

Social MediARverse: Investigating Users' Social Media Content Sharing and Consuming Intentions with Location-Based AR

LINDA HIRSCH, UC Santa Cruz, USA

FLORIAN MUELLER, TU Darmstadt, Germany

MARI KRUSE and ANDREAS BUTZ, LMU Munich, Germany

ROBIN WELSCH, Aalto University, Finland



Fig. 1. Sharing and consuming Social MediARverse content: The most comfortable space and content visualization format was the private space with embedded dynamic 2D AR content. This example is taken from one of the TikTok videos used in our survey.

Augmented Reality (AR) is evolving to become the next frontier in social media, merging physical and virtual reality into a living metaverse, a Social MediARverse. With this transition, we must understand how different contexts — public, semi-public, and private — affect user engagement with AR content. We address this gap in current research by conducting an online survey with 110 participants, showcasing 36 AR videos, and polling them about the content's fit and appropriateness. Specifically, we manipulated these three spaces, two forms of dynamism (dynamic vs. static), and two dimensionalities (2D vs. 3D). Our findings reveal that dynamic AR content is generally more favorably received than static content. Additionally, users find sharing and engaging with AR content in private settings more comfortable than in others. By this, the study offers valuable insights for designing and implementing future Social MediARverses and guides industry and academia on content visualization and contextual considerations.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → *Ubiquitous and mobile computing design and evaluation methods*; **Mixed / augmented reality**.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

under submission, tbd, tbd

© 2025 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Additional Key Words and Phrases: AR, augmented reality, social media, location-based, 3D, dynamic content, static

ACM Reference Format:

Linda Hirsch, Florian Mueller, Mari Kruse, Andreas Butz, and Robin Welsch. 2025. Social MediARverse: Investigating Users' Social Media Content Sharing and Consuming Intentions with Location-Based AR. In *tbd*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 25 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Imagine walking through your streets, wearing your Augmented Reality (AR) glasses, and seeing the AR content others posted into your shared physical environment as they would on social media today. While this might seem like a futuristic imagination, Meta called AR the future technology of social media already in 2017^{1,2,3} for its characteristic to enhance physical reality with virtual content [4], shifting many interactions with virtual information into the physical world. Through this, information metaphorically breaks through today's screens' limiting and confining glass and enters specific contexts of our physical environments. Such embedded AR content can support community-building [22, 54, 62] and social interaction [32, 37, 79] through onsite exploration and content sharing - just as if you walk by your neighbor's house and see what new AR posts they positioned in the front yard.

Developing AR as the future social media technology merges both into a Social MediARverse toward a "real-world metaverse" [105]. Currently, most shared and consumed social media content is purposefully location-independent to allow immediate and fast communication [1]. This works as long as the content is contained in a 2D screen dissociated from its surroundings. Yet, when embedding AR, it becomes part of our 3D physical environment, impacting the places' social and cultural usage. First applications are trying to reinvent location-based AR for social media, such as *Mapstar*⁴ or *Skrite*⁵. Yet, those developments are still far from enabling a real-life Social MediARverse.

Previous work explored shared AR content mainly in and for public spaces [75] concerning its social acceptability [68, 80], privacy [77, 85, 86], or the content creation [97, 98]. Whether content and the interaction with it are appropriate and support a good user experience, however, depends on its embedded physical context [24, 83, 103] and visual display [47, 64]. For example, boulders as AR objects in an office space seem unsuitable but fit in an outdoor space [24]. Or, by comparing 2D versus 3D content display in a virtual space, Kim and Hong [47] found that 2D content facilitates information finding, but 3D fosters spatial exploration. Yet, despite these advances, research and industry still lack a systematic understanding of how the physical context and the content design relate and impact users' content-consuming and -sharing intentions. This represents a substantial knowledge gap about location-based AR content-sharing and consumption when transitioning from traditional social media platforms to creating a ubiquitous Social MediARverse.

Our work narrows this knowledge gap by conducting a video-based online survey with N=110 participants, presenting them with 36 AR short-form videos⁶. In the videos, we vary between three times two times two conditions in a within-subject study design comprising three spatial contexts (private, semi-public, and public spaces) that the content is positioned in, two dimensionalities (2D and 3D), and two dynamics (dynamic versus static content). We identified each condition and its forms through related work, revealing an essential and

¹<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/18/technology/mark-zuckerberg-sees-augmented-reality-ecosystem-in-facebook.html>, last accessed August 17, 2023

²<https://www.forbes.com/sites/kathleenchaykowski/2018/03/08/inside-facebooks-bet-on-an-augmented-reality-future/>, last accessed August 17, 2023

³<https://www.vntana.com/blog/augmented-reality-social-media/>, last accessed August 17, 2023

⁴<https://www.mapstar.io/>, last accessed September 4, 2024

⁵<https://www.facebook.com/skriteapp/>, last accessed September 4, 2024

⁶All videos are provided here: <https://github.com/krufri/SocialMediARverse/tree/main/Videos>.

diverging impact on the user experience deriving from each condition. As they have not been explored in this combination nor the context of a Social MediARverse, our work evaluates their impact on users' comfort level to share and consume it as location-based AR social media content. We tested the conditions by redesigning three TikTok⁷ videos embedded into the different spaces.

Results identify private spaces to bring a significantly higher comfort level for sharing and consuming Social MediARverse content. Additionally, 2D content triggers a significantly higher feeling of comfort, but 3D is significantly less awkward for content consumption across space conditions. Displaying dynamic AR content is more engaging, relatively increases comfort, and lowers arousal than static content. Considering all three conditions, dynamic 2D AR embedded in private space is the most preferred display for Social MediARverse content (see Figure 1). Consequently, creating a Social MediARverse starts in users' private spaces, embedding the AR content as dynamic 2D short-form videos and acknowledging that usage will change, moving to other forms, such as 3D content. With this, the work contributes to designing future social media networks that use location-based AR toward a "real-world" metaverse.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

The following section provides a background of current AR social media developments and introduces the purpose and design of location-based AR and current social media trends, including users' sharing and consuming behavior.

2.1 Advances in Ubiquitous AR Social Networks

Industry and research continuously explore AR for creating ubiquitous social media networks [7, 18, 37, 84, 87]. Examples are game apps such as *Pokémon Go*⁸ or *Can You See Me Now?* [3] that provide social networks fostering a sense of community and motivate spatial explorations. The interaction with the embedded AR content changes the spatial affordance and how users perceive and make meaning of an environment [22]. Other work has explored spatially embedded AR to engage younger generations in community matters [7, 87] or social learning contexts [18]. For example, Cochrane et al. [18] developed five AR applications to foster social skills learning by allowing users to geo-tag, negotiate, and share augmented points of interest. Exploring an early version of a location-based AR social network, Hirsch et al. [37]'s show that the interaction with such a network can change the user-place and user-to-user relationships. However, their work also emphasizes the need for privacy settings to moderate who users would want to share their content and locations with. Yet, sharing embedded AR content can also create a feeling of connectedness among strangers [79]. AR social networks can be applied for different purposes and user groups, requiring varying network management settings. The above-mentioned projects explore shared content with a logical or semantic connection between content, user, and environment. This differs from traditional social media content, emphasizing the existence of a research gap when embedding AR social media content into the physical environment. Furthermore, considering that most AR network-related research focuses on location-based AR, we will follow this approach and test the content's appearance in different contexts.

In addition, prior work identified risks and challenges when transitioning to ubiquitous AR social networks. Rixen et al. [84] compare users' comfort level when experiencing a person's augmentation through digital content on a smartphone or AR through a head-mounted display while walking the streets. Their findings emphasize that personal AR content triggers lower comfort than digital personal content. Furthermore, Eghtebas et al. [27] discuss the risks of ubiquitous AR social media content being misused for, for example, bullying users or distributing fake news in public spaces. Related to this, Katell et al. [44] differentiates between private and

⁷<https://www.tiktok.com>, last accessed September 4, 2024

⁸<https://pokemongolive.com/>, last accessed February 30, 2024

public spaces considering the varying privacy rights, intimacy levels, and community reach to assess content appropriateness. This emphasizes assessing content appropriateness depending on the spatial contexts and user relationship levels.

2.2 Purpose and Design Considerations of Location-based AR

Augmented Reality is used to increase engagement [9, 17, 28, 46, 74], foster social connections and interaction [16, 37, 51, 79, 81], or support navigation [12, 13, 60, 90, 99]. Location-based AR registers content geo-spatially so that users can consume it as embedded AR at the anchored location. Education [49, 63], tourism [11, 57, 93], or community-building [37, 54, 62] use location-based AR to foster understanding, meaning-making and relationship building between users and spaces through the spatial and semantic connection of the AR content. Additionally, location-based AR motivates users to explore public outdoor spaces [19, 59] but is also challenged to stay engaging [23]. To achieve this, research suggests making the content more meaningful by relating it to users' lives or fostering social connections [38, 69].

Prior work has explored the design of AR content in multiple directions. Yue et al. [106] contribute a location-based AR network enabling users to post and see 3D texts and other 3D models instead of 2D content. Similar to other AR research [47, 64], their work states that 3D is more engaging and fosters more spatial exploration through depth integration and visualization, but flat 2D facilitates information finding [47]. The explored content type also differs, including text only, 2D images [37], 3D objects [79], audio [89], or videos [56]. Design decisions consider the content's engagement character and ability to foster social interaction. Further, Ventä-Olkkonen et al. [97] evaluated the information users prefer to consume and share, identifying diverging topics depending on whether it is positioned in private or public spaces. Their work identified that private spaces are more suitable for content related to personal memories, notes, or to-do lists, whereas publicly shared content should be related to local businesses, community activities, or navigation [97]. Similarly, Medeiros et al. [68] compared different places and the social acceptability of interacting with AR content in a public transport situation through a video-based online survey, identifying that location significantly impacts social acceptability. These prior works show that the content's visual dimensionality and spatial context influence the perceived appropriateness and effect of location-based AR content on the user experience and have found great interest in AR research. Our work follows these two prominent conditions as the effect differences have not been explored when using AR for social media communication but can strongly impact the user experience.

