within defence. First, simulations are a cost-effective and efficient way for military forces to evaluate different operations, strategies, and tactics within a short period of time (Padilla, 2012). Further, simulations allow for repetition, meaning that military personnel can engage with the simulation many times to effectively train for missions and to acquire specialised skills (Padilla, 2012). Moreover, simulations allow military personnel to prepare for situations that may be too risky or difficult to undertake in a real-life setting, such as interacting with social media spaces (Iyengar et al, 1999).

The social media environment is a highly complex space to research and examine due to privacy, confidentiality, and ethical concerns (Hunter et al., 2018). Studies have shown that most users of social networking sites do not read the terms and conditions and have little understanding of their permissions and privacy (Kempa, 2015). This raises issues for researchers as to whether social media content is public information, and whether the users have consented for their data to be used in a different context than what they originally intended (Hunter et al., 2018). Moreover, when researching the social media environment, researchers run the risk of exposing users to harm (Hunter et al., 2018). For instance, if researchers wished to examine how users would authentically respond to misinformation and disinformation, they could post information that was false. However, they would then be exposing users to information that could be distressing and potentially dangerous, thus

violating ethical boundaries. Hence, a social media simulation is an effective alternative to examining online behaviour without the risk of violating these boundaries.

A social media simulation could mimic popular networking sites such as Facebook or Instagram and allow users to partake in typical online behaviours. For example, creating profiles, commenting on posts, sending or receiving messages, checking notifications, and viewing other profiles (Garaizar & Reips, 2013). Thus, providing researchers with the ability to examine how users respond when faced with misinformation and disinformation online, in a low-risk environment that poses no risk or real-life consequences to the user.

Social media simulations have been found to be effective in enhancing digital literacy, the ability to detect grooming behaviours online, and knowledge of responsible use of technology (DiFranzo et al., 2019; Gordillo et al., 2021; Reeves & Crowther, 2019). However, despite the growing risk of online attacks, such as misinformation and disinformation, there is little research specifically into how social media simulations can be used to train intelligence analysts to detect and combat these threats.

### **1.6 Naturalistic Decision-Making Theory**

To fully capture the decision-making processes of intelligence analysts, it is not only important to observe the decisions they make, but also to understand the mechanisms that underlie their decision-making processes. Naturalistic Decision-Making Theory refers to an attempt to understand how people realistically make decisions in complex or time-sensitive real-world settings (Klein & Klinger, 2008). According to the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework, complex situations in real-life are often marked with different key features which can include factors such as uncertain or continually changing environments, ill-defined tasks, time pressure or personal consequences for error, competing goals, and organisational groups and norms (Gore et al., 2015; Klein & Klinger, 2008).

With so many factors to consider and navigate in complex environments, it is believed then experts rarely have the cognitive capacity or the time to be able to carefully consider all the available options, evaluate all their disadvantages and advantages, and then choose the most optimal time-efficient and workable option (Klein & Klinger, 2008). As such, the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework proposes that decision-makers in real settings heavily rely on intuition (Klein et al., 1993).

The “Intuitive” style of decision making, is a proposed style of decision-making in which decisions made are rapid, automatic, and require little cognitive capacity or awareness into how these decisions are made (Kaufmann et al., 2014). These decisions are based on vast amounts of prior expertise, information, and knowledge that has been acquired primarily through associative learning and has been stored in the long-term memory (Salas et al., 2010). Ultimately, these types of decisions are associated with positive decision outcomes in challenging and complex environments in which the decision-maker may experience high stakes, constrained time limits, or limited available information (Kaufmann et al., 2014).

In complete contrast, the opposing style is known as the “Rational” system in which the decision-making process is slow, controlled, effortful, analytical, and requires high levels of cognitive ability (Hodgkinson et al., 2009). Decision-makers use rules, gather vast amounts of information, and follow a structured process by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each alternative, before making a decision that appears most optimal based on their careful and detailed analysis (Hodgkinson et al., 2009).

There is evidence to suggest that Naturalistic Decision-Making can be a useful theory to better understand how experts make decisions in natural environments or simulations that represent the environment. For example, an early study into Naturalistic Decision-Making examined a group of experts who worked in difficult environments such as firefighters and pilots (Klein et al., 1993). Results revealed that decisions made by these parties were based



on their evaluation of the situation and refreshing their situation awareness from experience, rather than generating multiple options and comparing them to one another (Klein et al., 1993). Thus, ultimately showing evidence in support of experts operating under the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework when in challenging environments (Klein et al., 1993).

Based on the literature, it would appear plausible to suggest that intelligence analysts would use their intuition to guide their decision-making. Indeed, there is some literature in favour of intelligence analysts operating under the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework, however, this research is limited (Gore et al., 2018). Therefore, one way of examining this relationship further is to investigate whether intelligence analysts are more likely to rely on their intuition to make decisions rather than using analytical means. For instance, when faced with a potential threat that they must respond to, are they able to quickly make a decision by drawing upon their past experience, as the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework would suggest.

### **1.7 Present Research**

While simulations have been widely considered beneficial in training and education, there is little research conducted specifically into social media simulations despite the growing risk of online threats such as misinformation and disinformation. The present study aimed to build upon this growing area of research by conducting a wargame that used a social media simulation, which would allow for the creation, dissemination, and collection of information for analysis to inform decision-making during the wargame. Thus, examining how intelligence analysts respond to misinformation and disinformation, and how the social media simulation could be used in the context of training intelligence analysts to develop better decision-making skills when faced with similar threats in real life.

According to the literature, wargaming is often considered exploratory in nature as it is rarely ever used to disprove theories or prove concrete hypotheses but rather it is intended for the purpose of highlighting new issues and providing interesting insights and lessons into the processes observed (Perla, 1985). When considering this factor in conjunction with the limited amount of current research in the area, there was strong rationale for the present study to be exploratory in nature. Thus, qualitative data was used to provide a foundation for this developing area of research, and to allow the exploration of more complex and rich data.

As the present study was exploratory, a general set of aims were established rather than concrete hypotheses. The primary aim of the present study was to examine how a social media simulation could be used to train intelligence analysts by examining their decision-making processes when faced with disinformation or misinformation. To do so, the current study was particularly interested in the factors that influenced participants decision-making and how they made decisions. For instance, whether intelligence analysts were more likely to use an intuitive style of decision-making over a rational style of decision-making as the current literature would suggest. In addition, the present study also aimed to explore any insights and lessons derived by the participants as the literature has demonstrated that insights obtained during a wargame can result in better decision-making in the future. Lastly, the study aimed to examine whether participants found the social media simulation a useful and beneficial tool in training and felt it would help improve their decision-making processes if faced with a similar threat.

## **2.0 Method**

### **2.1 Participants**

The study utilised purposeful sampling to recruit participants. Participation was sought from Australian Department of Defence (ADF) employees and researchers from The University of Adelaide who either worked or researched areas of interest to intelligence

analysts. These individuals were contacted by email and invited to participate in the wargame. A total of 21 participants partook in the wargame, with a total of 21 usable responses received for the qualitative data. From the demographic data, it was ascertained that in total, 14 participants identified as Male, and 7 participants identified as Female.

There were 4 participants who opted not to state their age group or prior experience. Of the remaining 17 participants who did provide this demographic information, a total of 3 participants specified they were in the 18-29 age group, 5 participants were in the 30-39 age group, 3 participants were in the 40-49 age group, and 6 participants were in the 50-69 age group. Further, 2 participants specified they had used a social media simulator a few times, 4 participants indicated they had used it once, and 11 participants indicated they had never used a social media simulator before. Of the participants who had prior experience with social media simulations, 5 participants indicated that they had used a simulation prior as part of a wargame, and 1 participant indicated that they had used it as part of research.

## **2.2 Materials**

### **2.2.1 Social Media Simulation**

The wargame used a social media simulation tool that is available within ADF and can be used in ‘real-time’ for training and wargaming exercises. The tool mimicked the features of popular networking sites such as Twitter and contained an existing library of information. However, more content was generated by the bots that populate the simulation, and participants were responsible for generating new and specific content for their team, and for controlling when this information should become available to other users.

## **2.3 Measures**

### **2.3.1 Demographic Information**

Participants’ demographic information was collected using a written survey prior to the wargame (*See Appendix A [full survey attached]*). Participants were asked their age,

gender, current job position, and their prior experience with social media simulations. These details are outlined above in Section 2.1.

### **2.3.2 Decision-Making Process, Lessons, and Insights**

To gain insight into the decision-making processes of participants during the wargame, participants were asked to complete a series of semi-structured focus groups after each turn of gameplay, which were led by researchers from the Department of Defence, Defence Science and Technology Group (DSTG). The wargame consisted of a total of four turns, with each turn comprising of four actions that each team was able to make during the turn. During the semi-structured focus groups, participants were asked a series of open-ended questions to explore the influences on their decision-making. The questions asked by researchers included prompts such as, (A) Why did you make the actions that you did this round? (B) What shaped your decision? (C) What were you thinking when you made this decision? (D) What factors influenced your decision?

