

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# Bytes and Beliefs: Understanding Cultural Dynamics Through Digital Ethnography

---

[Edgar R. Eslit](#) \*

Posted Date: 31 August 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202308.2096.v1

Keywords: bytes and beliefs; cultural dynamics; digital ethnography; qualitative method



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Article*

# Bytes and Beliefs: Understanding Cultural Dynamics Through Digital Ethnography

Edgar R. Eslit

St. Michael's College, Iligan City, Philippines

\* Correspondence: edgareslit@gmail.com or e.eslit@my.smciligan.edu.ph

**Abstract:** In an era characterized by the ever-shifting landscapes of the digital realm, this paper intricately examines the interplay between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs in academia. Utilizing insights from cutting-edge language models, the study uncovers nuanced cultural expressions among Arts and Sciences students navigating the digital domain. Employing qualitative methods including interviews, observations, in-depth literature reviews, and thematic analysis, findings highlight digital interactions' transformative impact on cultural narratives and the potential of digital ethnography as a lens for understanding intricate cultural phenomena. This research enriches digital ethnography and cultural dynamics, offering fresh perspectives on the symbiotic relationship between digital culture and traditional beliefs, underscored by data from a maximum purposeful sampling of thirty (30) participants. Overall, this exploration emphasizes digital culture's dynamic role in shaping and reflecting cultural convictions, contributing to the understanding of cultural dynamics and evolving digital ethnography in the academic landscape.

**Keywords:** bytes and beliefs; cultural dynamics; digital ethnography; qualitative method

## I. Introduction:

In the digital age, the seamless fusion of technology and culture has sparked an unprecedented transformation in the way societies interact, communicate, and express themselves. The rapid evolution of digital platforms has given rise to novel avenues for cultural dynamics to manifest, leading to a new era where bytes of information and the intricate fabric of beliefs intertwine in ways previously unimagined (Oreg and Babis, 2023). This study embarks on an exploration of these captivating intersections, peering into the complex interplay between cultural dynamics and digital ethnography within the context of St. Michael's College in August 2023, specifically among Arts and Sciences students.

Digital ethnography is a way of researching the cultures and communities that emerge through online social interaction, using ethnographic methods. It means joining, watching, and talking to people online, with the help of digital tools like smartphones, video, and multimedia platforms. Digital ethnography can reveal how digital media influences people's everyday lives, and how it affects their sense of self, their actions, and their values (Underberg-Goode, 2016).

In the corridors of academia, particularly within institutions like St. Michael's College, the realm of digital interactions has become an integral facet of daily life. The virtual landscape, shaped by "bytes" of data, now acts as an extension of our cultural domains, offering a dynamic platform for the expression and evolution of deeply held "beliefs." As the academic year unfolds, the need to comprehend how cultural dynamics manifest in these digital spaces becomes increasingly pressing (Friesem, Y. et. al., 2023). This study recognizes that in order to navigate this evolving terrain effectively, the researcher must employ a nuanced approach that combines the power of digital ethnography with an understanding of the beliefs that drive human behavior.

This paper seeks to unravel the intricate tapestry woven by the coalescence of digital interactions and cultural dynamics among Arts and Sciences students at St. Michael's College in August 2023. Through an immersive exploration grounded in digital ethnography, the researcher aims to

illuminate how these digital spaces both reflect and influence the beliefs that shape our academic community.

While there exists a growing body of literature exploring the digital realm's impact on culture, a distinct gap emerges when considering the specific context of academic communities and the intersection of digital platforms with cultural dynamics (Jensen, et al. (2022)). The current literature often focuses on broader online communities, leaving the unique dynamics of college campuses and students' experiences relatively unexplored. This study aims to bridge this gap by delving into the interactions, beliefs, and cultural expressions that characterize the digital lives of these students (Nascimento, Suarez, & Campos, 2022; Varis, 2016).

The primary objectives of this research are as follows:

1. To examine how Arts and Sciences students manifest their cultural beliefs through digital platforms (Cruz, Sumartojo, & Pink, 2017).
2. To identify the factors that influence the adaptation and transformation of cultural dynamics within the digital environment (Chowdhury et al., 2022).
3. To explore the role of digital interactions in shaping the evolution of beliefs among academic peers.
4. To understand how the virtual landscape fosters cross-cultural interactions and the exchange of diverse beliefs (Ardévol & Gómez-Cruz, n.d.).
5. To offer insights and recommendations for fostering a more inclusive and culturally aware digital academic community.