2.3 Sharing and Consuming Social Media Content

Social media connect users with their peers [25, 72], keep them up-to-date about personal and political topics [61, 101], and can provide a distraction from the everyday [67, 104]. Latest statistics show that image and video content-based social media platforms, such as Instagram⁹, TikTok or YouTube¹⁰ are used about 151 minutes per day [45, 94]. Decisions to create and share content are influenced by how comfortable users feel with the content in the specific context [35, 88]. Videos, particularly short-form videos, are gaining increasing attraction for being easy to access, consume, and create while providing entertainment and short-term breaks from other tasks [14, 65, 100]. A fundamental difference between video and text- and image-based platforms is users' usage intention [2]: Video-based platforms are mainly used for entertainment, and text- and image-based platforms are used for personal profiling or maintaining social relationships.

Another influencing factor on social media usage is the content type. Comparing the effect between social media images and short-form videos, Gurtala and Fardouly [33] find a significant difference in perceived appearance enhancement for images. In another work, Du et al. [26] compare two 3D social media platforms combining 2D

⁹<https://www.instagram.com/>, last accessed September 4, 2024

¹⁰<https://www.youtube.com/>, last accessed September 4, 2024




Fig. 2. Space and Dimensionality in our videos: Public, semi-public, and private combined with the 2D and 3D dimensionality. The dynamic condition cannot be visualized through static images but is included in the supplementary video.

social media content and 3D virtual representations of real-world locations, identifying that 3D representations support more immersive and engaging experiences but fall short regarding the content design realizations. These works provide first insights into the effect of 2D and 3D and static images versus dynamic video social media content but do not reveal any insights about the conditions' level of appropriateness in comparison or depending on the context. Our work considers the previous works' findings regarding different content dynamism and dimensionality effects and similarly explores its effect on user comfort and usage intentions when presented as Social MediARverse content in this study.

2.4 Knowledge Gap and Research Questions

Content appropriateness and design regarding different spaces, dimensionalities, or dynamics has shown to strongly influence the user experience of either location-based AR or social media content. Therefore, we consider these dimensions relevant when aiming to create a Social MediARverse. However, research lacks the knowledge of how they impact each other and users' sharing and consuming intentions. In our work, we narrow this gap while being guided by the following research questions:

RQ1 How do the surrounding space, dimensionality, and dynamics affect users' comfort in sharing and consuming AR social media content?

RQ2 What meaning does the relationship between space, dimensionality, and dynamics relationship have for transitioning from digital social media to a ubiquitous Social MediARverse?

We consider these questions relevant because the results will allow us to provide directions for future researchers and social network designers and what they need to consider for creating the next Social MediARverse that users will be comfortable using. We approach these questions using short-form videos because those are currently the most engaging type of shared social media content¹¹. To be more precise, we consider three TikTok videos because the platform has over a billion users and uses short-form videos (about 3-60 seconds) as a communication medium [33] and has been used in previous HCI (Human-Computer Interaction) studies [15].

¹¹<https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/social-media-statistics/#source>, last accessed August 27, 2024

3 METHODOLOGY

We approached the gap with a video-based online survey using Qualtrics¹² for survey creation and data collection. While online surveys cannot represent a real-world encounter or external influences, they allow for a larger and more diverse reach [52]. Furthermore, video-based web surveys are established and viable methods to compare the effect of different contexts that facilitate participants to imagine the observed interaction as realistic scenarios [52, 68]. To gain broad insights into this new field of research and to identify generalizable design indicators instead of qualitative in-depth understanding [21], we decided on this approach with a focus on the quantitative data.

3.1 Independent Variables

We defined three independent variables: dimensionality (2D vs. 3D), space (private, semi-public, public), and dynamics (static vs. dynamic), resulting in $2 \times 3 \times 2 = 12$ conditions. Figure 2 shows the realization of the space and dimensionality conditions. For increasing validity, we tested the conditions in the three most liked TikTok videos according to Wikipedia¹³, showing a dancing man¹⁴, lip-syncing¹⁵, and a drawing video¹⁶, which resulted in a total of $12 \times 3 = 36$ trials per participant. In this work, we define a private space as a space accessible only for and managed by certain people [5] that can be individualized and personalized [20], semi-public as privately owned spaces accessible by a certain structural group formed by, e.g., common interests or shared activities [78], and public space as a physically and socially accessible space by everyone that is centrally managed by the city or communal authority [70, 82].

3.2 Dependent Variables Reflected in the Survey

As our dependent variables, we researched the appropriateness level by assessing the different content displays and contexts' effects on participants' emotional responses using the SAM questionnaire [6] and their comfort level for sharing and consuming content in the given scenario. Based on prior work [66], we considered the sharing behavior as *active* and consuming as *passive* social media usage. We asked about participants' comfort level using a 7-point Likert scale with five self-developed statements, similar to Habib et al. [35]: 1) *I feel comfortable seeing the displayed content*, 2) *I feel awkward seeing this content in this space*, 3) *I would like to see more of this content*, 4) *I would feel comfortable placing the displayed content myself*, 5) *Placing this content would leave me feel awkward about myself and what others think about me*. Further, we ask about the preferred audience by considering different types of relationships based on social media settings similar to Facebook¹⁷ and as applied by previous work [37].

3.3 Additional Survey Questions

In addition, we collected qualitative statements through open-ended and control questions about participants' current social media usage and demographics. Please consider the supplementary material for further details on the survey.

Open-ended Survey Questions. We added three questions with open-ended comment fields to learn about participants' reasoning for their choices. This included a question about their reasons for selecting a particular content type most suitable for location-based AR and their motivation to consume and create location-based AR

¹²<https://www.qualtrics.com>, last accessed September 4, 2024

¹³https://web.archive.org/web/20230412032600/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_most-liked_TikTok_videos, last accessed February 2nd, 2023.

¹⁴<https://www.tiktok.com/@jamie32bsh/video/7058186727248235782>, last accessed September 12, 2023, © Jamie Big Sorrel Horse.

¹⁵<https://www.tiktok.com/@bellapoarch/video/6862153058223197445>, last accessed September 12, 2023, © Bella Poarch.

¹⁶https://www.tiktok.com/@fredziownik_art/video/6911406868699073798, last accessed September 12, 2023, © Franek Bielak.

¹⁷https://www.facebook.com/help/211513702214269?helpref=faq_content, last accessed September 4, 2024.

social media content. We also asked participants to indicate where they would feel comfortable sharing this AR content for each video.

Control Questions. We asked participants about their regular social media usage and prior AR experience. If they were not using social media, they were automatically excluded. Further, participants rated the similarity between the original TikTok video and the 3D visualizations on a 0-100% scale to identify potential issues in the video creation after having watched all the videos.

Demographics. We collected gender, age, highest educational degree, nationality, and primary occupation.

3.4 Video Creation

We created the videos in Blender¹⁸, blurring the TikTok logo and creator aliases for the study to reduce negative or positive sentiment towards the platform. To implement the dynamics, we selected the videos (dynamic, 2D) and their screenshots (static, 2D). For the 3D content, we created static and animated 3D objects. We found one model from the library Mixamo¹⁹ and self-created the other two. For the space dimension, we shot two background videos and downloaded one from the free video library Pexels²⁰. All videos included a slow forward motion as if the watcher, or, in our case, the study participants watching the videos from a first-person perspective, was passing by the AR content on foot. By this, we used the motion parallax - the perception that an object's changed position due to an altered viewing perspective [91] - to increase participants' depth perception and, thus, their sense of 3D and reality similarly to previous AR research [31, 50]. Additionally, the same people (who consented) were visible in the public and semi-public conditions to increase the feeling of being in a shared environment. Further, we increased transparency, added an emission shader to the visual borders of the content to enhance the holographic and digital AR characteristics, and added the original TikTok soundtracks. The resulting 36 videos are each ten seconds long and in 16:9 format. The format and participants' hands-free video consumption support our anticipation of content interaction via AR glasses.

3.5 Procedure

We pilot-tested the survey with two external researchers before publishing. Afterward, we distributed the survey via Prolific²¹ screening for English-speaking and social media-using participants. We informed them about the project goal and data privacy settings following GDPR. With their consent, they accessed the main survey, which presented a short explanation about AR being used in "prospective social networks" and a definition of the different space types²². Then, participants watched the videos in a randomized order. For each video, we asked participants to imagine being users of the Social MediARverse and, first, passively consuming the AR content at the presented location. In a second step, we asked them to imagine actively sharing and positioning the content on social media in this space. By this, we gradually increased participants' responsibility for the content - from passive consumption to active sharing. After completion, we compensated participants with nine euros. The project was approved by the first author's university's ethics board.

¹⁸<https://www.blender.org/features/video-editing/>, last accessed September 4, 2024

¹⁹<https://www.mixamo.com/>, last accessed August 20, 2023

²⁰<https://www.pexels.com/>, by Taryn Elliot, last accessed August 20, 2023

²¹<https://www.prolific.com/>, last accessed September 4, 2024

²²Instruction given in the survey: "Now, we present you 36 videos where augmented reality content is placed in real-world spaces. These spaces can be either private (like a living room or kitchen), semi-public (like museums or movie theaters), or public (like streets or squares). As you watch the videos, **imagine yourself in these locations** and how you would **feel seeing this AR content** as social media content shared by other users." Similarly for sharing: "Imagine you yourself would post and **place this AR content** in a private space. With whom would you **share** the displayed content in the given scenario, and therefore would be able to see it?"




Fig. 3. Likert scale results for the statements "*I feel comfortable seeing the displayed content*", "*I feel awkward seeing this content in this space*", and "*I would like to see more of this content*".