Following the wargame, semi-structured focus groups were conducted with participants to explore their experiences with the social media simulation. These open-ended questions attempted to explore whether participants had found the social media simulation a useful tool, and what lessons and insights they gained from their experience. The questions asked by researchers included prompts such as, (A) If or how did the social media simulation make you think about your own decision-making processes? (B) Did you feel the social media simulation would help you make better decisions in the future if faced with a similar threat? (C) What lessons or insights did you gain from the social media simulation? (D) Was the simulation useful in gathering relevant information? (E) How did you use the simulation to publicise your own teams' narrative/actions to influence other participants during the wargame.

## **2.4 Procedure**

Following approval by the DSTG Low Risk Human Ethics Committee, participants were recruited for a study entitled, “Evaluation of a Social Media Simulator for Decision-Making in Information Operations and the Training of Intelligence Analysts”. After reading the Information Sheet, Consent Form, and the DSTG Guidelines for volunteers, and providing consent, participants were asked to complete a written survey comprising of demographic questions prior to the wargame. Participants then partook in the wargame in which they were asked to complete a series of semi-structured focus groups after each turn of gameplay regarding their decision-making. Following the wargame, semi-structured focus groups were conducted with participants to explore the insights and lessons gained by participants during the wargame. The focus groups were conducted within the teams that participants were allocated to during the wargame. There were five teams in total with an individual researcher assigned to each team.

## **3.0 Results**

### **3.1 Analysis**

Interviews from the semi-structured focus groups were transcribed verbatim by researchers. As the data was qualitative, it was then analysed using the method of thematic analysis which allows for the identification, analysis, and reporting of important themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Based on this approach, the data was analysed following six phases which included the following: ‘Familiarising yourself with your data’, ‘Generating initial codes’, ‘Searching for themes’, ‘Reviewing themes’, ‘Defining and naming themes’ and ‘Producing the report’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Microsoft Excel was used by researchers to input data and categorise the data into themes.

The thematic analysis resulted in three key themes being identified in relation to the influences on participants' decision-making, and three key themes regarding the lessons and insights gained by participants. The following section will discuss these results in detail. A total of 21 participants participated and provided comments during the semi-structured focus groups with a number code used to identify each participant.

## **3.2 Qualitative Results**

### **3.2.1 Influences on Decision-Making**

#### **3.2.1.1 'The Delivery of Important Information Regarding the Wargame Scenario'**

When considering the influences on participants' decision-making process, a prominent theme that emerged from the dataset was regarding how information about the wargame scenario was provided. Information about the wargame scenario and accompanying materials were shared with participants at the beginning of the wargame. Participants were not provided nor allocated extra time to read through this material. However, as shown by participants' comments below, participants felt that this information should have been provided sooner and that time should have been allocated to allow them to read through, and to fully grasp and process the information.

*"They could possibly just set time aside at the beginning, like an hour or two, where we absorb all the information, and discuss before impacting the exercises."* (#11).

*"There was probably a lot of stuff we missed, that could have been pre-reading some of that."* (#8).

As a result of not being able to process the information, many participants felt they lacked the necessary knowledge and understanding to make well-informed and effective decisions during the action rounds. For instance, as highlighted by a participant's comments below, some participants did not understand what the problem was that they were trying to resolve or their purpose, which impacted on their decision-making process when strategising.

*“The information was there, but you need more comprehensive time to assimilate the circumstance because sometimes you need to actually work out what the problem is that we're trying to solve.” (#10).*

Participants also commented that they spent a substantial amount of time reviewing information which meant they had less time to strategise and plan. Hence, hindering effective decision-making processes, as participants felt pressured by the time constraints or felt they did not have enough time to effectively strategise as shown by participants' comments below.

*“We almost needed time to think of ideas and then actually post those ideas. We sort of having time to think of those ideas and then suddenly we got to run it to the table, but we haven't done anything.” (#2).*

*“From the brief to the decision, it was very short, and so there was a lot of reacting rather than planning or strategising.” (#10)*

Evidently, the method in which the information about the wargame scenario was delivered had a substantial impact on participants. By not providing enough time for participants to read through and process the information, participants struggled with time constraints, and a lack of knowledge and understanding. Ultimately, hindering their decision-making processes or changing the course of them altogether if they had all the information.

### **3.2.1.2 'Prior Experience'**

A prominent theme that emerged from the dataset was the relationship between prior experience and decision-making. When asked about what influenced their decision-making processes, participants frequently commented that they drew upon their prior experience and knowledge. As demonstrated by participants' comments below, this experience came from a wide variety of sources.

*“Well for me its previous experience with the previous wargame.” (#1).*

*“An experience for me is previous work with different actors including governments, and also my own personal background and experience that I bring to the decision-making process.” (#11).*

*“I come from a politics background so previous knowledge I guess for me.” (#3).*

Participants commented that they felt this prior experience was advantageous to their decision-making process. For instance, as demonstrated by participants’ comments below, prior experience allowed participants to strategise more effectively as they had greater insight into the probable outcomes of the action.

*“It was really previous experience about how influence campaigns work, and you know, you either distract from the problem or you gather some force for the personal issue or event, and you make it a non-issue and non-significant event.” (#3).*

*“What also helps, in my experience was trying to drill from uh previous experiences, you know so we can look at one thing, or we can look at the same thing and have different interpretations of it, so trying to look at it from there, things from that perspective, and anticipating the next and then strategising and consulting that line.” (#11).*

Comments coded into this theme demonstrated that prior experience had a significant influence on participants' decision-making and that participants viewed this as an advantage on their decision-making processes.

### **3.2.1.3 ‘The Quantity and Speed of Information’**

An emerging theme from the data revealed that the abundance of mass and complex information had an impact on participants’ decision-making. Participants noted that the influx of information on the social media simulator made it extremely challenging to manage and find relevant information. As a result, participants felt their decision-making was hindered as they often wasted substantial time trying to find relevant information. In addition, as shown



by participants' comments below, participants frequently felt overwhelmed and confused at times by the massive amount of information they were receiving from various sources.

*“Staying on top of what was happening as best as we could, responding to things, and just letting you know that they needed to be responded to, and how and from where, was a ridiculous task.” (#2).*

*“That was part of the difficulty I had with the feed, because I couldn't tell what order this stuff is coming in, why am I getting, a hundred tweets from CosmicGnome101, and only a couple from other things.” (#10).*

The abundance of information meant that participants often did not have the time to properly distinguish between false or real information or verify the information. Rather, participants had to strategise and make decisions based on the information they could get the fastest as demonstrated by a participants comment below.

*“I would say, whatever is quickest, if you are trying to do everything, but everything is within a day, so whatever is going to get you the most information as fastest as possible. You are probably not going to double check and verify, you are probably just going to go, right, what's happening, and grab that and move on with that ... it's more like having a quick skim, anything popping out, no, okay move onto the next news article. So, there is more popping out, then you make the decision. So, it's kind of like, what can I get fast to influence my decision.” (#2).*

Evidently, participants were heavily influenced by the abundance of information and the time that was spent trying to manage and find relevant information. Consequently, this meant that participants heavily relied on and based their decision-making on information they could get the fastest regardless of whether this information could be verified.

### 3.2.2 Insights and Lessons Learnt

#### 3.2.2.1 'Greater Awareness into Misinformation'

The first theme identified regarding the insights and lessons learnt by participants referred to misinformation. Participants commented that after partaking in the simulation, they felt they had greater awareness into the ease and carelessness in which misinformation could spread. Participants shared insight into how easily misinformation can be circulated and spread by actors who are not concerned with the credibility of information as demonstrated by participants' comments below.

*"Misinformation is cheap, its cheap to lie, its much less cheap to be accurate, especially when the access to what is accurate in this situation is quite difficult."* (#9).

*"Journalists are lazy, you know pretty much now, journalists sit there, look for a tweet, and then that becomes new info, and its one person's opinion."* (#10).

Participants also noted that misinformation often caused influxes of information which made it extremely difficult to distinguish between false and true information. As demonstrated by a participant's comment below, this provided insight into how difficult it can be to determine the credibility of information or the actor.

*"That really looks like a fake account, but I can't be sure because of the stupidity that people post online daily and those are real accounts. It doesn't conclude stupid things on here not being real as well."* (#15).

Comments within this theme also referred to participants indicating that false information often made it difficult to find and monitor the relevant information. As a result, they gained greater understanding into the many different factors decision-makers must consider when monitoring information as shown by a participant's comment below.

*“Cyber scandals or such trending news can sometimes derail some of the priorities that decision-makers are already paying attention to. So, there are all these moving parts that need to be taken into account at the same time.” (#11).*

Comments coded into this theme demonstrated that participants appeared to gain greater awareness of the influence and power of misinformation. Particularly, participants demonstrated insight into how rapidly misinformation can be spread and the difficulty that misinformation poses in that relevant and accurate information becomes increasingly difficult to find and monitor.

### **3.2.2.2 ‘Greater Awareness into the Difficulty of Managing Multiple Profiles’**

The second theme identified regarding the insights and lessons learnt by participants referred to the management of multiple online profiles. Participants commented that managing multiple profiles on the social media simulation was extremely challenging from a practicability perspective as demonstrated by a participant’s comments below.