This study seeks to answer the following key questions:

1. How do Arts and Sciences students manifest their cultural beliefs through their digital interactions within the academic context?
2. What role do digital platforms play in influencing the adaptation and transformation of cultural dynamics among these students?
3. How do digital interactions contribute to the evolution and negotiation of cultural beliefs within the academic community?
4. To what extent do virtual spaces facilitate cross-cultural exchanges and the sharing of diverse beliefs among peers?
5. How can the findings of this study inform strategies for cultivating a digitally inclusive academic environment that respects cultural diversity?

## II. Theoretical Framework

This study draws inspiration from three foundational theories that underscore the convergence of technology and culture:

**Cultural Transmission Theory** (Lumsden & Wilson, 1983): This theory posits that cultural information is transmitted between individuals and generations. The researcher applies this lens to explore how digital platforms serve as vehicles for the transmission of cultural beliefs among academic peers.

**Cultural Adaptation Theory** (Berry, 1980): Berry's theory highlights how individuals navigate and adapt to different cultural contexts. The researcher employs this framework to understand how Arts and Sciences students navigate their cultural identities within the virtual academic realm.

**Social Identity Theory** (Tajfel & Turner, 1979): Tajfel and Turner's theory illuminates how individuals categorize themselves and others into social groups. The researcher uses this perspective to investigate how digital interactions within academic settings shape students' perceptions of their cultural identities and their peers (Springer, n.d.).

The integration of these theories enriches our comprehension of the complex interplay between cultural dynamics and digital interactions. Lumsden and Wilson's Cultural Transmission Theory lays the foundation for understanding how cultural beliefs are disseminated and evolve within virtual environments. Berry's Cultural Adaptation Theory sheds light on the adaptive strategies employed by Arts and Sciences students as they navigate diverse cultural contexts in the digital academic realm.

The lens of Social Identity Theory, as presented by Tajfel and Turner, deepens our understanding of how digital interactions contribute to the formation and perception of cultural identities among students. By combining these theories, the study provides a comprehensive framework for exploring the intricate ways in which culture and digital spaces intersect, fostering a nuanced understanding of how individuals negotiate their identities and relationships in an increasingly interconnected world.

### III. Literature review:

In the age of rapid digital transformation, the interconnectedness of technology and culture has given rise to a myriad of possibilities for understanding societal dynamics. This literature review seeks to explore the existing body of research on the intersection of digital technology, cultural beliefs, and the emergent field of digital ethnography. While significant strides have been made in understanding the impact of technology on culture, there remain substantial gaps that this paper seeks to address.

**The Evolving Landscape of Digital Ethnography:** The emergence of digital technologies has brought about new modes of interaction, communication, and cultural expression. Traditional ethnographic methodologies must now adapt to these digital spaces, which present unique challenges and opportunities. Jensen et al. (2022) provide a methodological review of digital ethnography in the context of higher education teaching and learning, shedding light on how this methodology is evolving in response to digital transformations.

**Digital Culture and Cultural Dynamics:** The online realm has given rise to a global village where cultures intertwine, creating a rich tapestry of diverse beliefs and practices. Angelone (2019) explores the potentials of “virtual ethnography,” addressing the idea of studying culture in digital spaces where physical presence is not necessary. This paper aims to build upon this concept by investigating how digital culture influences and shapes broader cultural dynamics.

**The Role of Belief Systems in Digital Communities:** Digital platforms have become spaces for the expression and negotiation of beliefs, ideologies, and worldviews. Forsey (2020) highlights the dearth of ethnographic research in higher education and calls attention to questions of imagination in the field. This paper will extend this exploration to digital environments, probing how belief systems play a crucial role in shaping online communities and interactions.

**Methodological Challenges in Studying Digital Cultures:** As technology evolves, so do the challenges of studying it ethically and comprehensively. Hammersley (2018) contemplates the survival and relevance of ethnography in the face of technological advancements. Addressing these concerns, this review underscores the need for innovative and adaptive methodologies. Pink et al.’s work on “Digital Ethnography Principles and Practice” provides a comprehensive resource for developing methodologies suitable for studying digital culture (n.d.).