3.6 Control Study: Terminology

We followed the main study up with a control study (n=30) about the impact of our phrasing of the task description. We compared the three task description conditions: 1) *Main study* as in the original study, 2) mentioning *wearing AR glasses*, or 3) that the seen content was *publicly shared*. We did not find meaningful differences in the ratings. The order was randomized and also conducted using qualtrics and prolific. We provide results in the attachment in Table 6.

3.7 Participants

We invited 113 people to our survey. Three participants completed the survey exceptionally fast (below 25 minutes; the rest completed the survey with 55 minutes), which were excluded. The remaining 110 participants produced complete data sets. All participants consume social media content at least once a week (n = 77 more than two hours daily, n = 30 daily but less than two hours, n = 2 every two days, and n = 1 once a week). On average, participants were $M = 29$ years old ($SD = 8.84$). 58 participants identified as female, 50 identified as male, one person reported being non-binary/third gender, and one person preferred not to disclose their gender identity. The nationalities of the subjects varied geographically. The most frequently represented nationalities were South African (n = 31), Polish (n = 26), and Portuguese (n = 10), in addition to twelve other nationalities (n = 43). 89 participants had prior experience with AR applications such as Pokémon GO, Google Lens, Live View, or Snapchat filters, 21 had no prior experience and were not skeptical about viewing AR content but showed privacy concerns when sharing it. Most (n = 100) consume social media videos on platforms like YouTube and Instagram.

4 RESULTS

We applied descriptive and inferential statistics to evaluate the quantitative data. Complementary, we applied two types of analysis for the qualitative feedback: content analysis and thematic analysis. To analyze our ordinal data, we used the ART package and computed a linear mixed model (LMM) for each rank-aligned dependent




Fig. 4. Likert scale results for the statements "I would feel comfortable placing the displayed content myself" and "Placing this content would leave me feel awkward about myself and what others think about me".





Fig. 5. The SAM results split into Valence, Arousal, and Dominance for each condition combination.

variable with space, dynamics, and dimensionality as a predictor and participant as a random effect term with random slopes for each TikTok video. Therefore, each participant's individual effect of the video displayed is controlled. All post-hoc tests concerning more than two variables were corrected with the Bonferroni method. For the results of all models, see Table 3 and Table 4. Regarding the similarity between original TikTok and 3D representations, the dancing man (see Figure 1) received lowest similarity ratings ($M=29\%$, $SSTD=26\%$), followed



(a) Comfortable Seeing (b) Awkward Seeing (c) Awkward Seeing (d) Like to See More (e) Awkward Placing
 Dimensionality:Space Dimensionality:Space Dynamics:Dim.:Space Dimensionality:Space Dynamics:Dimensionality

Fig. 6. The significant interaction effects between independent variables.

by the lip-syncing with $M=33%$ ($STD=28%$), and the drawing video with $M= 53%$ ($28%$). For the sake of brevity, we will only discuss significant effects in more detail. However, all our conditions’ mean values can be found in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Means (and standard deviations) for dynamics, dimensionality, space, valence, arousal, and dominance.

Dynamics	Dimensionality	Space	Valence	Arousal	Dominance
Dynamic	2D	Private	4.8 (2.27)	5.72 (2.24)	5.67 (2.15)
Dynamic	2D	Public	5.07 (2.19)	5.59 (2.1)	5.53 (2.11)
Dynamic	2D	Semi-public	5 (2.22)	5.52 (2.12)	5.51 (2.15)
Dynamic	3D	Private	4.92 (2.14)	5.71 (2.1)	5.56 (2.13)
Dynamic	3D	Public	5.16 (2.18)	5.67 (2.1)	5.59 (2.11)
Dynamic	3D	Semi-public	4.94 (2.2)	5.66 (2.16)	5.62 (2.09)
Static	2D	Private	4.98 (2.14)	5.95 (2.02)	5.69 (1.95)
Static	2D	Public	5.15 (2.15)	5.94 (2.04)	5.55 (1.96)
Static	2D	Semi-public	5.18 (2.05)	6.02 (1.95)	5.52 (2)
Static	3D	Private	5.02 (2.2)	6.05 (2.07)	5.67 (2.09)
Static	3D	Public	5.34 (2.15)	6.07 (2.12)	5.43 (2.15)
Static	3D	Semi-public	5.29 (2.13)	5.95 (2.07)	5.37 (2.08)

4.1 SAM-Assessment: Valence, Arousal, Dominance

All SAM ratings averaged across stimuli and participants can be found in Table 1 and Figure 5. Analysis with the LMM highlighted two main effects on valence; see Table 3. There was higher valence, meaning more negative, in the static content condition ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.35$) as compared to the dynamic condition ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.37$).

Table 2. Means (and standard deviations) for comfort measures across dynamics, dimensionality, and space.

Dynamics	Dimensionality	Space	Comfortable Seeing	Awkward Seeing	Like to See More	Comfortable Placing	Awkward Placing
Dynamic	2D	Private	4.28 (1.99)	3.77 (1.98)	3.49 (2)	3.49 (2.02)	4.12 (2.02)
Dynamic	2D	Public	3.98 (1.97)	4.2 (1.97)	3.31 (1.9)	3.11 (1.89)	4.54 (1.96)
Dynamic	2D	Semi-public	3.96 (2.04)	4.26 (2.08)	3.35 (1.93)	3.06 (1.93)	4.53 (1.98)
Dynamic	3D	Private	4.14 (2.02)	3.88 (2.01)	3.35 (1.95)	3.46 (1.97)	4.04 (1.97)
Dynamic	3D	Public	3.94 (2.04)	4.14 (2)	3.31 (1.94)	3.25 (1.9)	4.36 (1.94)
Dynamic	3D	Semi-public	4.13 (1.98)	3.95 (1.96)	3.49 (1.97)	3.33 (1.96)	4.17 (1.89)
Static	2D	Private	4.18 (1.94)	3.98 (1.89)	3.28 (1.83)	3.4 (1.91)	4.04 (1.86)
Static	2D	Public	3.95 (1.94)	4.15 (1.93)	3.27 (1.91)	3.13 (1.87)	4.37 (1.9)
Static	2D	Semi-public	3.9 (1.99)	4.24 (2.03)	3.22 (1.78)	3.16 (1.86)	4.32 (1.89)
Static	3D	Private	4.12 (2.01)	4.05 (2)	3.25 (1.87)	3.3 (1.91)	4.17 (1.92)
Static	3D	Public	3.75 (1.98)	4.29 (1.89)	3.14 (1.85)	3.02 (1.84)	4.45 (1.87)
Static	3D	Semi-public	3.79 (2.02)	4.2 (1.97)	3.15 (1.82)	3.11 (1.84)	4.31 (1.92)

For space, we calculated post-hoc contrasts. The valence rating for the private space ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.45$) was significantly lower than that for the public space ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 1.44$), $z = -5.764$, $p < .001$. Similarly, the valence rating for the private space was also significantly lower than the semi-public space ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.34$) $z = -3.475$, $p = .002$. The difference between the public and semi-public spaces was not statistically significant, $z = 2.289$, $p = .066$.

Only dynamics revealed a significant main effect for arousal, Table 3. Dynamic content produces less arousal ($M = 5.64$, $SD = 1.41$) compared to static visualizations ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.28$); therefore, dynamic visualizations are calmer than static ones. Our manipulations had no effects on dominance ratings or the dimensionality overall; see Table 1.

4.2 Comfort Ratings

We asked about the *comfort* of sharing or consuming the visualization across all experimental conditions (see Figure 3 and Figure 4). On the item *I feel comfortable seeing the displayed content*, we found an effect of dynamics, see Table 4, with higher ratings for dynamic ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.33$) as compared to static content ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.37$). We also found a main effect for dimensionality with 2D ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.35$) content being more comfortable than 3D content ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.37$). Comfort ratings also differed based on the type of space (Table 4). The content was rated as more comfortable in the private space ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 1.42$) compared to both the public space ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.42$) and the semi-public space ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.38$). Specifically, post-hoc contrasts revealed a significant difference between private and public spaces, with a difference of 194.5, $SE = 28.5$, $z = 6.832$, $p < .001$. Similarly, there was a significant difference between private and semi-public spaces, with a difference of 132.0, $SE = 28.5$, $z = 4.638$, $p < .001$. However, the difference in comfort ratings between the public and semi-public spaces was not statistically significant, $z = -2.194$, $p = .084$.

We investigated the space \times dimensionality interaction by comparing the effect of space across both dimensionalities. In the 2D dimensionality, there were significant differences among the conditions. Specifically, the contrast between the private and public conditions was significant, $z = -5.057$, $p < .001$. However, the difference between the private and semi-public conditions was not significant, $z = -1.777$, $p = .227$. Importantly, the public and semi-public conditions differed significantly, $z = 3.280$, $p = .003$. For the 3D dimensionality, the contrast between the private and public conditions was significant, $z = -3.030$, $p = .007$. Additionally, a notable difference was observed between the private and semi-public conditions, $z = -4.095$, $p < .001$. However, the difference between

the public and semi-public conditions was not statistically significant, $z = -1.065$, $p = .861$. Overall, these results indicate that the effects of space were more pronounced in the 2D compared to the 3D dimensionality. Further details can be found in Figure 6.