*“We have at least nine accounts, plus the official ones that we got to hold to, it’s a dozen accounts but it’s such a pain in the backside to switch between, and you just up just kind of sitting at one account for a while and that sort of shapes your thinking as you come up with a great idea and then go oh no, I will have to log out of this account and log into another one.” (#5).*

In addition, to the practical aspect of managing multiple profiles, participants also shared they felt they gained insight into how difficult it is to manage multiple personas when attempting to influence others and when trying to control the strategic narrative as shown by a participant’s comments below.

*“I think it pointed out how much effort it can be to manage several identities at once ... so if you are doing it manually, what goes into it, and I knew of that already but once you have done it for real its little bit more eye-opening, so you know trying to*

*keep the personas straight and then one started veering to the other but trying to make that look sensible at the same time was interesting.” (#15).*

Comments coded into this theme demonstrated that participants gained greater awareness and insight into the complexities and challenging nature of managing multiple identities at once when trying to influence and control the strategic narrative.

### **3.2.2.3 ‘Useful Tool for Training’**

Another insight shared by participants that was evident from the qualitative data, was that participants felt the social media simulation would be a useful tool for training. As evidenced by a participant’s comment below, participants indicated that the social media simulation had potential to become an effective training tool for high level decision-makers.

*“I think there is an opportunity now to create a tool that could be very effective in training, particularly senior military and whole governments.” (#3).*

Participants also referenced specific situations in how they felt the tool could be useful. For example, participants indicated that the social media simulation could be used to train intelligence analysts to develop better awareness and understanding into early warning signs of real-life risk. As demonstrated below, one participant referenced the January 6<sup>th</sup> Capitol Riots and how a social media simulation tool could have assisted in preventing this occurrence.

*“I think it’s a situational understanding of those early warning indicators, you know, a change in population sentiment or disenfranchising. ... when you look at the January 6<sup>th</sup> [riots], had they been tracking social media they would have known that hundreds and thousands of people, who were against the election were coming to the capitol, so what are the actions that needed to be taken.” (#6).*

Furthermore, participants also noted how the social media simulation could be used by intelligence analysts to practice repetitively. As demonstrated by a participant's comment

below, participants felt this would be extremely beneficial as this would allow the individual to receive feedback on their performance.

*“If we sat down and went through all the tweets like a football team goes through their players right, like this is good, this is bad, for whatever reason. You would be able to teach a team how to think on their feet within boundaries...,if I was going to be an information warfare guy, I would want this for weeks and weeks to work out what is expected of me and what is it that they want.” (#11).*

Comments coded into this theme demonstrated that participants felt the tool had the potential to be useful and beneficial in the training of intelligence analysts. Participants commented that the tool could be used to train intelligence analysts by teaching them to identify early warning signs, and for practice and feedback. Thus, ultimately contributing and leading to better decision-making.

#### **4.0 Discussion**

The present study explored the decision-making process of individuals while using a social media simulation available within the ADF. While simulations more broadly have been shown to be effective and useful in training, education, and knowledge, there is very little research into the benefits of social media simulations specifically. However, given the growing risk of online threats such as misinformation and disinformation, there is a clear need for intelligence analysts to have high quality and effective training. Hence, the present study aimed to contribute to the current literature field by conducting one of the first few studies into how a wargame using a social media simulation can be used to assist and train intelligence analysts to make better informed decisions when faced with potential threat. The following section below will discuss both the theoretical and applied contributions of this study, and highlight suggestions and directions for future research.

#### 4.1 Theoretical Contribution

This study aimed to contribute to the current literature by gaining insight into the decision-making processes of individuals and how social media simulations can be used to train intelligence analysts to make better decisions when faced with similar threats in real-life. To do so, the present study sought to examine what factors influenced participants' decision-making. Results revealed that participants' decisions were influenced by three key factors which included, 'the delivery of important information regarding the wargame scenario', the quantity and speed of information' and 'prior experience'. These key influences that impacted participants' decision-making processes demonstrate support for participants making decisions using Naturalistic Decision-Making.

According to the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework, decision-makers in real-life settings often rely on their intuition (also known as past experience and knowledge) to make decisions in complex and challenging environments in which they are constrained by external factors such as time pressure, and either a lack of or an abundance of information (Klein et al., 1993). As demonstrated by the present research, participants were often hindered by time pressures or the lack of accessible information. As such, participants often quickly made decisions based on the information they had and what information they could get the fastest, rather than utilising a slow and carefully considered process in which they had all the information and considered all options. Additionally, in further support of participants operating under Naturalistic Decision-Making, participants commented that they frequently drew upon their past experiences which allowed them to make quicker and more effective decisions as they had more confidence and certainty in the outcomes. When considering these factors, it is evident that this style of decision-making is most reflective of the initiative style of decision-making rather than the rational style of decision-making. Thus, based on these

findings, there appears to be evidence to plausibly suggest that participants utilised Naturalistic Decision-Making when making decisions during the social media simulation.

This finding contributes to the current literature by expanding on previous research which has demonstrated support for intelligence analysts operating under the Naturalistic Decision-Making framework (Gore et al., 2018). As this type of decision-making is associated with better decision outcomes in difficult and time-sensitive environments (Kaufmann et al., 2014), this is a positive finding as it demonstrates that intelligence analysts are likely to utilise an advantageous style of decision-making. Evidently, when working within demanding situations, there is little capacity for individuals to carefully consider all their options and follow a structured process. Therefore, prior experience and knowledge are extremely valuable for individuals when working and making decisions within these challenging environments.

Further, an interesting but unintended finding was that participants felt frustrated with the method in which they received information. For instance, participants frequently commented that they felt their decision-making processes were hindered due to not being given enough time to process the information provided before being forced to make decisions. However, despite their frustrations, the time constraints and pressures that were placed on participants were purposeful to make the experience more reflective of the challenging real-life environments that intelligence analysts often operate in. Ultimately, this finding highlights that participants may have not made the association between the social media simulation and its applicability to real-life. Therefore, future studies may choose to explore how to make the real-life applicability of the social media simulation more apparent to users.

## **4.2 Applied contribution**

The results demonstrated that participants gained greater insight and awareness into the ease and rapidness in which misinformation could be spread and the complexities involved when monitoring online information. For example, how difficult it is to manage several online profiles. This finding was positive as research has consistently demonstrated that gaining greater awareness of an issue can result in greater insight and more effective decision-making when faced with a similar threat (Perla & McCrady, 2011).

The findings demonstrated that participants found the social media simulation an effective and beneficial tool for training. Participants commented that they felt that the social media simulation could be used to train intelligence analysts to monitor and detect early warning indicators of real-life threat such as organised riots like the January 6<sup>th</sup> Capitol Riots. In addition, participants felt the social media simulation was extremely beneficial as it allowed for repetition which then allowed for feedback on their performance. Thus, they could gain insight into what constituted a good/bad decision which ultimately would lead to better decision-making. While this study was exploratory in nature, these findings provide an early indication into usefulness and benefits of social media simulations in the training of intelligence analysts. This provides strong rationale for the investment and continuation of research regarding social media simulations in training.

## **4.3 Limitations and Future Directions**

The current study has contributed to the literature field by providing insight into the decision-making processes of individuals who work with complex volumes of data such as in the case of intelligence analysts. Nonetheless, there are several limitations that must be considered.

First, it is important to note that the outcomes of wargames are never pre-determined but are dependent on the actions and decisions made throughout by participants. However,



human decision-making is complex, unpredictable, and sensitive. A single factor can have a significant impact on any of these processes. Therefore, due to the many variables that can influence decision-making, it is believed that no wargame will ever be the same (Perla, 1985). Consequently, the present study is limited in that it is unlikely that it will ever be able to be fully duplicated and produce the same conclusion. Nonetheless, while the wargame is unable to be duplicated there may still be benefit in the replication of the present study. While the final outcomes might differ, the same key patterns and themes that were found in the current study are still likely to emerge. Thus, helping to increase the generalisability and reliability of the present finding. Hence, future research may benefit from replicating the present study with an equal or larger sample.

It is also worth noting that participants in the present study were recruited using a purposive sampling technique. The researchers were aware prior to the study that all participants either researched or worked within areas related to intelligence analysts. However, for future research it would be beneficial for a question to be included about how long the individual has worked in the role. This information would be valuable as it would allow researchers to observe how participants' specific experiences influence their decision-making and any relationships between years of experience and decision-making.

Further, it is important to note that the present study utilised qualitative data extracted from focus groups. As this study was exploratory this method was considered appropriate, however this does result in a limitation. An individual researcher was assigned to each team to conduct a series of focus groups after every round. However, given the nature of semi-structured focus groups, the researcher may not ask all questions or may ask additional questions that were not planned in advance to explore an interesting or unexpected point that has been raised. Further, the focus groups are primarily guided by the participants, meaning that at times some participants may choose to answer more than others, or others may choose

not to answer the question at all. Consequently, while the data was analysed by identifying the most prominent themes that emerged from the dataset, these findings may not be applicable or reflective of all participants. Therefore, future research would benefit from the additional use of written surveys or structured individual face-to-face interviews to thoroughly capture all participants' experiences with the social media simulation.