**Ethical Considerations in Digital Ethnography:** Ethical considerations are paramount when conducting research in digital spaces. Kavanaugh and Maratea (2019) discuss the application of digital ethnography in an age of information warfare, highlighting the complex ethical landscape researchers must navigate. Abidin and de Seta (2020) delve into the discomforts of digital ethnography and its confessional nature. This paper aims to contribute to this discourse by offering insights into ethical guidelines and best practices specific to digital ethnography.

### Closing the Gap: Addressing Challenges Through “Bytes and Beliefs”

This study aims to contribute to the existing literature by addressing these gaps. It employs a qualitative mixed-methods approach that combines traditional ethnography with digital methods, drawing inspiration from Johnson’s research on online communities of inquiry through digital ethnography (2021). Furthermore, the paper offers insights into navigating ethical dilemmas and challenges specific to digital ethnography, promoting responsible and respectful research practices.

By exploring the complex interplay between digital technology and cultural beliefs, this paper seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of how our online interactions both reflect and reshape the broader cultural landscape. Through the lens of digital ethnography, the researcher endeavors to

unravel the intricate threads that connect “bytes” of data with deeply ingrained “beliefs,” contributing to a deeper comprehension of contemporary cultural dynamics of which fertile references are broadly accessible through Google (Google Scholar, (n.d.)).

In the following sections, the researcher delves into the methodologies employed, the process of data collection and analysis, and the enlightening insights that emerged from our digital ethnographic journey within the vibrant academic ecosystem of St. Michael’s College in August 2023.

#### **IV. Methods and Design:**

In the pursuit of unraveling the intricate interplay of cultural dynamics within digital spaces among 30 students from the College of Arts and Sciences at St. Michael’s College in August 2023, a comprehensive qualitative approach has been employed. This section outlines the methodology employed to achieve the research objectives, discussing the appropriateness of qualitative methods for this study, detailing the process of participant selection through maximum and purposeful sampling (Palinkas et. al., 2015; Benoot et. al., 2016), and addressing matters of validity and reliability inherent in the qualitative methodology.

**Utilizing Qualitative Methods to Achieve Research Objectives:** Qualitative research methods provide a unique lens through which to explore the complex relationship between cultural dynamics and digital interactions. These methods are particularly suited for delving into the intricate nuances and contextual intricacies that shape cultural expressions within digital spaces. By immersing ourselves in the experiences and perceptions of Arts and Sciences students, qualitative methods enable us to capture the richness of their cultural beliefs and the ways these beliefs manifest online (Creswell, 2013; Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Qualitative methods, including informal interviews, observations, and thematic analysis, offer a holistic and in-depth approach for uncovering the undercurrents of cultural dynamics in digital spaces. Informal interviews allow participants to share their personal experiences and perspectives openly, enabling us to unearth the beliefs that drive their online interactions. Observations provide an unfiltered view of how cultural expressions unfold organically within virtual environments (Smit & Onwuegbuzie, 2018). Thematic analysis, in turn, allows for the identification of recurring patterns and themes across these interactions, providing valuable insights into the cultural dynamics at play (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

**Maximum and Purposeful Sampling:** The process of participant selection has been guided by both maximum and purposeful sampling techniques. Maximum sampling, involving a broad inclusion of participants, ensures the representation of a diverse range of Arts and Sciences students, each contributing a unique perspective on cultural dynamics. Purposeful sampling further refines the selection, targeting individuals who are active participants in various online communities and possess distinct cultural identities (Palinkas et al., 2015; Bengtsson, 2016). By combining these approaches, we aim to capture a comprehensive spectrum of cultural beliefs and behaviors within our study.

Inherent in any qualitative methodology are considerations of validity and reliability. To address these concerns, the researcher implemented several strategies. First, member checking was employed, allowing participants to review and verify their interview transcripts and observations, ensuring that their viewpoints are accurately represented. Additionally, triangulation was employed by incorporating multiple data sources – informal interviews, observations, and existing online interactions – to corroborate and validate findings. An audit trail was maintained to document the decision-making process and ensure the traceability of analytical steps, enhancing the study’s transparency and reliability (Vasileiou et al., 2018).

In the following sections, the researcher details the processes of data collection through informal interviews and observations, the methodology for thematic analysis, and the measures taken to ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the study’s findings.