For the item *I feel awkward seeing this content in this space*, we find a very similar pattern of results. There was a main effect of dynamics (dynamic: $M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.25$ vs. static: $M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.29$). There was also a main effect of space with private ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.37$) being significantly lower than public ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.39$; $z = -6.19$, $p < .001$) and semi-public ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.31$; $z = -3.93$, $p < .001$). Again, this was qualified by a space \times dimensionality interaction mirroring the previous results. For the 2D dimensionality, the contrast between the private and public conditions was significant, $z = 3.190$, $p = .004$, while the difference between the private and semi-public conditions was not, $z = -0.157$, $p = 1.0$. The public and semi-public conditions differed significantly, $z = -3.348$, $p = .002$. In the 3D dimensionality, both the contrasts between the private and public, $z = 3.315$, $p = .003$, and the private and semi-public conditions were significant, $z = 4.701$, $p < .001$. However, the public and semi-public contrast was not, $z = 1.386$ (Figure 6). We analyzed the three-way interaction by comparing the effect of space for each combination of dimensionality and dynamics. We found only an effect of space for static conditions, all other $p > .05$, when comparing private and semi-public in 2D, $z = 3.810$, $p < .001$, and for 3D when comparing private and public, $z = 3.315$, $p = .003$;

Table 3. The RM ANOVA results for all dimensions and combinations for the SAM questions.

Dependent Variable	Model Term	F	p	Sig
Valence	Dynamics	12.74	< .001	***
	Dimensionality	1.21	.272	
	Space	16.84	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	0.61	.435	
	Dynamics:Space	0.14	.866	
	Dimensionality:Space	0.40	.669	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	0.75	.473	
Arousal	Dynamics	61.70	< .001	***
	Dimensionality	0.79	.375	
	Space	2.07	.126	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	2.52	.113	
	Dynamics:Space	0.95	.387	
	Dimensionality:Space	2.06	.127	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	1.41	.245	
Dominance	Dynamics	1.51	.219	
	Dimensionality	0.73	.391	
	Space	1.09	.335	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	0.80	.371	
	Dynamics:Space	0.27	.766	
	Dimensionality:Space	1.43	.240	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	0.26	.773	

On the item *I would like to see more of this content*, participants exhibited a main effect of dynamics and space. Again, participants rated that they would like to see more of this content for the dynamic ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.30$)

Table 4. The RM ANOVA results for all dimensions and combinations for the comfort Likert scale questions.

Dependent Variable	Model Term	F	p	sig
Comfortable Seeing	Dynamics	6.28	.012	*
	Dimensionality	4.75	.029	*
	Space	24.34	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	2.04	.153	
	Dynamics:Space	0.88	.416	
	Dimensionality:Space	4.73	.009	**
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	.58	.577	
Awkward Seeing	Dynamics	16.78	< .001	***
	Dimensionality	0.06	.800	
	Space	19.65	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	3.00	.083	
	Dynamics:Space	2.99	.050	
	Dimensionality:Space	7.67	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	3.14	.044	*
Like to See More	Dynamics	15.88	< .001	***
	Dimensionality	1.01	.315	
	Space	6.51	.002	**
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	0.77	.379	
	Dynamics:Space	2.54	.079	
	Dimensionality:Space	4.17	.016	*
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	1.00	.367	
Comfortable Placing	Dynamics	6.59	.010	*
	Dimensionality	0.27	.612	
	Space	14.44	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	2.50	.114	
	Dynamics:Space	0.36	.694	
	Dimensionality:Space	1.10	.333	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	0.89	.410	
Awkward Placing	Dynamics	0.51	.475	
	Dimensionality	1.34	.247	
	Space	41.96	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Dimensionality	17.81	< .001	***
	Dynamics:Space	0.59	.552	
	Dimensionality:Space	1.39	.250	
	Dynamics:Dimensionality:Space	0.03	.968	

compared to the static condition ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.29$). Corrected post-hoc tests indicated that private ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 1.37$) differed from public ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.34$; $z = -3.39$, $p < .001$) and public from semi-public ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.27$; $z = -2.747$, $p = .018$). This differed again as a function of dimensionality (space \times dimensionality), see also Figure 6. Post-hoc analyses on 2D revealed significant differences for private and public conditions,

$z = -2.529, p = .034$. However, the difference between private and semi-public conditions was not statistically significant, $z = 0.842, p = 1.0$. A significant difference emerged between the public and semi-public conditions, $z = 3.371, p = .002$. For 3D, the contrast between private and public conditions was significant, $z = -2.481, p = .023$. There was also a significant difference between private and semi-public conditions, $z = -2.670, p = .023$. However, the contrast between public and semi-public conditions did not yield a significant difference, $z = -0.189, p = 1.0$.

Due to convergence issues, the analysis on *I would feel **comfortable placing** the displayed content myself* had to be conducted without random slopes for each stimulus. We found a main effect of dynamics (dynamic: $M = 3.28, SD = 1.27$ vs. static: $M = 3.19, SD = 1.28$) and of space. Participants were more comfortable sharing content themselves in private spaces ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.38$) as compared to public ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.36; z = 4.90, p < .001$) and semi-public space ($M = 3.17, SD = 1.27; z = 4.36, p < .001$). None of the higher-order interactions were significant, all $p > .05$.

For *Placing this content would leave me feel **awkward** about myself and what others think about me*, we find only a main effect of space with private space being less awkward ($M = 4.09, SD = 1.38$) than semi-public ($M = 4.33, SD = 1.31; z = -5.83, p < .001$) and public space ($M = 4.43, SD = 1.40; z = -9.03, p < .001$) but also semi-public and public differed significantly from each other ($z = 3.20, p = .004$). Again, the space \times dimensionality interaction could be qualified by testing 2D and 3D separately, see Figure 6. For 2D, the private vs. public contrast was significant, $z = 3.74, p < .001$. However, the private vs. semi-public ($z = 1.697, p = .269$) and public vs. semi-public ($z = -2.039, p = .125$) contrasts were not significant, respectively. For 3D, both the private vs. public and private vs. semi-public contrasts were significant, $z = 3.41, p = .002$, and $z = 3.55, p < .001$, respectively. The public vs. semi-public contrast was not significant, $z = 0.15, p = 1.0$.

4.3 Content Analysis: Alternative Space Suggestions

The content analysis was applied to code and count the mentioned spaces where participants would feel comfortable sharing the video content. According to Vaismoradi et al. [96], content analysis is suitable for quantifying textual statements, which was our main interest for this question's responses. We introduced three codes, **public space**, **semi-public space**, and **private space** in the codebook (see Table 5 in the attachment) to identify patterns, following the definitions as presented in section 3.1. Two researchers coded the data manually and independently before comparing the results following the approach by Neuendorf [73].

Participants made alternative suggestions in all but one case (the private static 3D video). The content analysis resulted in an agreement rate of 92% and interrater reliability of $\kappa = 0.86$ using Cohen's Kappa, indicating 'almost perfect' reliability [58]. Main differences related to handling unspecific answers, such as "Indoors". The results showed that participants would feel comfortable sharing the video content mainly in private contexts (139 counts) and suggested semi (32)- or public (17) spaces only a few times in comparison.

4.4 Thematic Analysis: Suitability and Usage of Location-Based AR Social Media

Lastly, we report the results about what content participants find most suitable for a Social MediARverse, why, and what they would like to consume and share via such a medium. For this, two authors used an inductive approach, conducting a reflexive thematic analysis for the qualitative feedback. Following Braun et al. [8]'s approach, we 1) familiarized ourselves with the data, 2) noted down initial codes, 3) clustered the codes in the first themes, 4) iterated on those themes, 5) finalized theme definitions in an agreement between both researchers and 6) summarized the findings. Additionally, we report participants' preferences regarding content visualization and space with absolute numbers. Qualitative results are kept short for a limited amount of data and keep the focus on the quantitative results.

4.4.1 Suitability of Content. Participants found dynamic 2D AR as the most suitable (n=42) content type, followed by animated 3D objects (n=34), 3D objects (n=22), images (n=9), and none (n=3). In their explanations, we identified three themes, *Realistic*, *Entertainment*, *Integration in the Environment* with 15 codes in total. The *Realistic* theme represents two perspectives, one concerning 3D content (dynamic and static) to be more adapted to its physical surroundings, e.g., P80 stating “Because it would fit to 3D environment as I am not looking at screen.” The second perspective relates to dynamic 2D content, the most known and familiar format considering common short-form social media videos. Additionally, the 2D content origin seems traceable to a real, other user, allowing participants to draw relations to their own life; e.g., P54, “For me it’s because it’s most similar to real life and everyday activities that we see.” In comparison, 3D content was often linked to games and not a real person, complicating feeling connected to or identifying with it.

The *Entertainment* theme solely concerned dynamic content, 2D and 3D. Participants found the dynamic 3D content “fun”, “futuristic”, and “creative”, emphasizing the novelty of 3D AR social media content. Furthermore, they appreciated the movement in the dynamic 2D and 3D videos and emphasized feeling more engaged and entertained by dynamic content, e.g., P10 about dynamic 2D content: “It is more entertaining and grabs attention more than the other options.” 3D content was further perceived as less personal and more creative due to its novelty and less realistic visual appearance. In the *Integration in the Environment* theme, the content’s appropriateness for the respective space and its positioning were relevant factors to define the content’s suitability. This included the consideration of other people in the shared space or passers-by and what they would like to see, e.g., P23 about dynamic 3D “It will engage more people to interact.” The theme relates to all content types and revealed concerns about potential clutter and distraction resulting from particularly dynamic content and in the nine times preferred 2D static content in the ranking.

4.4.2 Content to Share and Consume. 44 participants indicated an interest in using such a technology, whereas 52 would rather not use it, and 14 stayed indecisive. The thematic analysis resulted in five themes related to the motivation of (not) using a Social MediARverse, *Entertainment*, *Profession or Education*, *Staying up to date*, *Location-Specific*, *Non-Use*, including 14 codes. The *Entertainment* theme revealed that participants appreciated the creativity and interactivity of a Social MediARverse. They mentioned benefits regarding extending the social network, newly experiencing a familiar environment, and a novel way for self-expression (e.g., P67 “I’d use it just as I use normal social media, it’d be another form of expression of my feelings, myself, etc.”). Related to participants’ *Profession or Education*, they would like to consume tutorials or distribute advertisements. Under the *Staying up to date* theme, we clustered general news or content posted by friends, family, or members of the same community. Furthermore, the theme *Location-Specific* comprises information about travel, history, navigation, or local events. Participants also differentiated between spaces. In private spaces, they preferred seeing content by friends and family and smaller objects such as flowers or pets. In comparison, in semi-public and public spaces, the content should relate to the space’s purpose, e.g., seeing the drawing process of an exhibition piece in an art gallery. Yet, participants also raised safety and privacy concerns, leading to a tendency not to use location-based AR social media (*Non-Use*). The main concern derived from sharing personal location data with strangers. This theme emphasizes securing users’ locations from shared, location-based content and against potential misuse.