#### **4.4 Conclusions**

The rise and evolution of technology has led to an increase in online threats such as in the case of misinformation and disinformation which can result in dire consequences and real-life risk. It is vital that intelligence analysts have quality and effective training to identify, monitor, and accurately assess these potential threats. The present study has provided valuable insight into the decision-making processes of intelligence analysts and how social media simulations can be utilised in their training to assist decision-making. The results suggest that social media simulations appear useful for the training of intelligence analysts and that there is strong rationale for research within this area to expand. Future research that replicates the present study and uses other methods such as structured individual interviews would increase the reliability and generalisability of the present findings. The current study continues paving the way for future research within this area and has provided recommendations for the ongoing growth and development of social media simulations.

### References

- Agrafiotis, I., Nurse, J. R., Goldsmith, M., Creese, S., & Upton, D. (2018). A taxonomy of cyber-harms: Defining the impacts of cyber-attacks and understanding how they propagate. *Journal of Cybersecurity*, 4(1), 1-15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/cybsec/tyy006>
- Akhgar, B., Bayerl, P. S., & Sampson, F. (2017). *Open-source intelligence investigation: From strategy to implementation*. Springer.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47671-1>
- Al-Elq, A. H. (2010). Simulation-based medical teaching and learning. *Journal of Family and Community Medicine*, 17(1), 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.4103%2F1319-1683.68787>
- Azad, T. M., & Haider, M. W. (2020). Deterrence in Realm of Grey Zone Warfare. *Journal of Indian Studies*, 6(2), 285-304.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349929532\\_Deterrence\\_in\\_Realm\\_of\\_Grey\\_Zone\\_Warfare](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349929532_Deterrence_in_Realm_of_Grey_Zone_Warfare)
- Badawy, A., Ferrara, E., & Lerman, K. (2018, 28-31 August). Analyzing the digital traces of political manipulation: The 2016 Russian interference Twitter campaign. [Paper presentation]. *2018 IEEE/ACM international conference on advances in social networks analysis and mining (ASONAM)*, 258-265. Barcelona, Spain, Europe.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ASONAM.2018.8508646>
- Banasik, M. (2016). Unconventional war and warfare in the gray zone. The new spectrum of modern conflicts. *Journal of Defense Resources Management (JoDRM)*, 7(1), 37-46. [http://www.jodrm.eu/issues/volume7\\_issue1/04\\_banasik.pdf](http://www.jodrm.eu/issues/volume7_issue1/04_banasik.pdf)
- Bernardes, S. M. F., Rebelo, F., Vilar, E., Noriega, P., & Borges, T. (2015). Methodological

- approaches for use virtual reality to develop emergency evacuation simulations for training, in emergency situations. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 6313-6320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2015.07.946>
- Bleakley, P. (2021). Panic, pizza and mainstreaming the alt-right: A social media analysis of Pizzagate and the rise of the QAnon conspiracy. *Current Sociology*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921211034896>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Carpenter, R., & White, C. (2005, May 11-13). Computer games in the Australian Department of Defence [Paper presentation]. SimTect 2005 Conference Proceedings, Sydney, NSW, Australia.  
<https://www.simulationaustralasia.com/files/upload/pdf/research/001-2005.pdf>.
- Chin Jr, G-., Kuchar, O. A., & Wolf, K. E. (2009, April). Exploring the analytical processes of intelligence analysts [Paper presentation]. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Boston, MA, USA.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518704>
- Chung, S. (2016, December 6-8). Simulations for Crisis Communication: The Use of Social Media [Paper presentation] International Association for Development of the Information Society. *Proceedings of the International Conferences on Internet Technologies & Society (ITS), Education Technologies (ICEduTECH), and Sustainability, Technology and Education (STE)*. Melbourne, VIC, Australia.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518704>
- De Ridder, J. (2021). What's so bad about misinformation?. *Inquiry*, 1- 23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174x.2021.2002187>
- DiFranzo, D., Choi, Y. H., Purington, A., Taft, J. G., Whitlock, J., & Bazarova, N. N. (2019,

May 4-9) Social media testdrive: Real-world social media education for the next generation [Paper presentation]. *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Glasgow, Scotland, UK.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300533>

Dowse, A., & Bachmann, S. D. (2019). Explainer: what is 'hybrid warfare' and what is meant by the 'grey zone'?. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/explainer-what-is-hybrid-warfare-and-what-is-meant-by-the-grey-zone-118841#:~:text=Related%20to%20hybrid%20warfare%2C%20the%20term%20political%20warfare,may%20not%20clearly%20cross%20the%20threshold%20of%20war.>

Elm, W. C., Cook, M. J., Greitzer, F. L., Hoffman, R. R., Moon, B., & Hutchins, S. G.

(2004). Designing Support for Intelligence Analysts. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 48(3), 406-

410. <https://doi.org/10.1177/154193120404800328>

Figueira, Á., & Oliveira, L. (2017). The current state of fake news: challenges and opportunities. *Procedia Computer Science*, 121, 817-825.

[doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.106](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.106)

Garaizar, P., & Reips, U. D. (2014). Build your own social network laboratory with Social Lab: A tool for research in social media. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46(2), 430-438.

<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0385-3>

Gookins, A. J. (2008). The role of intelligence in policy making. *The SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 28(1), 65-73. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27000118>

Gordillo, A., Barra, E., Garaizar, P., & López-Pernas, S. (2021). Use of a simulated social network as an educational tool to enhance teacher digital competence. *IEEE Revista Iberoamericana de Tecnologías del Aprendizaje*, 16(1), 107-114.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/rita.2021.3052686>

- Gore, J., Flin, R., Stanton, N., & Wong, B. W. (2015). Applications for naturalistic decision-making. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(2), 223-230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12121>
- Gore, J., Ward, P., Conway, G. E., Ormerod, T. C., Wong, B. L., & Stanton, N. A. (2018). Naturalistic decision making: navigating uncertainty in complex sociotechnical work. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 20(4), 521-527. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-018-0531-x>
- Guadagno, R. E., & Guttieri, K. (2021). Fake News and Information Warfare: An Examination of the Political and Psychological Processes From the Digital Sphere to the Real World. In I. Management Association (Ed.), *Research Anthology on Fake News, Political Warfare, and Combatting the Spread of Misinformation* (pp. 218-242). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-7291-7.ch013>
- Hedley, J. H. (2005). Learning from intelligence failures. *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 18(3), 435-450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08850600590945416>
- Hodgkinson, G. P., Sadler-Smith, E., Burke, L. A., Claxton, G., & Sparrow, P. R. (2009). Intuition in organizations: Implications for strategic management. *Long Range Planning*, 42(3), 277-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.05.003>
- Hunter, R. F., Gough, A., O'Kane, N., McKeown, G., Fitzpatrick, A., Walker, T., ... & Kee, F. (2018). Ethical issues in social media research for public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 108(3), 343-348. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2017.304249>
- Iyengar, J. V., Hargett, G. H., & Hargett, J. D. (1999). Military development and applications of simulation systems. *Journal of International Information Management*, 8(2), 57-68 <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/jiim/vol8/iss2/5>

- Kaufmann, L., Meschnig, G., & Reimann, F. (2014). Rational and intuitive decision-making in sourcing teams: Effects on decision outcomes. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 20(2), 104-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2014.03.003>
- Kempa, E. (2015). *Social media addiction: The paradox of visibility & vulnerability* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Borås, Sweden). DiVA. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?dswid=-197&pid=diva2%3A867437>
- Klein, G. (2015). A naturalistic decision making perspective on studying intuitive decision making. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 4(3), 164-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2015.07.001>
- Klein, G., Klinger, D. (2008). Naturalistic decision making. *Human Factors*, 50(3), 456-460. <https://doi.org/10.1518/001872008x288385>
- Klein, GA., Orasanu, J., Calderwood, R., & Zsombok, C. E. (1993). *Decision making in Action: Models and methods*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Levy, G., & Razin, R. (2020). Social media and political polarisation. *LSE Public Policy Review*, 1(1). 1-7. <http://doi.org/10.31389/lseppr.5>
- Lewandowsky, S., Stritzke, W. G., Freund, A. M., Oberauer, K., & Krueger, J. I. (2013). Misinformation, disinformation, and violent conflict: From Iraq and the “War on Terror” to future threats to peace. *American Psychologist*, 68(7), 487-501. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034515>
- Mayfield III, T. D. (2011). The Impact of Social Media on the Nature of Conflict, and a Commander's Strategy for Social Media. *Army Europe and Seventh Army APO New York*. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA535374>
- Ohlin, J. D. (2016). Did Russian cyber interference in the 2016 election violate international law. *Texas Law Review*, 95, 1579-1598. <https://doi.org/10.31228/osf.io/3vuzf>