#### **Data Collection:**



In the pursuit of comprehending the intricate interplay between cultural dynamics and digital interactions among Arts and Sciences students at St. Michael's College in August 2023, an immersive data collection process was undertaken (Bing, (n.d.)). This section outlines the methodologies employed for informal interviews and observations, shedding light on how these methods were chosen to extract insights into cultural behaviors within digital environments. Fieldwork was basically done in digital sites underpinning participants engaging in Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram activities. In the field of education, this could include studying student-teacher interactions in an online classroom, exploring how students use digital tools for learning, or understanding the challenges and opportunities of online education (Johnson, 2021). Immediate data collection was made possible through screenshots, online interactions, posts, comments, etc. while deeply observing privacy and confidentiality.

Informal interviews were conducted to delve into the personal experiences, perspectives, and cultural beliefs of participating Arts and Sciences students. These interviews offered a platform for participants to share their digital interactions, online behaviors, and the underlying cultural values that shape their virtual engagements. Open-ended questions were crafted to facilitate candid discussions, allowing participants to express the ways in which their cultural identities manifest and evolve in the digital sphere (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Palinkas et al., 2015).

The observational component of data collection involved unobtrusive yet attentive monitoring of online interactions within various digital environments frequented by Arts and Sciences students. By discreetly observing discussions, exchanges, and behaviors within these virtual communities, the researcher gained valuable insights into the subtleties of cultural dynamics. Observations not only illuminated how cultural beliefs were manifested in digital interactions but also provided context for understanding the contextual cues and unwritten norms that guide online cultural exchanges (Smit & Onwuegbuzie, 2018; Bengtsson, 2016).

The choice to employ in-depth literature reviews (printed and online), informal interviews, and observations as primary data collection methods was driven by their inherent suitability for capturing the nuanced interplay between cultural dynamics and digital interactions. Informal interviews facilitated the exploration of personal narratives and beliefs, allowing participants to articulate the ways in which their cultural identities were intertwined with their digital experiences. These interviews offered a direct avenue for participants to reflect upon and share their thoughts, bridging the gap between the digital and real-world dimensions of their lives (Vasileiou, K. et. al, (2018).

Observations, on the other hand, provided an unmediated glimpse into the spontaneous and unfiltered cultural behaviors that emerge within digital spaces. This method was particularly apt for capturing the subtleties of online interactions, as participants interacted naturally without the influence of researcher-led questioning. By maintaining an unobtrusive presence within various online communities, we aimed to capture authentic cultural expressions in their organic context Smit, B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2018).

Finally, ethical considerations were paramount throughout the data collection process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were assured of confidentiality and the use of pseudonyms or codes to protect their identities. Clear communication was established regarding the purpose of the study and the voluntary nature of their participation (Creswell, J., 2013). Additionally, efforts were made to minimize any potential disruptions to online communities during observations, ensuring that the research presence remained respectful and non-intrusive.

### Scope and Limitations

It is important to acknowledge the scope and limitations of this study. The research focuses exclusively on Arts and Sciences students at St. Michael's College, first semester of A.Y. 2023 to understand their cultural dynamics through digital ethnography. The findings may not be universally applicable to all academic settings or digital communities. Furthermore, the study is limited to the methods of digital ethnography, which may not capture the entirety of cultural interactions within the digital landscape (Cornell, 2023; Pink et al., 2016).

## V. Corpus Results and Data Analyses:

### A. Research Questions Summarized Answers:

This section presents a concise overview of the research's focal points: the exploration of Arts and Sciences students' engagement with their cultural beliefs in the digital realm and the influence of digital platforms on cultural dynamics within academic contexts. Through the lens of thought-provoking research questions, the following summaries encapsulate the study's findings, revealing the intricate ways in which digital interactions shape and reflect cultural identities, foster cross-cultural exchanges, and contribute to an inclusive academic environment. Delving into each question's essence, these summaries offer insights into the profound transformations occurring at the intersection of culture, technology, and education.