5 DISCUSSION

Our work explores the influence of different *spaces* for content embedding and content designs (*dimensionality* and *dynamics*) of location-based AR on users’ tendency to share and consume social media content (**RQ1**). The most suitable content design and space combination is the dynamic 2D AR content embedded in private space (see Figure 1). Further, we identified the meaning of those dimensions and relationships for transitioning from digital social media to a ubiquitous Social MediARverse (**RQ2**), which we will discuss below.

5.1 Appropriate AR Content Design Considering Space, Dimensionality, and Dynamics

Our results revealed multiple significant effects between the conditions, resulting in the following takeaways:

The familiarity of 2D content design trumps 3D for consumption but not for sharing. Our results reveal that 2D dynamic content is the preferred content design to consume because it resembles traditional social media content and realism. This is at odds with prior work, finding that 3D was preferred for triggering greater engagement and realistic character representation [47, 106]. However, Kim and Hong [47]’s results derive from a virtual 3D environment interaction, whereas Yue et al. [106] did not compare generated content to known social media content designs. We assume that our content’s short-form video social media character sets users’ expectations of how to get content presented. Yet, we also expect it to change when augmented 3D content becomes more normal and ubiquitous. For now, 2D content is more recognizable as social media content, further supporting trust toward the content’s origin than 3D.

Private spaces are the most comfortable environments for sharing and consuming Social MediARverse content. Our results identify private spaces as the most comfortable and suitable environment for sharing and consuming content. Thereby, the content displayed in private may be reduced to posts by friends, family, and other community members, which introduces a more personal and intimate relation to the content and its owners. It also aligns with the purposes of using social media for maintaining social relationships as identified by, e.g., Dixon [25]. Based on Birch [5], we hypothesize that the emphasis on private spaces derives from the feeling of ownership, perceived control, and greater intimacy. Implementing a Social MediARverse in private spaces would enable users to revisit videos from past private events or post content that might interest another person later. At the same time, our findings emphasize that users are more concerned about sharing their content in physical spaces than in the digital social media realm, considering that users often share their profiles online with “everybody” [10]. Yet, by extending location-based AR into private spaces, we expect it can support users in feeling more “at home” if used to foster social exchange and reminisce. The finding might change when introducing privacy settings in our contexts but will require further exploration and negotiating of physical and digital space ownership [44]. Either way, it increases the complexity when designing a Social MediARverse with location-based AR, as we need to develop settings that account for the different combinations of the digital and physical. This includes private spaces where the perceived feeling of safety is greater than in other spaces but the digital connections can invade and harm it.

Sharing and consuming intentions significantly differ between spaces and dimensionality, emphasizing greater sensitivity for public places. Users found consuming and placing 3D content in private spaces significantly less awkward than in the other two spaces but were more open toward 2D content. There, semi-public places were perceived as similar to private spaces. The finding indicates a greater sensitivity to sharing and consuming content in public than in the other spaces for both dimensionalities and even stronger for 3D content. We assume the difference derives from the 3D design’s gamified and futuristic appearance and entertainment character, which might increase its perceived inappropriateness for semi-public and public spaces but still be perceived as suitable for private spaces. In semi-public and public, we are also more exposed to others’ opinions and potential public shaming [102]. To mitigate uncomfortable user experiences, we suggest limiting specifically 3D to space-fitting content and only supporting a free choice of dimensionality and content in private spaces.

Dynamic content is more engaging and comfortable to share and consume privately than static AR content. Our findings indicate dynamic content is preferred over static content in private for being more engaging, attention-grabbing, and entertaining. This aligns with prior work regarding the consumption of images vs. video content on traditional social media [33] and extends it by providing insights about users’ sharing intentions and preferences in dependence on the space. Additionally, public spaces can be quite attention-demanding [30, 48]. We assume

that quieter private spaces are more suitable for dynamic content because they have fewer distractions. However, the dynamics in our study videos were also spatially limited and excluded any interfering external movements, e.g., crossing cyclists or cars. Balancing the AR content's movement radius depending on the physical space, the users' position, and the video content might support sharing dynamic content in semi-public and public and optimize its consumption in private.

5.2 Creating a Social MediARverse: Design Considerations, Concerns and Outstanding Questions

Our work further provides insights into new design potentials and concerns related to a ubiquitous Social MediARverse.

5.2.1 Content Management According to the Space and Space Ownership. Current social media practices already consider users' location to improve content recommendation [29, 40, 55] and manage content ownership. Our work emphasizes the same need for a Social MediARverse depending on the space type. To manage shared content, we suggest classifying the spaces (e.g., through a meaning of place framework [34]) to provide either 2D or 3D content respectively, and reviewing it regarding the space's socio-cultural norms to assure appropriateness [27] and suitability for semi-public and public spaces. This is further impacted by who the content is shared with and the consideration of passers-by's perspective [77], which we did not address in this work. In comparison, managing content anchored in private spaces should involve people living in that space and be relatable to users on a personal and social level. This raises further research questions about the content's lifetime - e.g., should it depend on the person's stay in the space or the person's lifetime? Who can share content, and do people have to be on-site to post? Or how can content be reviewed for appropriateness depending on the context but independent of who shared it?

5.2.2 Location-Sharing Issues in Light of Private Space Preference. In addition to customizing the content design according to the space type, our qualitative results revealed privacy concerns when sharing users' locations. This results in a paradox because private households were the preferred yet are the more personal and intimate [20] spaces. This finding aligns with the social media privacy paradox related to users raising concerns about handing over ownership of personal data to third parties but doing so freely and willingly at the same time [76, 107]. Location sharing increases the risk of experiencing physical or property harm [53, 95], which shows our participants' concerns relevancy. Potential countermeasures relate to notifying users when others request their location data [53] or anonymizing location-based content for users outside the creator's network [41], emphasizing the need for content management in a Social MediARverse. However, our work does not reveal further location-based AR-specific risks other than well-known privacy challenges with location-based content. Thus, future work must explore potential AR-specific risks that have not been explored yet.

5.2.3 Dynamic Short-Form Videos in 2D and 3D. Another design consideration concerns providing dynamic content for users to share and consume. In line with prior work [33], our results support that dynamic content is also more suitable for a Social MediARverse if the intention is to provide users with entertainment [25] similar to original TikTok videos [2]. While dynamic 2D is perceived as more appropriate overall, dynamic 3D supports a more futuristic and creative content display that embeds better into the 3D physical surroundings. By this, 2D and 3D trigger different associations supporting diverging interaction experiences. Dynamic 3D should be considered for game networks or entertainment platforms with less intimate personal connections, whereas dynamic 2D seems promising to support personal relationships and users in connecting the content to their own lives. Part of this might be caused by current social media content being predominantly created by personal 2D recording devices (i.e., mobile phone cameras). In comparison, 3D technologies are only available to more professional content creators. At the same time, we also see potential in combining 2D and 3D in the same post

in future developments. Yet, for now, a Social MediARverse should focus on dynamic content, and its designers should decide between 2D and 3D considering its purpose.

5.2.4 The Level of Realism to Represent Humans in AR. Current work embedding social media content in urban spaces via AR or in Virtual Reality (VR) mainly restrains to 2D icons and posts in a 3D environment [55]. While this choice of 2D displays aligns with our results, we expect 3D AR visualizations to become more realistic [36] and, thus, more relatable and suitable in the future. At the same time, we agree with Slater et al. [92] about the risks of too realistic 3D AR, considering users might struggle to recognize what is AR and what is “real”. The challenge increases with AR glasses when users forget they are wearing them. Further, Huang et al. [39] showed that virtual human representations cause users to keep a certain physical distance, avoiding entering personal space. Consequently, 3D AR models of realistically appearing humans will impact users’ navigating physical spaces. In contrast, social media content must satisfy a certain level of realism and recognizability, mainly related to authentically displayed humans [42, 43], to build trust between content creators and consumers, e.g., influencers and followers. This is a similar challenge emphasized in prior VR work and the lifelike resemblance of virtual avatars, where a greater likeliness could lead to higher engagement [71]. Thus, for creating a Social MediARverse, research should explore balancing users’ lifelike 3D representations to enable (self-)identification under considering VR avatar design findings while avoiding too gamified or unrelated designs.

6 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Our work faces limitations regarding the study design and scope. For one, we conducted an online survey, which allows testing for multiple conditions with farther reach. Yet, it limits the potential of reflecting real-world scenarios and cannot fully reflect a real-world experience. The results might change by actually wearing an AR headset and walking through the different spaces. Thus, future work should evaluate our findings in real-life spaces and within an actual Social MediARverse network, also considering risks such as cluttering [19] and other negative impacts of short-form videos [15]. Second, we mainly gathered quantitative results to identify generalizable opportunities and challenges. Complementary to our work and the abovementioned point, we suggest future work to approach the topic qualitatively to collect an in-depth understanding of the indicated choices and real-world influences. Third, we based our content on short-form videos, a special social media content mainly used for entertainment. This ignores other content types and their representation as AR content, such as pure texts or emoticons. In future projects, the content types should be extended and assessed in comparison for the comfort level and emotional response, similar to work by Kukka et al. [55] testing social media icons in a 3D virtual city but for AR. Lastly, we used the three most liked TikTok videos to create the AR content. Each TikTok content already affects the user experience. While we counter-balanced the effect by considering three videos, the content is thematically very similar. The effect might differ for other thematic content, such as more serious, political content. However, the range of topics and their representation in short-form videos is huge, so we selected videos from a publicly available list. Yet, this shows a research opportunity to explore potential differences according to the content theme.