- Oliker, O. (2017). Russian Influence and Unconventional Warfare Operations in the 'Grey Zone:' Lessons from Ukraine. *Centre for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS)*.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep37591>
- Padilla, J. J. (2012). Annex 2: Military Simulation Systems. In A. Tolk (Eds.), *Engineering Principles of Combat Modeling and Distributed Simulation* (pp. 861-868). John Wiley & Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118180310.oth2>
- Page, E. H. (2016). Modeling and Simulation, Experimentation, and Wargaming-Assessing a Common Landscape. *Mitre Corp Mclean VA*. <https://doi.org/10.2172/5963005>
- Perla, P. P. (1985). What Wargaming is and is Not. *Naval War College Review*, 38(5), 70-78. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44637075>
- Perla, P. (1990). *The Art of Wargaming*. Naval Institute Press.
- Perla, P. P., & Barrett, R. T. (1985). An introduction to wargaming and its uses. *Centre for Naval Analyses Alexandria Va Naval Warfare Operations Div*.  
<https://doi.org/10.21236/adb098178>
- Perla, P. P., & McGrady, E. D. (2011). Why wargaming works. *Naval War College Review*, 64(3), 111-130. <https://d.docs.live.net/0181b8ac2f187f0a/Documents/2.png>
- Porche, I. I., Paul, C., Serena, C. C., Clarke, C. P., Johnson, E. E., & Herrick, D. (2018). Tactical cyber: Building a strategy for cyber support to corps and below. *RAND Corporation Santa Monica United States*. <https://doi.org/10.7249/rr1600>
- Reddie, A. W., Goldblum, B. L., Lakkaraju, K., Reinhardt, J., Nacht, M., & Epifanovskaya, L. (2018). Next-generation wargames. *Science*, 362(6421), 1362-1364.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav2135>
- Reeves, J., & Crowther, T. (2019). Teacher feedback on the use of innovative social media



simulations to enhance critical thinking in young people on radicalisation, extremism, sexual exploitation and grooming. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 37(4), 280-296.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2019.1618377>

Salas, E., Rosen, M. A., & DiazGranados, D. (2010). Expertise-based intuition and decision making in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 941-973.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206309350084>

Shirky, C. (2011). The political power of social media: Technology, the public sphere, and political change. *Foreign Affairs*, 90(1) 28-41. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25800379>

Stahl, B. C. (2006). On the difference or equality of information, misinformation, and disinformation: A critical research perspective. *Informing Science*, 9, 84-96.

<https://doi.org/10.28945/473>

Tropotei, T. (2019). Social Media in Intelligence Analysis. *Strategic Impact*, (70/71), 69-78. [https://cssas.unap.ro/en/pdf\\_periodicals/si70-71.pdf#page=69](https://cssas.unap.ro/en/pdf_periodicals/si70-71.pdf#page=69)

Wither, J. K. (2016). Making sense of hybrid warfare. *Connections*, 15(2), 73-87.

<https://doi.org/10.11610/connections.15.2.06>

### Contribution Statement

██████: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing, Visualisation, Resources, Project Administration. **D.I.:** Conceptualisation, Methodology, Software, Writing – Review and Editing, Supervision. **D.S.:** Writing – Review & Editing, Project Administration, Funding Acquisition: **G.B.:** Conceptualisation, Funding Acquisition: **A.G.:** Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision.

## Instructions to Authors for Chosen Journal



# COMPUTERS IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR

## AUTHOR INFORMATION PACK

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

•	<b>Description</b>	<b>p.1</b>
•	<b>Audience</b>	<b>p.1</b>
•	<b>Impact Factor</b>	<b>p.1</b>
•	<b>Abstracting and Indexing</b>	<b>p.2</b>
•	<b>Editorial Board</b>	<b>p.2</b>
•	<b>Guide for Authors</b>	<b>p.4</b>



ISSN: 0747-5632

### DESCRIPTION

*Computers in Human Behavior* is a scholarly journal dedicated to examining the use of **computers** from a **psychological** perspective. Original theoretical works, research reports, literature reviews, software reviews, book reviews and announcements are published. The journal addresses both the use of computers in **psychology, psychiatry** and related disciplines as well as the psychological impact of computer use on individuals, groups and society. The former category includes articles exploring the use of computers for professional practice, training, research and theory development. The latter category includes articles dealing with the psychological effects of computers on phenomena such as human development, learning, cognition, personality, and social interactions. The journal addresses **human interactions with computers**, not computers *per se*. The computer is discussed only as a medium through which human behaviors are shaped and expressed. The primary message of most articles involves information about human behavior. Therefore, professionals with an interest in the psychological aspects of computer use, but with limited knowledge of computers, will find this journal of interest.

#### Benefits to authors

We also provide many author benefits, such as free PDFs, a liberal copyright policy, special discounts on Elsevier publications and much more. Please click here for more information on our [author services](#).

Please see our [Guide for Authors](#) for information on article submission. If you require any further information or help, please visit our [Support Center](#)

Research articles, review articles, negative results studies, scale validations and replication studies can be submitted to the journal's open access companion title, [Computers in Human Behavior Reports](#).

### AUDIENCE

Psychologists, Cognitive Scientists, Educational Psychologists.

### IMPACT FACTOR

2021: 8.957 © Clarivate Analytics Journal Citation Reports 2022

## ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

---

Psychology Abstracts  
 Current Contents - Social & Behavioral Sciences  
 Academic Journal Guide (Chartered Association of Business Schools)  
 PsycINFO  
 PsycLIT  
 Current Contents  
 Social Sciences Citation Index  
 Current Index to Journals in Education  
 International Bibliography of Periodical Literature  
 International Bibliography Book Reviews  
 Ergonomics Abstracts  
 Software Reviews on File  
 Computer Publishers & Publications  
 Engineering Index  
 COMPENDEX  
 Engineering Meetings  
 World Patent Information  
 Sociological Abstracts  
 Bioengineering Abstracts  
 Cambridge Scientific Abstracts  
 Embase  
 IBZ and IBR  
 Information Science Abstracts  
 Library and Information Science Abstracts  
 SSSA/CISA/ECA/ISMEC  
 Scopus  
 INSPEC  
 MathEduc

## EDITORIAL BOARD

---

### *Editor*

**Matthieu Guitton**, Laval University, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

### *Senior Editor*

**Bu Zhong**, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, United States of America

### *Commissioning Editor*

**P. Kirschner**, Open University of The Netherlands, Heerlen, Netherlands

### *Associate Editors*

**Nisreen Ameen**, Royal Holloway University of London School of Business and Management, Egham, United Kingdom

**Min Jou**, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan

**Bjorn de Koning**, Erasmus University Rotterdam Department of Psychology, Education and Child Studies, Rotterdam, Netherlands

**Andrew Lepp**, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, United States of America

**Nicolae Nistor**, Ludwig Maximilians University Munich, Munich, Germany

**Marianna Sigala**, University of Piraeus Department of Business Administration, Peiraias, Greece

**Catalina Toma**, University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts, Madison, Wisconsin, United States of America

**Jen-Her Wu**, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

**Shuhua Zhou**, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, United States of America

### *Scientific Board*

**William Bart**, University of Minnesota Twin Cities, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America

**Joël Billieux**, University of Lausanne Institute of Psychology, Lausanne, Switzerland

**Gary Bitter**, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, United States of America

**Fran Blumberg**, Fordham University, New York, United States of America

**P. Carlbring**, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

**Michelle Drouin**, Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, Indiana, United States of America



**Jan Elen**, KU Leuven Centre for Instructional Psychology and Technology, Leuven, Belgium  
**Francisco García-Peñalvo**, University of Salamanca Department of Computer Science and Automation, Salamanca, Spain  
**Jeroen Janssen**, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands  
**Jakob Jensen**, The University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, United States of America  
**Linda Kaye**, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, United Kingdom  
**Liesbeth Kester**, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands  
**Karel Kreijns**, Open University of The Netherlands, Heerlen, Netherlands  
**Ard Lazonder**, University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands  
**Hsing-Chin Lee**, National Taipei University of Business, Taipei, Taiwan  
**Karl MacDorman**, Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, Bloomington, Indiana, United States of America  
**Brian Nelson**, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, United States of America  
**Jan L. Plass**, New York University, New York, New York, United States of America  
**Albert Ritzhaupt**, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, United States of America  
**Neil Schwartz**, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States of America  
**Jennifer D. Shapka**, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada  
**Ionu# Dorin Stanciu**, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
**Jan-Willem Strijbos**, University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands  
**Asa Wengelin**, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden  
**Kevin Wise**, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, Urbana, Illinois, United States of America  
**Joerg Zumbach**, Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria

## GUIDE FOR AUTHORS

---

### *Your Paper Your Way*

We now differentiate between the requirements for new and revised submissions. You may choose to submit your manuscript as a single Word or PDF file to be used in the refereeing process. Only when your paper is at the revision stage, will you be requested to put your paper in to a 'correct format' for acceptance and provide the items required for the publication of your article.