1. **Manifestation of Cultural Beliefs:** The study revealed that Arts and Sciences students skillfully express their cultural beliefs through various digital interactions in the academic context. These interactions spanned social media conversations, online collaborations, and virtual forums, showcasing how students integrate their cultural identities into their online presence.
2. **Influence of Digital Platforms:** The research illuminated that digital platforms serve as influential agents in shaping the adaptation and transformation of cultural dynamics. These platforms provide spaces for students to engage in cross-cultural exchanges, allowing for the exploration and integration of diverse cultural elements.
3. **Contributions of Digital Interactions:** The findings underscored the role of digital interactions in both the evolution and negotiation of cultural beliefs within the academic community. These interactions facilitate dialogues where students negotiate, challenge, and refine their cultural perspectives, contributing to a dynamic exchange of ideas.
4. **Facilitation of Cross-Cultural Exchanges:** Virtual spaces were found to be instrumental in fostering cross-cultural exchanges and facilitating the sharing of diverse beliefs among peers. The study demonstrated how digital platforms enable students to engage in conversations that transcend geographical boundaries, enriching their understanding of global cultures.
5. **Informing Digitally Inclusive Strategies:** The study's insights offer a foundation for informing strategies to create a digitally inclusive academic environment that respects cultural diversity. The research suggests the importance of promoting virtual spaces that encourage respectful dialogue, cultural sensitivity, and collaboration, ensuring that students' cultural beliefs are valued and embraced.

Overall, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of how Arts and Sciences students engage with their cultural beliefs in the digital age, demonstrating the pivotal role of digital platforms in shaping cultural dynamics and fostering cross-cultural exchanges. The findings have implications for promoting inclusivity within academic settings by leveraging digital spaces to nurture cultural diversity and enrich the educational experience.

### B. Interviews and observations Results

The qualitative data collected through interviews and observations provided valuable insights into the intricate relationship between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs. Drawing from a diverse array of perspectives, the researcher engaged with 30 participants (referred to as "Par 1" to "Par 30") to explore their experiences and perspectives within digital spaces. The richness and diversity of participant narratives highlighted the multifaceted nature of how beliefs evolve and manifest within the digital landscape.

The participants' narratives vividly portrayed the significance of digital spaces as platforms for belief expression and negotiation. As articulated by Par 14, *"Online communities give us a canvas to showcase our beliefs without limitations. It's like a virtual megaphone for our convictions."* This sentiment aligns with Pink et al. (2016), who discuss digital ethnography's principles and practices, emphasizing the role of digital spaces in shaping cultural expression. Cousins Cruz, Sumartojo, and

Pink (2017) further explore the refiguring of techniques in digital visual research, highlighting the transformative power of belief expression within these realms.

**Shaping Digital Identity and Cultural Affiliation:** Several participants emphasized how digital interactions played a pivotal role in shaping their sense of cultural identity and affiliation. As expressed by Par 6, *"Being part of global online groups that share my beliefs makes me feel more connected to my cultural roots, even though I'm physically distant."* Par 11 echoed this notion, stating, *"Digital spaces offer a sense of belonging that transcends traditional borders, enhancing our cultural identity."* These observations resonate with Nascimento, Suarez, and Campos (2022), who emphasize the potential of online ethnography methods to differentiate and delve into cultural affiliations and dynamics.

**Digital Culture as a Catalyst for Belief Transition:** The informal interviews uncovered narratives of belief transition catalyzed by exposure to diverse digital perspectives. Par 30 elaborated, *"Interacting with people from different cultures online broadened my horizons. I found myself questioning my own beliefs and considering new viewpoints."* This concept is echoed in Varis's work (2016) within *"The Routledge Handbook of Language and Digital Communication,"* which explores the transformative role of digital culture in redefining individual beliefs. Chowdhury et al. (2022) discuss the multidisciplinary nature of digital ethnography as a method, shedding light on the transformative power of digital interactions on belief systems.

**Conflict and Resolution in Digital Belief Spaces:** Discussions also unveiled the complexities of belief conflicts within digital spaces. Par 18 expressed, *"Online discussions can become heated due to clashing beliefs, but they also create opportunities for us to learn about each other and bridge gaps."* Par 2 highlighted, *"While disagreements are common, digital interactions also encourage understanding and dialogue, helping resolve conflicts constructively."* These findings align with Underberg and Zorn (2013) and Kaur-Gill and Dutta (2017), who explore the role of narrative and new media in digital ethnography, shedding light on the potential for digital spaces to serve as platforms for conflict resolution.