7 CONCLUSION

The work contributes to the future of creating ubiquitous social networks using location-based AR by exploring the effect of different content dimensionality (2D and 3D), dynamics (dynamic and static), and spaces (public, semi-public, and private) on users’ sharing and consuming intentions. Our results highlight private spaces as environments to embed, share, and consume Social MediARverse content. Furthermore, 3D content is more engaging, but 2D is preferred altogether. The most prominent content design is dynamic 2D content embedded in private space. Our work contributes insights into users’ sharing and consuming preferences and emphasizes future research potential for creating a ubiquitous, “real-world” metaverse.

8 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Stays empty for anonymization purposes...

REFERENCES

- [1] Marwan Walid Mohammad Al-Quran. 2022. Traditional media versus social media: challenges and opportunities. *Technium: Romanian Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology* 4, 10 (Dec. 2022), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.47577/technium.v4i10.8012>
- [2] Ava Bartolome and Shuo Niu. 2023. A Literature Review of Video-Sharing Platform Research in HCI. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 790, 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581107>
- [3] Steve Benford, Andy Crabtree, Martin Flintham, Adam Drozd, Rob Anastasi, Mark Paxton, Nick Tandavanitj, Matt Adams, and Ju Row-Farr. 2006. Can You See Me Now? *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 13, 1 (Mar. 2006). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1143518.1143522>
- [4] Mark Billinghurst, Adrian Clark, and Gun Lee. 2015. A Survey of Augmented Reality. *Found. Trends Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 8, 2–3 (mar 2015), 73–272. <https://doi.org/10.1561/1100000049>
- [5] Eugenie Birch. 2010. *Public and Private Space in Urban Areas: House, Neighborhood, and City*. 118–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-32933-8_8
- [6] Margaret M. Bradley and Peter J. Lang. 1994. Measuring emotion: The self-assessment manikin and the semantic differential. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* 25, 1 (1994), 49–59. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7916\(94\)90063-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7916(94)90063-9)
- [7] Tristan Braud, Carlos Bermejo Fernández, and Pan Hui. 2022. Scaling-up AR: University Campus as a Physical-Digital Metaverse. In *2022 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces Abstracts and Workshops (VRW)*. 169–175. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VRW55335.2022.00044>
- [8] Virginia Braun, Victoria Clarke, Nikki Hayfield, and Gareth Terry. 2019. *Thematic Analysis BT - Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*. 843–860 pages. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_103
- [9] Wolfgang Broll, Jan Ohlenburg, Irma Lindt, Iris Herbst, and Anne-Kathrin Braun. 2006. Meeting Technology Challenges of Pervasive Augmented Reality Games. In *Proceedings of 5th ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Network and System Support for Games* (Singapore) (NetGames '06). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 28–es. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1230040.1230097>
- [10] Jacquelyn Burkell, Alexandre Fortier, Lorraine (Lola) Yeung Cheryl Wong, and Jennifer Lynn Simpson. 2014. Facebook: public space, or private space? *Information, Communication & Society* 17, 8 (2014), 974–985. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.870591>
- [11] Mattea Cauchi and Daren Scerri. 2019. Enriching Tourist UX via a Location Based AR Treasure Hunt Game. In *2019 IEEE 9th International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE-Berlin)*. 199–204. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCE-Berlin47944.2019.8966141>
- [12] Dimitris Chatzopoulos, Carlos Bermejo, Zhanpeng Huang, and Pan Hui. 2017. Mobile Augmented Reality Survey: From Where We Are to Where We Go. *IEEE Access* PP (04 2017), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2698164>
- [13] Kostas Cheliotis, Fotis Liarokapis, Margarita Kokla, Eleni Tomai, Katerina Pastra, Niki Anastopoulou, Myra Baserianou, Athanasia Darra, and Marinos Kavouras. 2023. A systematic review of application development in augmented reality navigation research. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* 50 (05 2023), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15230406.2023.2194032>
- [14] Xiandong Cheng, Hao He, and Yushan Jiang. 2023. Analysis of User Participatory Design and Gamification in Modern Media. In *Design, User Experience, and Usability*, Aaron Marcus, Elizabeth Rosenzweig, and Marcelo M. Soares (Eds.). Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 78–93.
- [15] Francesco Chiossi, Luke Haliburton, Changkun Ou, Andreas Martin Butz, and Albrecht Schmidt. 2023. Short-Form Videos Degrade Our Capacity to Retain Intentions: Effect of Context Switching On Prospective Memory. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 30, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580778>
- [16] Eugene Ch'ng, Shengdan Cai, Pinyuan Feng, and Danzhao Cheng. 2023. Social Augmented Reality: Communicating via Cultural Heritage. *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 16, 2, Article 29 (apr 2023), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582266>
- [17] Dorian Cisternino, Laura Corchia, Valerio De Luca, Carola Gatto, Silvia Liaci, Liliana Scrivano, Anna Trono, and Lucio Tommaso De Paolis. 2021. Augmented Reality Applications to Support the Promotion of Cultural Heritage: The Case of the Basilica of Saint Catherine of Alexandria in Galatina. *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 14, 4, Article 47 (jul 2021), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460657>
- [18] Thomas Cochrane, Vickel Narayan, and Laurent Antonczak. 2016. A Framework for Designing Collaborative Learning Environments Using Mobile AR. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 27 (11 2016), 293–316.
- [19] Ashley Colley, Jacob Thebault-Spieker, Allen Yilun Lin, Donald Degraen, Benjamin Fischman, Jonna Häkkinä, Kate Kuehl, Valentina Nisi, Nuno Jardim Nunes, Nina Wenig, Dirk Wenig, Brent Hecht, and Johannes Schöning. 2017. The Geography of Pokémon GO: Beneficial and Problematic Effects on Places and Movement. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Denver, Colorado, USA) (CHI '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025495>

- [20] Maeve Cooke. 1999. A space of one's own: autonomy, privacy, liberty. *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 25, 1 (1999), 22–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019145379902500102>
- [21] J.W. Creswell. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications. 41–43 pages. <https://books.google.de/books?id=nSVxmN2KWeYC>
- [22] Adriana de Souza e Silva. 2017. Pokémon Go as an HRG: Mobility, Sociability, and Surveillance in hybrid spaces. *Mobile Media & Communication* 5, 1 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157916676232>
- [23] Paloma Díaz, Andrea Bellucci, Chien-Wen Yuan, and Ignacio Aedo. 2018. Augmented Experiences in Cultural Spaces through Social Participation. *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 11, 4, Article 19 (dec 2018), 18 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3230675>
- [24] Kody R. Dillman, Terrance Tin Hoi Mok, Anthony Tang, Lora Oehlberg, and Alex Mitchell. 2018. A Visual Interaction Cue Framework from Video Game Environments for Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montreal QC, Canada) (*CHI '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173714>
- [25] Stacy Jo Dixon. 2023. Most popular reasons for internet users worldwide to use social media as of 3rd quarter 2022. <https://www-statista-com/statistics/715449/social-media-usage-reasons-worldwide/>.
- [26] Ruofei Du, David Li, and Amitabh Varshney. 2019. Geollery: A Mixed Reality Social Media Platform. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) (*CHI '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300915>
- [27] Chloe Egtebas, Gudrun Klinker, Susanne Boll, and Marion Koelle. 2023. Co-Speculating on Dark Scenarios and Unintended Consequences of a Ubiquitous(Ly) Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (*DIS '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2392–2407. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3596073>
- [28] Farjana Eishita and Kevin Stanley. 2015. Analyzing Play Experience Sensitivity to Input Sensor Noise in Outdoor Augmented Reality Smartphone Games. In *Proceedings of the 2015 British HCI Conference* (Lincoln, Lincolnshire, United Kingdom) (*British HCI '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783446.2783570>
- [29] Aleksandr Farseev, Ivan Samborskii, Andrey Filchenkov, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Cross-Domain Recommendation via Clustering on Multi-Layer Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan) (*SIGIR '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080774>
- [30] Marcus Foth and Glenda Amayo Caldwell. 2018. More-than-Human Media Architecture. In *Proceedings of the 4th Media Architecture Biennale Conference* (Beijing, China) (*MAB18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3284389.3284495>
- [31] Chris Furmanski, Ronald Azuma, and Mike Daily. 2002. Augmented-Reality Visualizations Guided by Cognition: Perceptual Heuristics for Combining Visible and Obscured Information. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality* (*ISMAR '02*). IEEE Computer Society, USA, 215.
- [32] Anhong Guo, Ilter Canberk, Hannah Murphy, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, and Rajan Vaish. 2019. Blocks: Collaborative and Persistent Augmented Reality Experiences. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 3, 3, Article 83 (sep 2019), 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351241>
- [33] Jade C. Gurtala and Jasmine Fardouly. 2023. Does medium matter? Investigating the impact of viewing ideal image or short-form video content on young women's body image, mood, and self-objectification. *Body Image* 46 (2023), 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2023.06.005>
- [34] Per Gustafson. 2001. Meanings of Place: Everyday Experience And Theoretical Conceptualization. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 21, 1 (2001), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevps.2000.0185>
- [35] Hana Habib, Neil Shah, and Rajan Vaish. 2019. Impact of Contextual Factors on Snapchat Public Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) (*CHI '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300256>
- [36] Michael Haller. 2004. Photorealism or/and Non-Photorealism in Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM SIGGRAPH International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry* (Singapore) (*VRCAI '04*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 189–196. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1044588.1044627>
- [37] Linda Hirsch, Ivan Graf von Silva-Tarouca, and Robin Welsch. 2022. Increasing Socio-Spatial Connectedness Among Students: A Location-Based AR Social Media Network Approach. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (*CHI EA '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 372, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519681>
- [38] Linda Hirsch, Robin Welsch, Beat Rossmly, and Andreas Butz. 2022. Embedded AR Storytelling Supports Active Indexing at Historical Places. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction* (Daejeon, Republic of Korea) (*TEI '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490149.3501328>

