Dripps Paper

Research findings have begun to highlight how interactions with ICTs, including social media, are correlated with positive (e.g. gains in social capital, reduced depression) and negative (e.g. physical isolation, social comparison, envy) aspects of physical, mental, and
spiritual well-being (Choi and DiNitto, 2013; Pearce and Rice, 2013; Appel, Gerlach & Crusius,
2016; Shakya & Christakis, 2017).

```
Does this research psychological value between positive and negative out comes of digital
 social interactions ? So to speak, do we know which one weigh in more in consideration wi
th well being of the society
```

However, there has been less theory developed to date about
how interactions with specific digital places influence well-being in the context of interactions
with physical places.

```
that answers to the previous question on my notes
```

In expanding our understanding of how digital places influence well-being, we might also
look to sociological approaches, which have elaborated on how place effects in physical settings
operate in part through their design (think: built characteristics), which can encourage or discourage social interaction, and thereby increase or decrease potential social influence
(Logan, 2012).

```
drive from this, we can say that ICTs systems, like Dripps, can support improvement in rel
ationships between places and physical set up , hence, help us to tackle negative outcomes
arisen in socio-psychology and drive the future of connections through collective sociolog
ical positive outcomes.
```

According to sociologists, the design of places can influence well-being in a variety of ways, including by embodying and entrenching otherwise intangible cultural norms, identities and memories that facilitate social structural patterns (e.g., categories, differences and hierarchies); and by arranging chance face-to-face interactions (e.g., through the design of staircases at places of work), thus shaping the formation of social networks and, potentially, stronger or weaker communities *(Gieryn, 2000).*

```
refer to most physical structure design to a digital social structure
```

Geosocial data encompasses a variety of media forms (e.g. photographs shared via Instagram, Twitter posts, etc.) but fundamentally include some aspect of an online social media contribution from an individual user and a location associated with it. Studies that examine spatial patterns in geosocial data usually make the implicit assumption that what people post in their social media is partly a reflection of their experience in physical place-time; for example, imbuing the locational expression of these posts with some place-based meaning (Hauthal and Burghardt, 2016). To our knowledge, there is little or no research that supports this assumption.

```
can this assumption suggest that we manifest our life experiences; communicating by using
 the data we collected and constructed to project ?

If there is a implicit assumption, can there be also implicit correlation to the places we
design also impacts to how we project ?

Can more transparency and clearness in a secure physical set up can establish more positiv
e projections on digital social platform?
```

```
Can location data clusters aim to secure more individuals?
Web3 cultures embraces diversity in locations ( either for individuals or groups of people
s) -> can designing with a web3 philosophy help us to solve discrepancies between cultural
strata and multi-hierarchical social communications?
```

Similar approaches by
Huang et al. (2017) and Robertson et al (2017) use space-time clustering and activity-based
models of human movement to derive individual places. These types of individual-based models
of place using geosocial data can reflect the range of groups and geographic activity patterns
within a population of social media contributors better than aggregate approaches where these
differences are often masked.

```
can dripps provide both jaiku's nested structure as well as twitters location, within a se
cure scope, pillars?
```

Erickson (2010) argued that Twitter's design encouraged more straightforward broadcasting,
sometimes about specific places, which facilitated communal bonds more reflective of a "common geographical territory" (p.1204); whereas the social media Jaiku was better structured
to facilitate threaded conversations that relied less on location. Davenport and colleagues
(2013) observed differences in how younger and older narcissists preferred using Twitter and

In one case, a study might aim to investigate the physical or social environment of social media use in
a direct and momentary way by linking expressions to GPS coordinates. Here, interaction in the
physical place are of primary interest, while digital place interactions may be less important for
examining well-being.

Here, GPS coordinates can help indicate whether expressions are related to direct or indirect (e.g., future, past, never) experiences, and therefore, the utility of data about physical
places.

```
NFT metadata as locationfuture past and never experience.
```

This active identity construction carries over to geosocial data as well, through
the selection of which places warrant posting and/or checking in on geographically referenced
social media networks. Schwartz and Halegoua (2015) describe this selection through the
framework of the spatial self, which examines the presentation of one's identity through geographic traces of physical (i.e., real world) activity. As described by Saker (2017) the spatial
self 'involves people actively thinking about the spaces they frequent, what they might present
about their identity, and if this fits in with their on-going narratives.'

```
Spatial Identity: If we enlarge the geosocial data, does it improve spatial self -> make t
he spatial-identity more flexible and adaptable? Can this also effect the perception of ot
hers?
```