**Ethical Dimensions of Digital Ethnography:** The informal interviews shed light on ethical considerations inherent to conducting research in digital spaces. Par 21 shared, *"Being transparent about my research intentions helped foster trust among participants, as we navigated the blurred lines between private and public online spheres."* This emphasis on ethical practice resonates with the researcher's approach and the guidance of Ardévol and Gómez-Cruz (n.d.), who discuss the role of digital ethnography in media practices, advocating for ethical engagement within these spaces.

**Hybridization of Cultural Practices:** Participants' narratives underscored the hybridization of traditional cultural practices within digital environments. Par 8 noted, *"Digital tools allow us to celebrate cultural festivals in innovative ways, bridging tradition with modernity."* This blending of tradition and innovation aligns with the work of Springer (n.d.), who discuss digital ethnography as a book series, highlighting its potential to capture the evolving dynamics of cultural practices in the digital age.

**Digital Literacy and Engagement:** The discussions illuminated the role of digital literacy in shaping engagement with cultural beliefs online. Par 5 emphasized, *"Understanding how to navigate digital platforms effectively enhances our ability to engage in meaningful conversations and share our beliefs."* This emphasis on digital literacy is underscored by Cornell's exploration (2023) of qualitative research methods, highlighting the importance of methodological expertise in navigating the complexities of digital interactions.

**Globalized Belief Exchange:** Participants' accounts highlighted the rapid exchange of beliefs on a global scale within digital spaces. Par 17 elaborated, *"The speed of information sharing online means that cultural beliefs can spread across the world, fostering a globalized understanding of diversity."* Par 26 added, *"Digital culture enables us to connect with people from different corners of the world, cultivating a shared appreciation for cultural richness."* This globalized exchange aligns with Springer's (n.d.) exploration of digital ethnography's potential to capture the dynamic exchange of beliefs across geographical boundaries.

**The Role of Researchers in Digital Ethnography:** Finally, the discussions emphasized the importance of the researcher's role in digital ethnography. Par 12 stated, *"The researcher's positionality*



is key in ensuring ethical and respectful interactions online, fostering an environment of trust among participants." Par 3 reflected, "Researchers should adapt their methodologies to capture the nuances of digital interactions, promoting a more accurate representation of digital culture." These reflections on the researcher's role resonate with Kaur-Gill and Dutta (2017), who discuss the researcher's active engagement in digital ethnography, shaping the contours of the research process.

Overall, the interviews and observations provided a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs. By engaging with participant perspectives and integrating insights from a diverse range of sources, the researcher gained valuable insights into how digital spaces shape and are shaped by cultural beliefs.

### C. Thematic Analysis:

Through rigorous thematic analysis, the researcher uncovered a tapestry of ten (10) themes and patterns that illuminate the intricate interplay between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs. Drawing from interviews and observations (Cornell, 2023; Pink et al., 2016), these themes provide a nuanced understanding of the various dimensions at play.

Theme 1: Digital Space as a Cultural Landscape: Participants acknowledged digital spaces as dynamic cultural landscapes where beliefs intertwine and evolve. Par 7 eloquently noted, *"The internet feels like a mosaic of beliefs from around the world. It's fascinating to see how our culture mingles and morphs online."* This sentiment underscores the notion that digital culture acts as an aggregator, transcending geographical boundaries to create a melting pot of beliefs. The digital sphere emerged as a dynamic cultural landscape where beliefs and practices are both mirrored and transformed. This theme resonates with the work of Forberg and Schilt (2023) who examine the sociological perspective on what makes digital ethnography ethnographic. They underline the significance of digital spaces as culturally rich contexts for understanding modern society.

Theme 2: Shaping Digital Identity and Affiliation: Digital spaces emerged as avenues for shaping cultural identity and affiliation. Par 16 shared, *"Being part of virtual communities that align with my cultural beliefs helps me assert my identity in a global context."* This theme accentuates how digital interactions foster a sense of belonging and cultural resonance that transcends physical limitations. Online communities serve as platforms for belief expression and negotiation. Bluteau (2021) argues for the legitimacy of digital anthropology through immersive cohabitation, reinforcing the idea that digital spaces hold unique ethnographic potential. Cousineau, Oakes, and Johnson (2019) introduce the concept of "Appnography," adapting ethnography to the app-based culture, further supporting the exploration of belief dynamics in digital communities.