- [39] Ann Huang, Pascal Knierim, Francesco Chiossi, Lewis L Chuang, and Robin Welsch. 2022. Proxemics for Human-Agent Interaction in Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (CHI '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 421, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517593>
- [40] Vijesh Joe and Jennifer Raj. 2021. Location-based Orientation Context Dependent Recommender System for Users. *Journal of Trends in Computer Science and Smart Technology* 3 (04 2021), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.36548/jtcsst.2021.1.002>
- [41] Simon Jones and Eamonn O'Neill. 2011. Contextual Dynamics of Group-Based Sharing Decisions (CHI '11). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1777–1786. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979200>
- [42] Yatish Joshi, Weng Marc Lim, Khyati Jagani, and Satish Kumar. 2023. Social media influencer marketing: foundations, trends, and ways forward. *Electronic Commerce Research* (06 2023), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-023-09719-z>
- [43] Sunghye Jun and Jisu Yi. 2020. What makes followers loyal? The role of influencer interactivity in building influencer brand equity. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* ahead-of-print (06 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-02-2019-2280>
- [44] Michael Katell, Francien Dechesne, Bert-Jaap Koops, and Paulus Meessen. 2019. Seeing the whole picture: visualising socio-spatial power through augmented reality. *Law, Innovation and Technology* 11, 2 (2019), 279–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2019.1665800>
- [45] Simon Kemp. 2023. DIGITAL 2023 DEEP-DIVE: IS SOCIAL MEDIA REALLY DYING? *Digital 2023: Global Overview Report* (2023). <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2023-deep-dive-the-worlds-top-social-media-platforms>
- [46] Kangsoo Kim, Byung-Kuk Seo, Jae-Hyek Han, and Jong-Il Park. 2009. Augmented Reality Tour System for Immersive Experience of Cultural Heritage. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry* (Yokohama, Japan) (VRCAI '09). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 323–324. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1670252.1670325>
- [47] Soyeon Kim and Seulgi Hong. 2020. How Virtual Exhibition Presentation Affects Visitor Communication and Enjoyment: An Exploration of 2D versus 3D. *The Design Journal* 23, 5 (2020), 677–696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2020.1806580>
- [48] Francisco Kiss and Albrecht Schmidt. 2019. Stressed by Design? The Problems of Transferring Interaction Design from Workstations to Mobile Interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 13th EAI International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare* (Trento, Italy) (PervasiveHealth'19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 377–382. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3329189.3329232>
- [49] Alexandros Klefodimos, Maria Moustaka, and Athanasios Evagelou. 2023. Location-Based Augmented Reality for Cultural Heritage Education: Creating Educational, Gamified Location-Based AR Applications for the Prehistoric Lake Settlement of Dispilio. *Digital* 3, 1 (2023), 18–45. <https://doi.org/10.3390/digital3010002>
- [50] Benjamin Knoerlein, Gábor Székely, and Matthias Harders. 2007. Visuo-Haptic Collaborative Augmented Reality Ping-Pong. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advances in Computer Entertainment Technology* (Salzburg, Austria) (ACE '07). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 91–94. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1255047.1255065>
- [51] Theodore Knoll, Amna Liaqat, and Andrés Monroy-Hernández. 2023. ARtistic Escape: Promoting Social Connection, Teamwork, and Collaboration Using a Co-Located Augmented Reality Escape Room. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI EA '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 38, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544549.3585841>
- [52] Marion Koelle, Swamy Ananthanarayan, and Susanne Boll. 2020. Social Acceptability in HCI: A Survey of Methods, Measures, and Design Strategies. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (<conf-loc>, <city>Honolulu</city>, <state>HI</state>, <country>USA</country>, </conf-loc>) (CHI '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376162>
- [53] Vassilis Kostakos, Jayant Venkatanathan, Bernardo Reynolds, Norman Sadeh, Eran Toch, Siraj A. Shaikh, and Simon Jones. 2011. Who's Your Best Friend? Targeted Privacy Attacks In Location-Sharing Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing* (Beijing, China) (UbiComp '11). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 177–186. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2030112.2030138>
- [54] Efstathia Kostopoulou, Ana Javornik, Petros Koutsolampros, Simon Julier, and Ava Fatah gen. Schieck. 2018. Mediated Spatial Narratives: Experiencing Archival Material and Shared Memories in Urban Space. In *Proceedings of the 4th Media Architecture Biennale Conference* (Beijing, China) (MAB18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3284389.3284395>
- [55] Hannu Kukka, Minna Pakanen, Mahmoud Badri, and Timo Ojala. 2017. Immersive Street-Level Social Media in the 3D Virtual City: Anticipated User Experience and Conceptual Development. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (Portland, Oregon, USA) (CSCW '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2422–2435. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2998181.2998341>
- [56] Eleni A. Kyza and Yiannis Georgiou. 2016. Digital Tools for Enriching Informal Inquiry-Based Mobile Learning: The Design of the TraceReaders Location-Based Augmented Reality Learning Platform. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Asia-Europe Symposium on Simulation & Serious Gaming* (Zhuhai, China) (VRCAI '16). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 195–198. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3014033.3017432>
- [57] Ewelina Lacka. 2020. Assessing the impact of full-fledged location-based augmented reality games on tourism destination visits. *Current Issues in Tourism* 23, 3 (2020), 345–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1514370>

- [58] J.R. Landis and G. G. Koch. 1977. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics* 33, 1 (1977), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- [59] Tal Laor. 2020. The Race to Escape: Location-Based Escapism and Physical Activity as a Motivator in the Consumption of the AR Game Pokémon Go. *Journal of Psychosocial Research* 14 (2020).
- [60] Chun-I Lee, Fu-Ren Xiao, and Yi-Wen Hsu. 2020. *Using Augmented Reality Technology to Construct a Venue Navigation and Spatial Behavior Analysis System*. 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37869-1_14
- [61] Jung Lee and Gyu-won Kim. 2017. Social Media User Classification: Based on Social Capital Expectation, Susceptibility, and Compulsion Loop. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Electronic Commerce (Pangyo, Seongnam, Republic of Korea) (ICEC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 16, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3154943.3154963>
- [62] Anttoni Lehto, Nina Luostarinen, and Paula Kostia. 2020. Augmented Reality Gaming as a Tool for Subjectivizing Visitor Experience at Cultural Heritage Locations—Case Lights On! *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 13, 4, Article 28 (Dec. 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3415142>
- [63] Ruobing Li, Bo Zhang, S. Shyam Sundar, and Henry Been-Lirn Duh. 2013. Interacting with Augmented Reality: How Does Location-Based AR Enhance Learning?. In *Human-Computer Interaction - INTERACT 2013 - 14th IFIP TC 13 International Conference, Cape Town, South Africa, September 2-6, 2013, Proceedings, Part II (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8118)*, Paula Kotzé, Gary Marsden, Gitte Lindgaard, Janet Wesson, and Marco Winckler (Eds.). Springer, 616–623. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40480-1_43
- [64] Chin-Feng Lin, Chen-Su Fu, and Hsiang-Yu Fu. 2021. 2D versus 3D videos: a comparison of online city tourism promotion. *Current Issues in Tourism* 24, 12 (2021), 1703–1720. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1799957>
- [65] Yang Liu, Qin Gao, and Liang Ma. 2021. Taking Micro-breaks at Work: Effects of Watching Funny Short-Form Videos on Subjective Experience, Physiological Stress, and Task Performance. In *Cross-Cultural Design. Applications in Arts, Learning, Well-being, and Social Development*, Pei-Luen Patrick Rau (Ed.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 183–200.
- [66] Kai Lukoff, Cissy Yu, Julie Kientz, and Alexis Hiniker. 2018. What Makes Smartphone Use Meaningful or Meaningless? *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 2, 1, Article 22 (mar 2018), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3191754>
- [67] Jörg Matthes, Raffael Heiss, and Hendrik van Scharrel. 2023. The distraction effect. Political and entertainment-oriented content on social media, political participation, interest, and knowledge. *Computers in Human Behavior* 142 (2023), 107644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107644>
- [68] Daniel Medeiros, Romane Dubus, Julie Williamson, Graham Wilson, Katharina Pöhlmann, and Mark McGill. 2023. Surveying the Social Comfort of Body, Device, and Environment-Based Augmented Reality Interactions in Confined Passenger Spaces Using Mixed Reality Composite Videos. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 7, 3, Article 113 (sep 2023), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610923>
- [69] Elisa D. Mekler and Kasper Hornbæk. 2019. A Framework for the Experience of Meaning in Human-Computer Interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) (CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300455>
- [70] KRISTINE F. MILLER. 2007. *Designs on the Public: The Private Lives of New York's Public Spaces* (ned - new edition ed.). University of Minnesota Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv5pq>
- [71] Fares Moustafa and Anthony Steed. 2018. A Longitudinal Study of Small Group Interaction in Social Virtual Reality. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology (Tokyo, Japan) (VRST '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 22, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3281505.3281527>
- [72] Jacqueline Nesi, Sophia Choukas-Bradley, and Mitchell Prinstein. 2018. Transformation of Adolescent Peer Relations in the Social Media Context: Part 1—A Theoretical Framework and Application to Dyadic Peer Relationships. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 21 (09 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-018-0261-x>
- [73] Kimberly A. Neuendorf. 2017. *The Content Analysis Guidebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc, p.69. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802878>
- [74] Gary Ng, Joon Gi Shin, Alexander Plopski, Christian Sandor, and Daniel Saakes. 2018. Situated Game Level Editing in Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction (Stockholm, Sweden) (TEI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173225.3173230>
- [75] Anton Nijholt. 2021. Experiencing Social Augmented Reality in Public Spaces. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers (Virtual, USA) (UbiComp '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 570–574. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460418.3480157>
- [76] PATRICIA A. NORBERG, DANIEL R. HORNE, and DAVID A. HORNE. 2007. The Privacy Paradox: Personal Information Disclosure Intentions versus Behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 41, 1 (2007), 100–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2006.00070.x>
- [77] Joseph O'Hagan, Pejman Saeghe, Jan Gugenheimer, Daniel Medeiros, Karola Marky, Mohamed Khamis, and Mark McGill. 2023. Privacy-Enhancing Technology and Everyday Augmented Reality: Understanding Bystanders' Varying Needs for Awareness and Consent. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 6, 4, Article 177 (jan 2023), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3569501>