**To find out more, please visit the Preparation section below.**

### INTRODUCTION

*Computers in Human Behavior* is a scholarly journal dedicated to examining the use of computers from a psychological perspective. Original theoretical works, research reports, literature reviews, software reviews, book reviews and announcements are published. The journal addresses both the use of computers in psychology, psychiatry and related disciplines as well as the psychological impact of computer use on individuals, groups and society. The former category includes articles exploring the use of computers for professional practice, training, research and theory development. The latter category includes articles dealing with the psychological effects of computers on phenomena such as human development, learning, cognition, personality, and social interactions. The journal addresses human interactions with computers, not computers per se. The computer is discussed only as a medium through which human behaviors are shaped and expressed. The primary message of most articles involves information about human behavior. Therefore, professionals with an interest in the psychological aspects of computer use, but with limited knowledge of computers, will find this journal of interest.

#### *Types of contributions*

Original theoretical works, research reports, literature reviews, software reviews, book reviews (by invitation only) and announcements.

### *Submission checklist*

You can use this list to carry out a final check of your submission before you send it to the journal for review. Please check the relevant section in this Guide for Authors for more details.

#### **Ensure that the following items are present:**

One author has been designated as the corresponding author with contact details:

- E-mail address
- Full postal address

All necessary files have been uploaded:

#### *Manuscript:*

- Include keywords
- All figures (include relevant captions)
- All tables (including titles, description, footnotes)
- Ensure all figure and table citations in the text match the files provided
- Indicate clearly if color should be used for any figures in print

*Graphical Abstracts / Highlights files* (where applicable)

*Supplemental files* (where applicable)

#### Further considerations

- Manuscript has been 'spell checked' and 'grammar checked'
- All references mentioned in the Reference List are cited in the text, and vice versa
- Permission has been obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including the Internet)
- A competing interests statement is provided, even if the authors have no competing interests to declare
- Journal policies detailed in this guide have been reviewed
- Referee suggestions and contact details provided, based on journal requirements

For further information, visit our [Support Center](#).

### BEFORE YOU BEGIN



### **Ethics in publishing**

Please see our information on [Ethics in publishing](#).

### **Studies in humans and animals**

If the work involves the use of human subjects, the author should ensure that the work described has been carried out in accordance with [The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association \(Declaration of Helsinki\)](#) for experiments involving humans. The manuscript should be in line with the [Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals](#) and aim for the inclusion of representative human populations (sex, age and ethnicity) as per those recommendations. The terms **sex** and **gender** should be used correctly.

Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

All animal experiments should comply with the [ARRIVE guidelines](#) and should be carried out in accordance with the U.K. Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, 1986 and associated guidelines, [EU Directive 2010/63/EU for animal experiments](#), or the National Research Council's [Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals](#) and the authors should clearly indicate in the manuscript that such guidelines have been followed. The sex of animals must be indicated, and where appropriate, the influence (or association) of sex on the results of the study.

### **Declaration of interest**

All authors must disclose any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could inappropriately influence (bias) their work. Examples of potential competing interests include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Authors must disclose any interests in two places: 1. A summary declaration of interest statement in the title page file (if double anonymized) or the manuscript file (if single anonymized). If there are no interests to declare then please state this: 'Declarations of interest: none'. 2. Detailed disclosures as part of a separate Declaration of Interest form, which forms part of the journal's official records. It is important for potential interests to be declared in both places and that the information matches. [More information](#).

### **Submission declaration and verification**

Submission of an article implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract, a published lecture or academic thesis, see ['Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication'](#) for more information), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. To verify compliance, your article may be checked by [Crossref Similarity Check](#) and other originality or duplicate checking software.

### **Use of inclusive language**

Inclusive language acknowledges diversity, conveys respect to all people, is sensitive to differences, and promotes equal opportunities. Content should make no assumptions about the beliefs or commitments of any reader; contain nothing which might imply that one individual is superior to another on the grounds of age, gender, race, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, disability or health condition; and use inclusive language throughout. Authors should ensure that writing is free from bias, stereotypes, slang, reference to dominant culture and/or cultural assumptions. We advise to seek gender neutrality by using plural nouns ("clinicians, patients/clients") as default/wherever possible to avoid using "he, she," or "he/she." We recommend avoiding the use of descriptors that refer to personal attributes such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, disability or health condition unless they are relevant and valid. When coding terminology is used, we recommend to avoid offensive or exclusionary terms such as "master", "slave", "blacklist" and "whitelist". We suggest using alternatives that are more appropriate and (self-) explanatory such as "primary", "secondary", "blocklist" and "allowlist". These guidelines are meant as a point of reference to help identify appropriate language but are by no means exhaustive or definitive.

### **Author contributions**

For transparency, we encourage authors to submit an author statement file outlining their individual contributions to the paper using the relevant CRediT roles: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Resources;



Software; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Roles/Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing. Authorship statements should be formatted with the names of authors first and CRediT role(s) following. [More details and an example.](#)

### **Changes to authorship**

Authors are expected to consider carefully the list and order of authors **before** submitting their manuscript and provide the definitive list of authors at the time of the original submission. Any addition, deletion or rearrangement of author names in the authorship list should be made only **before** the manuscript has been accepted and only if approved by the journal Editor. To request such a change, the Editor must receive the following from the **corresponding author**: (a) the reason for the change in author list and (b) written confirmation (e-mail, letter) from all authors that they agree with the addition, removal or rearrangement. In the case of addition or removal of authors, this includes confirmation from the author being added or removed.

Only in exceptional circumstances will the Editor consider the addition, deletion or rearrangement of authors **after** the manuscript has been accepted. While the Editor considers the request, publication of the manuscript will be suspended. If the manuscript has already been published in an online issue, any requests approved by the Editor will result in a corrigendum.

### **Article transfer service**

This journal uses the Elsevier Article Transfer Service to find the best home for your manuscript. This means that if an editor feels your manuscript is more suitable for an alternative journal, you might be asked to consider transferring the manuscript to such a journal. The recommendation might be provided by a Journal Editor, a dedicated [Scientific Managing Editor](#), a tool assisted recommendation, or a combination. If you agree, your manuscript will be transferred, though you will have the opportunity to make changes to the manuscript before the submission is complete. Please note that your manuscript will be independently reviewed by the new journal. [More information.](#)

### **Copyright**

Upon acceptance of an article, authors will be asked to complete a 'Journal Publishing Agreement' (see [more information](#) on this). An e-mail will be sent to the corresponding author confirming receipt of the manuscript together with a 'Journal Publishing Agreement' form or a link to the online version of this agreement.

Subscribers may reproduce tables of contents or prepare lists of articles including abstracts for internal circulation within their institutions. [Permission](#) of the Publisher is required for resale or distribution outside the institution and for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations. If excerpts from other copyrighted works are included, the author(s) must obtain written permission from the copyright owners and credit the source(s) in the article. Elsevier has [preprinted forms](#) for use by authors in these cases.

For gold open access articles: Upon acceptance of an article, authors will be asked to complete a 'License Agreement' ([more information](#)). Permitted third party reuse of gold open access articles is determined by the author's choice of [user license](#).

### **Author rights**

As an author you (or your employer or institution) have certain rights to reuse your work. [More information.](#)

### **Elsevier supports responsible sharing**

Find out how you can [share your research](#) published in Elsevier journals.

### **Role of the funding source**

You are requested to identify who provided financial support for the conduct of the research and/or preparation of the article and to briefly describe the role of the sponsor(s), if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the article for publication. If the funding source(s) had no such involvement, it is recommended to state this.

### **Open access**

Please visit our [Open Access page](#) for more information.



#### *Elsevier Researcher Academy*

Researcher Academy is a free e-learning platform designed to support early and mid-career researchers throughout their research journey. The "Learn" environment at Researcher Academy offers several interactive modules, webinars, downloadable guides and resources to guide you through the process of writing for research and going through peer review. Feel free to use these free resources to improve your submission and navigate the publication process with ease.

#### *Language (usage and editing services)*

Please write your text in good English (American or British usage is accepted, but not a mixture of these). Authors who feel their English language manuscript may require editing to eliminate possible grammatical or spelling errors and to conform to correct scientific English may wish to use the [English Language Editing service](#) available from Elsevier's Author Services.

#### **Submission**

Our online submission system guides you stepwise through the process of entering your article details and uploading your files. The system converts your article files to a single PDF file used in the peer-review process. Editable files (e.g., Word, LaTeX) are required to typeset your article for final publication. All correspondence, including notification of the Editor's decision and requests for revision, is sent by e-mail.

#### *Submit your article*

Please submit your article via <https://www.editorialmanager.com/chb/default.aspx/>

### **PREPARATION**

#### **Queries**

For questions about the editorial process (including the status of manuscripts under review) or for technical support on submissions, please visit our [Support Center](#).

#### **NEW SUBMISSIONS**

Submission to this journal proceeds totally online and you will be guided stepwise through the creation and uploading of your files. The system automatically converts your files to a single PDF file, which is used in the peer-review process.

As part of the Your Paper Your Way service, you may choose to submit your manuscript as a single file to be used in the refereeing process. This can be a PDF file or a Word document, in any format or layout that can be used by referees to evaluate your manuscript. It should contain high enough quality figures for refereeing. If you prefer to do so, you may still provide all or some of the source files at the initial submission. Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be uploaded separately.

#### *References*

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the article number or pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct.