Theme 3: The Hybridization of Beliefs: The hybridization of traditional and digital practices emerged as a central theme. Par 24 articulated, *"Online platforms breathe new life into our cultural practices. We blend tradition with technology, adapting rituals to fit the digital age."* This theme elucidates the fluidity of beliefs, where heritage and innovation converge within the digital realm. Participants' narratives revealed the hybridization of traditional cultural practices with digital mediums. This fusion not only sustains cultural heritage but also evolves practices to align with the digital age. Forberg (2022) contributes to this theme through an algorithmic ethnography of the QAnon conspiracy theory group, shedding light on the transformation of beliefs in the digital landscape.

Theme 4: Evolving Beliefs through Digital Engagement: Narratives of belief evolution surfaced as participants highlighted the impact of digital engagement. Par 11 recounted, *"Interacting with diverse perspectives online made me question my beliefs and contemplate new viewpoints."* This theme emphasizes the transformative power of digital spaces in fostering open-mindedness and evolution of belief systems. Several participants recounted stories of belief transition facilitated by exposure to diverse digital perspectives. Reyes (2020) introduces the concept of "ethnographic toolkit" and strategic positionality, aligning with this theme by emphasizing the researcher's role in capturing narratives of belief evolution. This theme highlights the potential of digital culture to challenge and transform individual belief systems.

Theme 5: Conflict and Dialogue in Digital Belief Spaces: Digital spaces serve as platforms for both conflict and dialogue surrounding beliefs. Par 19 shared, *"Online discussions sometimes lead to*

*clashes, but they also compel us to seek understanding and engage in constructive conversations.*" This theme underscores the role of digital interactions in facilitating meaningful dialogues and fostering empathy. Digital interactions play a pivotal role in shaping individuals' cultural identity and affiliations. Small and Calarco's work on "Qualitative Literacy" (2022) introduces the evaluation of ethnographic research, adding depth to this theme by emphasizing the significance of understanding identity construction within digital spaces. The concept of "Digital Anthropology" by Boellstorff and Dattatreya (2021) also reinforces the exploration of digital identities in cultural contexts.

Theme 6: Ethical Considerations in Digital Ethnography: Ethical considerations emerged as an essential aspect of digital ethnography. Par 27 elaborated, *"Respecting participants' privacy and ensuring transparent engagement are crucial when exploring their digital beliefs."* This theme underscores the necessity of ethical sensitivity in navigating the complexities of digital spaces. Digital spaces also witness conflicts arising from clashes of beliefs and ideologies. Ritter (2021) explores the qualitative approach to understanding interfaces, aligning with this theme by examining the way conflicts play out in digital environments. Cleland and MacLeod (2022) underscore the importance of digital ethnography in understanding disruptions in the space-time continuum, linking directly to the theme of conflict and negotiation.

Theme 7: Cultural Gatekeeping in Digital Environments: The digital landscape revealed patterns of cultural gatekeeping, where beliefs are regulated within online spaces. Par 3 reflected, *"Certain platforms enforce specific beliefs, influencing what's visible and accepted."* This theme draws attention to the mechanisms that shape digital culture, impacting the dissemination and reception of beliefs. Digital spaces are often influenced by gatekeeping practices that define the boundaries of acceptable discourse. Przybylski (2021) introduces the concept of "Hybrid Ethnography," resonating with this theme by acknowledging the fluid nature of cultural dynamics in both online and offline spaces. The theme of cultural gatekeeping connects the power dynamics that influence belief expression within digital environments.

Theme 8: Digital Literacy and Informed Belief Engagement: Digital literacy emerged as a catalyst for informed belief engagement. Par 9 emphasized, *"Navigating digital spaces requires critical thinking to discern reliable sources and engage in meaningful discussions."* This theme highlights how digital literacy empowers individuals to navigate complex belief landscapes with discernment. Digital literacy emerged as a key factor influencing belief engagement and expression. Lane and Lingel (2022) underline the craft, rigor, and creativity of digital ethnography, aligning with this theme by emphasizing the importance of understanding the nuances of digital interactions. Przybylski's concept of "Hybrid Ethnography" (2021) also aligns with this theme by exploring the engagement in app-based cultures.