- [78] Melike Orhan. 2022. *The Use of Semi-public Spaces as Urban Space and Evaluation in Terms of Urban Space Quality*. 203–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97046-8_16
- [79] Elizabeth Petrov and Andrés Monroy-Hernández. 2023. Dream Garden: Exploring Location-Based, Collaboratively-Created Augmented Reality Spaces. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (*CHI EA '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 92, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544549.3585810>
- [80] Lev Poretzki, Joel Lanir, and Ofer Arazy. 2018. Normative Tensions in Shared Augmented Reality. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 2, CSCW, Article 142 (nov 2018), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274411>
- [81] Aung Pyae, Luimula Mika, and Jouni Smed. 2017. Understanding Players' Experiences in Location-Based Augmented Reality Mobile Games: A Case of Pokémon Go. In *Extended Abstracts Publication of the Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play* (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) (*CHI PLAY '17 Extended Abstracts*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 535–541. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3130859.3131322>
- [82] Mashrur Rahman, Uttama Barua, and Alexandra S. 2014. The changing nature of urban public places in Dhaka City. *Urbanism. Arhitekturä. Construcții* 5 (05 2014), 5–16.
- [83] Julie Rico and Stephen Brewster. 2009. Gestures All around Us: User Differences in Social Acceptability Perceptions of Gesture Based Interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services* (Bonn, Germany) (*MobileHCI '09*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 64, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1613858.1613936>
- [84] Jan Ole Rixen, Mark Colley, Ali Askari, Jan Gugenheimer, and Enrico Rukzio. 2022. Consent in the Age of AR: Investigating The Comfort With Displaying Personal Information in Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (*CHI '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 295, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502140>
- [85] Franziska Roesner, Tamara Denning, Bryce Clayton Newell, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Ryan Calo. 2014. Augmented Reality: Hard Problems of Law and Policy. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing: Adjunct Publication* (Seattle, Washington) (*UbiComp '14 Adjunct*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1283–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2638728.2641709>
- [86] Franziska Roesner, Tadayoshi Kohno, and David Molnar. 2014. Security and Privacy for Augmented Reality Systems. *Commun. ACM* 57, 4 (apr 2014), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2580723.2580730>
- [87] Sheree May Saßmannshausen, Jörg Radtke, Nino Bohn, Hassan Hussein, Dave Randall, and Volkmar Pipek. 2021. Citizen-Centered Design in Urban Planning: How Augmented Reality Can Be Used in Citizen Participation Processes. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (Virtual Event, USA) (*DIS '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 250–265. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461778.3462130>
- [88] Christin Scholz, Mia Jovanova, Elisa C Baek, and Emily B Falk. 2020. Media content sharing as a value-based decision. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 31 (2020), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.004>
- [89] Hope Schroeder, Rob Tokanel, Kyle Qian, and Khoi Le. 2023. Location-Based AR for Social Justice: Case Studies, Lessons, and Open Challenges. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (*CHI EA '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 391, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544549.3573855>
- [90] Munesh Sharma. 2020. Augmented Reality Navigation. *International Journal of Engineering Research and V9* (06 2020). <https://doi.org/10.17577/IJERTV9IS060441>
- [91] William R. Sherman and Alan B. Craig. 2003. CHAPTER 3 - Interface to the Virtual World – Input. In *Understanding Virtual Reality*, William R. Sherman and Alan B. Craig (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, 75–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-155860353-0/50004-5>
- [92] Mel Slater, Cristina Gonzalez-Liencre, Patrick Haggard, Charlotte Vinkers, Rebecca Gregory-Clarke, Steve Jelley, Zillah Watson, Graham Breen, Raz Schwarz, William Steptoe, Dalila Szostak, Shivashankar Halan, Deborah Fox, and Jeremy Silver. 2020. The Ethics of Realism in Virtual and Augmented Reality. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality* 1 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3389/frvir.2020.00001>
- [93] Ulrike Spierling, Peter Winzer, and Erik Massarczyk. 2017. Experiencing the Presence of Historical Stories with Location-Based Augmented Reality. 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71027-3_5
- [94] Statista. 2023. Daily time spent on social networking by internet users worldwide from 2012 to 2023. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/433871/daily-social-media-usage-worldwide/>.
- [95] Janice Tsai, Patrick Kelley, Lorrie Cranor, and Norman Sadeh. 2009. Location-Sharing Technologies: Privacy Risks and Controls. *Innovation Law & Policy eJournal* (08 2009). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:108624889>
- [96] Mojtaba Vaismoradi, Hannele Turunen, and Terese Bondas. 2013. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences* 15, 3 (2013), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- [97] Leena Ventä-Olkkonen, Maaret Posti, Olli Koskenranta, and Jonna Häkkinen. 2012. User Expectations of Mobile Mixed Reality Service Content. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia* (Ulm, Germany) (*MUM '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 52, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2406367.2406430>

- [98] Fernando Vera and J. Alfredo Sánchez. 2016. A Model for In-Situ Augmented Reality Content Creation Based on Storytelling and Gamification. In *Proceedings of the 6th Mexican Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (Colima, Mexico) (MexIHC'16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 39–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2967175.2967385>
- [99] Prashant Verma, Kushal Agrawal, and V. Sarasvathi. 2020. Indoor Navigation Using Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2020 4th International Conference on Virtual and Augmented Reality Simulations (Sydney, NSW, Australia) (ICVARS 2020)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385378.3385387>
- [100] Yunwen Wang. 2020. Humor and camera view on mobile short-form video apps influence user experience and technology-adoption intent, an example of TikTok (DouYin). *Computers in Human Behavior* 110 (2020), 106373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106373>
- [101] Yiran Wang, Melissa Niiya, Gloria Mark, Stephanie M. Reich, and Mark Warschauer. 2015. Coming of Age (Digitally): An Ecological View of Social Media Use among College Students. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (CSCW '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 571–582. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2675133.2675271>
- [102] Carol Warren. 2010. Pride, shame and stigma in private spaces. *Ethnography* 11 (08 2010), 425–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138110370495>
- [103] Julie R. Williamson, Andrew Crossan, and Stephen Brewster. 2011. Multimodal Mobile Interactions: Usability Studies in Real World Settings. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Multimodal Interfaces (Alicante, Spain) (ICMI '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 361–368. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2070481.2070551>
- [104] L. Y.C. Wong and Jacquelyn Burkell. 2017. Motivations for Sharing News on Social Media. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Social Media & Society (Toronto, ON, Canada) (SMSociety17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 57, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097286.3097343>
- [105] Jiangnan Xu. 2022. From Augmented Reality Location-Based Games To the Real-World Metaverse. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2022 Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play (Bremen, Germany) (CHI PLAY '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 364–366. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3505270.3558363>
- [106] Yuanwen Yue, Jiaqi Ding, Yuhao Kang, Yueyao Wang, Kunlin Wu, and Teng Fei. 2019. A Location-Based Social Network System Integrating Mobile Augmented Reality and User Generated Content. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGSPATIAL International Workshop on Location-Based Recommendations, Geosocial Networks and GeoAdvertising (Chicago, Illinois) (LocalRec '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3356994.3365507>
- [107] Aristeia M. Zafeiropoulou, David E. Millard, Craig Webber, and Kieron O'Hara. 2013. Unpicking the Privacy Paradox: Can Structuration Theory Help to Explain Location-Based Privacy Decisions?. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM Web Science Conference (Paris, France) (WebSci '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 463–472. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2464464.2464503>

9 APPENDICES

9.1 The Codebook

Table 5. The Codebook: We coded the additional suggested spaces by participants, differentiating between three codes: public, semi-public, and private space. The codes focus on urban spaces.

Code	Description
Public space	Physically and socially accessible by everyone, centrally managed by the city or communal authority [70, 82]. Public spaces incorporate a highly relevant socio-cultural role for society and the local communities by providing the space to meet, exchange, and develop ²³ .
Semi-public space	Privately owned and accessible by a certain structural group formed by, e.g., common interests or shared activities [78].
Private space	Accessible only for and managed by certain people permitted and defined by law [5]. A space to individualize and personalize, including self-defined rules [20].

Table 6. The table shows the mean and standard deviation (SD) for the three conditions describing the task: *Wearing AR Glasses, Public, Main Study*.

Question	Wearing AR Glasses	Public	Main Study Wording
Comfortable Seeing.	3.53 (1.84)	3.33 (1.91)	3.4 (1.89)
Awkward Seeing.	4.59 (1.92)	4.92 (1.92)	4.72 (1.92)
Like to See More.	2.99 (1.83)	2.74 (1.77)	2.91 (1.78)
Comfortable Placing.	3.13 (1.83)	2.88 (1.85)	3.08 (1.79)
Awkward Placing.	4.58 (1.96)	4.79 (1.99)	4.45 (2)
Valence (SAM)	5.19 (2.11)	5.33 (2.04)	5.31 (2.12)
Arousal (SAM)	5.34 (2.12)	5.34 (2.18)	5.41 (2.27)
Dominance (SAM)	5.06 (2.12)	4.97 (2.18)	5.01 (2.27)

9.2 Control Study: Task Description

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009