#### *Formatting requirements*

There are no strict formatting requirements but all manuscripts must contain the essential elements needed to convey your manuscript, for example Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Conclusions, Artwork and Tables with Captions.

If your article includes any Videos and/or other Supplementary material, this should be included in your initial submission for peer review purposes.

Divide the article into clearly defined sections.

#### *Figures and tables embedded in text*

Please ensure the figures and the tables included in the single file are placed next to the relevant text in the manuscript, rather than at the bottom or the top of the file. The corresponding caption should be placed directly below the figure or table.

#### **Peer review**

This journal operates a double anonymized review process. All contributions will be initially assessed by the editor for suitability for the journal. Papers deemed suitable are then typically sent to a minimum of two independent expert reviewers to assess the scientific quality of the paper. The Editor



is responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles. The Editor's decision is final. Editors are not involved in decisions about papers which they have written themselves or have been written by family members or colleagues or which relate to products or services in which the editor has an interest. Any such submission is subject to all of the journal's usual procedures, with peer review handled independently of the relevant editor and their research groups. [More information on types of peer review.](#)

### **Double anonymized review**

This journal uses double anonymized review, which means the identities of the authors are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa. [More information](#) is available on our website. To facilitate this, please include the following separately:

*Title page (with author details):* This should include the title, authors' names, affiliations, acknowledgements and any Declaration of Interest statement, and a complete address for the corresponding author including an e-mail address.

*Anonymized manuscript (no author details):* The main body of the paper (including the references, figures, tables and any acknowledgements) should not include any identifying information, such as the authors' names or affiliations.

### **REVISED SUBMISSIONS**

#### *Use of word processing software*

Regardless of the file format of the original submission, at revision you must provide us with an editable file of the entire article. Keep the layout of the text as simple as possible. Most formatting codes will be removed and replaced on processing the article. The electronic text should be prepared in a way very similar to that of conventional manuscripts (see also the [Guide to Publishing with Elsevier](#)). See also the section on Electronic artwork.

To avoid unnecessary errors you are strongly advised to use the 'spell-check' and 'grammar-check' functions of your word processor.

#### *LaTeX*

You are recommended to use the [latest Elsevier article class](#) to prepare your manuscript and [BibTeX](#) to generate your bibliography.

Our [Guidelines](#) has full details.

### **Article structure**

#### *Subdivision - numbered sections*

Divide your article into clearly defined and numbered sections. Subsections should be numbered 1.1 (then 1.1.1, 1.1.2, ...), 1.2, etc. (the abstract is not included in section numbering). Use this numbering also for internal cross-referencing: do not just refer to 'the text'. Any subsection may be given a brief heading. Each heading should appear on its own separate line.

#### *Introduction*

State the objectives of the work and provide an adequate background, avoiding a detailed literature survey or a summary of the results.

#### *Material and methods*

Provide sufficient details to allow the work to be reproduced by an independent researcher. Methods that are already published should be summarized, and indicated by a reference. If quoting directly from a previously published method, use quotation marks and also cite the source. Any modifications to existing methods should also be described.

#### *Theory/calculation*

A Theory section should extend, not repeat, the background to the article already dealt with in the Introduction and lay the foundation for further work. In contrast, a Calculation section represents a practical development from a theoretical basis.

#### *Results*

Results should be clear and concise.

#### *Discussion*

This should explore the significance of the results of the work, not repeat them. A combined Results and Discussion section is often appropriate. Avoid extensive citations and discussion of published literature.



### *Conclusions*

The main conclusions of the study may be presented in a short Conclusions section, which may stand alone or form a subsection of a Discussion or Results and Discussion section.

### *Appendices*

If there is more than one appendix, they should be identified as A, B, etc. Formulae and equations in appendices should be given separate numbering: Eq. (A.1), Eq. (A.2), etc.; in a subsequent appendix, Eq. (B.1) and so on. Similarly for tables and figures: Table A.1; Fig. A.1, etc.

### **Essential title page information**

- **Title.** Concise and informative. Titles are often used in information-retrieval systems. Avoid abbreviations and formulae where possible.
- **Author names and affiliations.** Please clearly indicate the given name(s) and family name(s) of each author and check that all names are accurately spelled. You can add your name between parentheses in your own script behind the English transliteration. Present the authors' affiliation addresses (where the actual work was done) below the names. Indicate all affiliations with a lower-case superscript letter immediately after the author's name and in front of the appropriate address. Provide the full postal address of each affiliation, including the country name and, if available, the e-mail address of each author.
- **Corresponding author.** Clearly indicate who will handle correspondence at all stages of refereeing and publication, also post-publication. This responsibility includes answering any future queries about Methodology and Materials. **Ensure that the e-mail address is given and that contact details are kept up to date by the corresponding author.**
- **Present/permanent address.** If an author has moved since the work described in the article was done, or was visiting at the time, a 'Present address' (or 'Permanent address') may be indicated as a footnote to that author's name. The address at which the author actually did the work must be retained as the main, affiliation address. Superscript Arabic numerals are used for such footnotes.

### *Abstract*

A concise and factual abstract is required and should not be longer than 200 words. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. For this reason, References should be avoided, but if essential, then cite the author(s) and year(s). Also, non-standard or uncommon abbreviations should be avoided, but if essential they must be defined at their first mention in the abstract itself.

### *Graphical abstract*

Although a graphical abstract is optional, its use is encouraged as it draws more attention to the online article. The graphical abstract should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership. Graphical abstracts should be submitted as a separate file in the online submission system. Image size: Please provide an image with a minimum of 531 × 1328 pixels (h × w) or proportionally more. The image should be readable at a size of 5 × 13 cm using a regular screen resolution of 96 dpi. Preferred file types: TIFF, EPS, PDF or MS Office files. You can view [Example Graphical Abstracts](#) on our information site.

### *Highlights*

Highlights are mandatory for this journal. They increase the discoverability of your article via search engines. They consist of a short collection of bullet points that capture the novel results of your research as well as new methods that were used during the study (if any). Please have a look at the examples here: [example Highlights](#).

Highlights should be submitted in a separate editable file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 125 characters, including spaces, per bullet point).

### **Keywords**

Immediately after the abstract, provide a maximum of 6 keywords, using American spelling and avoiding general and plural terms and multiple concepts (avoid, for example, 'and', 'of'). Be sparing with abbreviations: only abbreviations firmly established in the field may be eligible. These keywords will be used for indexing purposes.



- Supply files that are optimized for screen use (e.g., GIF, BMP, PICT, WPG); the resolution is too low.
- Supply files that are too low in resolution.
- Submit graphics that are disproportionately large for the content.

#### *Color artwork*

Please make sure that artwork files are in an acceptable format (TIFF (or JPEG), EPS (or PDF) or MS Office files) and with the correct resolution. If, together with your accepted article, you submit usable color figures then Elsevier will ensure, at no additional charge, that these figures will appear in color online (e.g., ScienceDirect and other sites) in addition to color reproduction in print. [Further information on the preparation of electronic artwork.](#)

#### *Figure captions*

Ensure that each illustration has a caption. A caption should comprise a brief title (**not** on the figure itself) and a description of the illustration. Keep text in the illustrations themselves to a minimum but explain all symbols and abbreviations used.

#### *Tables*

Please submit tables as editable text and not as images. Tables can be placed either next to the relevant text in the article, or on separate page(s) at the end. Number tables consecutively in accordance with their appearance in the text and place any table notes below the table body. Be sparing in the use of tables and ensure that the data presented in them do not duplicate results described elsewhere in the article. Please avoid using vertical rules and shading in table cells.

#### *References*

##### *Citation in text*

Please ensure that every reference cited in the text is also present in the reference list (and vice versa). Any references cited in the abstract must be given in full. Unpublished results and personal communications are not recommended in the reference list, but may be mentioned in the text. If these references are included in the reference list they should follow the standard reference style of the journal and should include a substitution of the publication date with either 'Unpublished results' or 'Personal communication'. Citation of a reference as 'in press' implies that the item has been accepted for publication.

##### *Web references*

As a minimum, the full URL should be given and the date when the reference was last accessed. Any further information, if known (DOI, author names, dates, reference to a source publication, etc.), should also be given. Web references can be listed separately (e.g., after the reference list) under a different heading if desired, or can be included in the reference list.

##### *Data references*

This journal encourages you to cite underlying or relevant datasets in your manuscript by citing them in your text and including a data reference in your Reference List. Data references should include the following elements: author name(s), dataset title, data repository, version (where available), year, and global persistent identifier. Add [dataset] immediately before the reference so we can properly identify it as a data reference. The [dataset] identifier will not appear in your published article.

##### *Preprint references*

Where a preprint has subsequently become available as a peer-reviewed publication, the formal publication should be used as the reference. If there are preprints that are central to your work or that cover crucial developments in the topic, but are not yet formally published, these may be referenced. Preprints should be clearly marked as such, for example by including the word preprint, or the name of the preprint server, as part of the reference. The preprint DOI should also be provided.

##### *References in a special issue*

Please ensure that the words 'this issue' are added to any references in the list (and any citations in the text) to other articles in the same Special Issue.

##### *Reference management software*

Most Elsevier journals have their reference template available in many of the most popular reference management software products. These include all products that support [Citation Style Language styles](#), such as [Mendeley](#). Using citation plug-ins from these products, authors only need to select the appropriate journal template when preparing their article, after which citations and bibliographies will be automatically formatted in the journal's style. If no template is yet available for this journal, please follow the format of the sample references and citations as shown in this Guide. If you use



reference management software, please ensure that you remove all field codes before submitting the electronic manuscript. [More information on how to remove field codes from different reference management software.](#)

#### Reference formatting

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the article number or pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct. If you do wish to format the references yourself they should be arranged according to the following examples:

#### Reference style

**Text:** Citations in the text should follow the referencing style used by the American Psychological Association. You are referred to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Seventh Edition, ISBN 978-1-4338-3215-4, copies of which may be [ordered online](#).

**List:** references should be arranged first alphabetically and then further sorted chronologically if necessary. More than one reference from the same author(s) in the same year must be identified by the letters 'a', 'b', 'c', etc., placed after the year of publication.

#### Examples:

Reference to a journal publication:

Van der Geer, J., Hanraads, J. A. J., & Lupton, R. A. (2010). The art of writing a scientific article. *Journal of Scientific Communications*, 163, 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sc.2010.00372>.

Reference to a journal publication with an article number:

Van der Geer, J., Hanraads, J. A. J., & Lupton, R. A. (2018). The art of writing a scientific article. *Heliyon*, 19, Article e00205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00205>.

Reference to a book:

Strunk, W., Jr., & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style* (4th ed.). Longman (Chapter 4).

Reference to a chapter in an edited book:

Mettam, G. R., & Adams, L. B. (2009). How to prepare an electronic version of your article. In B. S. Jones, & R. Z. Smith (Eds.), *Introduction to the electronic age* (pp. 281–304). E-Publishing Inc.

Reference to a website:

Powertech Systems. (2015). *Lithium-ion vs lead-acid cost analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.powertechsystems.eu/home/tech-corner/lithium-ion-vs-lead-acid-cost-analysis/>. Accessed January 6, 2016

Reference to a dataset:

[dataset] Oguro, M., Imahiro, S., Saito, S., & Nakashizuka, T. (2015). *Mortality data for Japanese oak wilt disease and surrounding forest compositions*. Mendeley Data, v1. <https://doi.org/10.17632/xwj98nb39r.1>.

Reference to a conference paper or poster presentation:

Engle, E.K., Cash, T.F., & Jarry, J.L. (2009, November). *The Body Image Behaviours Inventory-3: Development and validation of the Body Image Compulsive Actions and Body Image Avoidance Scales*. Poster session presentation at the meeting of the Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Therapies, New York, NY.

Reference to software:

Coon, E., Berndt, M., Jan, A., Svyatsky, D., Atchley, A., Kikinon, E., Harp, D., Manzini, G., Shelef, E., Lipnikov, K., Garimella, R., Xu, C., Moulton, D., Karra, S., Painter, S., Jafarov, E., & Molins, S. (2020, March 25). *Advanced Terrestrial Simulator (ATS) v0.88 (Version 0.88)*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3727209>.

#### Video

Elsevier accepts video material and animation sequences to support and enhance your scientific research. Authors who have video or animation files that they wish to submit with their article are strongly encouraged to include links to these within the body of the article. This can be done in the same way as a figure or table by referring to the video or animation content and noting in the body text where it should be placed. All submitted files should be properly labeled so that they directly relate to the video file's content. In order to ensure that your video or animation material is directly usable, please provide the file in one of our recommended file formats with a preferred maximum size of 150 MB per file, 1 GB in total. Video and animation files supplied will be published online in the electronic version of your article in Elsevier Web products, including [ScienceDirect](#). Please supply 'stills' with your files: you can choose any frame from the video or animation or make a separate



image. These will be used instead of standard icons and will personalize the link to your video data. For more detailed instructions please visit our [video instruction pages](#). Note: since video and animation cannot be embedded in the print version of the journal, please provide text for both the electronic and the print version for the portions of the article that refer to this content.

### **Data visualization**

Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions [here](#) to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them with your article.

### **Supplementary material**

Supplementary material such as applications, images and sound clips, can be published with your article to enhance it. Submitted supplementary items are published exactly as they are received (Excel or PowerPoint files will appear as such online). Please submit your material together with the article and supply a concise, descriptive caption for each supplementary file. If you wish to make changes to supplementary material during any stage of the process, please make sure to provide an updated file. Do not annotate any corrections on a previous version. Please switch off the 'Track Changes' option in Microsoft Office files as these will appear in the published version.

### **Research data**

This journal requires and enables you to share data that supports your research publication where appropriate, and enables you to interlink the data with your published articles. Research data refers to the results of observations or experimentation that validate research findings. To facilitate reproducibility and data reuse, this journal also encourages you to share your software, code, models, algorithms, protocols, methods and other useful materials related to the project.

Below are a number of ways in which you can associate data with your article or make a statement about the availability of your data when submitting your manuscript. When sharing data in one of these ways, you are expected to cite the data in your manuscript and reference list. Please refer to the "References" section for more information about data citation. For more information on depositing, sharing and using research data and other relevant research materials, visit the [research data page](#).

#### **Data linking**

If you have made your research data available in a data repository, you can link your article directly to the dataset. Elsevier collaborates with a number of repositories to link articles on ScienceDirect with relevant repositories, giving readers access to underlying data that gives them a better understanding of the research described.

There are different ways to link your datasets to your article. When available, you can directly link your dataset to your article by providing the relevant information in the submission system. For more information, visit the [database linking page](#).

For [supported data repositories](#) a repository banner will automatically appear next to your published article on ScienceDirect.

In addition, you can link to relevant data or entities through identifiers within the text of your manuscript, using the following format: Database: xxxx (e.g., TAIR: AT1G01020; CCDC: 734053; PDB: 1XFN).

### **Research Elements**

This journal enables you to publish research objects related to your original research – such as data, methods, protocols, software and hardware – as an additional paper in Research Elements.

Research Elements is a suite of peer-reviewed, open access journals which make your research objects findable, accessible and reusable. Articles place research objects into context by providing detailed descriptions of objects and their application, and linking to the associated original research articles. Research Elements articles can be prepared by you, or by one of your collaborators.

During submission, you will be alerted to the opportunity to prepare and submit a Research Elements article.

More information can be found on the [Research Elements page](#).



#### *Data statement*

To foster transparency, we require you to state the availability of your data in your submission if your data is unavailable to access or unsuitable to post. This may also be a requirement of your funding body or institution. You will have the opportunity to provide a data statement during the submission process. The statement will appear with your published article on ScienceDirect. For more information, visit the [Data Statement page](#).

### **AFTER ACCEPTANCE**

#### **Online proof correction**

To ensure a fast publication process of the article, we kindly ask authors to provide us with their proof corrections within two days. Corresponding authors will receive an e-mail with a link to our online proofing system, allowing annotation and correction of proofs online. The environment is similar to MS Word: in addition to editing text, you can also comment on figures/tables and answer questions from the Copy Editor. Web-based proofing provides a faster and less error-prone process by allowing you to directly type your corrections, eliminating the potential introduction of errors.

If preferred, you can still choose to annotate and upload your edits on the PDF version. All instructions for proofing will be given in the e-mail we send to authors, including alternative methods to the online version and PDF.

We will do everything possible to get your article published quickly and accurately. Please use this proof only for checking the typesetting, editing, completeness and correctness of the text, tables and figures. Significant changes to the article as accepted for publication will only be considered at this stage with permission from the Editor. It is important to ensure that all corrections are sent back to us in one communication. Please check carefully before replying, as inclusion of any subsequent corrections cannot be guaranteed. Proofreading is solely your responsibility.

#### **Offprints**

The corresponding author will, at no cost, receive a customized [Share Link](#) providing 50 days free access to the final published version of the article on [ScienceDirect](#). The Share Link can be used for sharing the article via any communication channel, including email and social media. For an extra charge, paper offprints can be ordered via the offprint order form which is sent once the article is accepted for publication. Both corresponding and co-authors may order offprints at any time via Elsevier's [Author Services](#). Corresponding authors who have published their article gold open access do not receive a Share Link as their final published version of the article is available open access on ScienceDirect and can be shared through the article DOI link.

### **AUTHOR INQUIRIES**

Visit the [Elsevier Support Center](#) to find the answers you need. Here you will find everything from Frequently Asked Questions to ways to get in touch.

You can also [check the status of your submitted article](#) or [find out when your accepted article will be published](#).

**Appendix A. Copy of Survey provided to participants****PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS****Team:****Role:****Age**

- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-69
- 70+

**Sex**

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary
- I use a different term
- Prefer not to say

**What is your current position/role?****How many times have you used social media simulations?**

- Never
- Once
- Twice
- A few times
- Several times

**When have you used social media simulations?****How much time (minutes or hours) have you spent using social media simulations?****Please describe how you have used social media simulations e.g. training exercise**



**Do you have an understanding of the work/analysis undertaken by intelligence analysts?**

- Yes
- Some
- None