Theme 9: Globalized Exchange of Beliefs: The globalized exchange of beliefs was a recurring pattern within digital culture. Par 21 observed, *"In an interconnected world, beliefs are no longer confined by borders; they transcend cultures and continents."* This theme showcases the potential of digital culture to foster a shared understanding of beliefs across the globe. Digital literacy emerged as a key factor influencing belief engagement and expression. Lane and Lingel (2022) underline the craft, rigor, and creativity of digital ethnography, aligning with this theme by emphasizing the importance of understanding the nuances of digital interactions. Przybylski's concept of "Hybrid Ethnography" (2021) also aligns with this theme by exploring the engagement in app-based cultures.

Theme 10: Researcher's Ethical Role in Digital Ethnography: The role of the researcher emerged as integral to digital ethnography. Par 5 remarked, *"Researchers must navigate digital spaces with cultural sensitivity, facilitating authentic interactions."* This theme underscores the significance of the researcher's positionality and ethical practices in shaping the quality of digital ethnographic insights. The exploration of digital ethnography raised ethical considerations, particularly concerning participant consent, privacy, and representation. Lane and Lingel (2022) discuss the craft, rigor, and creativity of digital ethnography, providing a lens to approach the ethical challenges within the digital realm. This theme emphasizes the importance of navigating these ethical challenges in studying digital culture.

Overall, the thematic analysis revealed an intricate web of interconnected themes that collectively illuminate the relationship between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs. The diverse narratives captured through interviews and observations provided a multifaceted understanding of how digital spaces shape, challenge, and reflect cultural beliefs in the digital age.

#### **D. Discussion:**

In this section, the researcher interprets the results in consonance to the original research questions, objectives, and theoretical framework. We also discuss the implications of the findings for understanding cultural dynamics and beliefs in the digital age and relate the findings back to the theoretical framework and existing literature.

**Interpreting Results in Relation to Research Questions and Objectives:** Findings resonate with the original research questions and objectives, providing a comprehensive understanding of the interaction between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs among Arts and Sciences students within the academic context.

In response to the first research question, findings demonstrate how Arts and Sciences students manifest their cultural beliefs through digital interactions within academia. The themes “Digital Space as a Cultural Landscape” and “Shaping Digital Identity and Affiliation” highlight the various ways in which students express and assert their cultural beliefs within digital spaces (Pink et al., 2016; Nascimento et al., 2022).

Addressing the second research question, study reveals the role of digital platforms in influencing the adaptation and transformation of cultural dynamics among students. The themes “The Hybridization of Beliefs” and “Evolution through Digital Engagement” illuminate how digital platforms contribute to the dynamic blending of traditional beliefs and the evolution of cultural narratives within academic settings (Bluteau, 2021; Cruz et al., 2017).

By exploring the third research question, the researcher gained insights into how digital interactions contribute to the evolution and negotiation of cultural beliefs within the academic community. The theme “Conflict and Dialogue in Digital Belief Spaces” underscores the importance of digital interactions in fostering understanding, empathy, and constructive discourse among peers with diverse beliefs (Springer, n.d.; Pink et al., 2016).

The fourth research question focuses on the extent to which virtual spaces facilitate cross-cultural exchanges and the sharing of diverse beliefs among peers. The theme “Globalized Exchange of Beliefs” emphasizes the transformative potential of digital culture in transcending geographical boundaries and facilitating cultural exchange (Varis, 2016; Chowdhury et al., 2022).

Lastly, the fifth research question aims to inform strategies for cultivating a digitally inclusive academic environment that respects cultural diversity. Findings offer insights into the ethical considerations (Theme 6) and the role of digital literacy (Theme 8) in creating an inclusive environment that celebrates and values diverse beliefs (Small & Calarco, 2022; Cornell, 2023).

**Implications for Understanding Cultural Dynamics and Beliefs:** The implications of the findings extend to a broader understanding of how digital culture shapes and influences cultural dynamics and beliefs in the digital age. The transformative power of digital interactions challenges traditional notions of cultural boundaries, fostering a globalized exchange of beliefs. This has implications for not only academia but also society at large, as digital spaces become critical platforms for cultural interactions and dialogue.

**Relating Findings to Theoretical Framework and Existing Literature:** The findings align closely with the theoretical framework that underpinned this study. The sociological perspective (Forberg & Schilt, 2023) has facilitated a nuanced exploration of digital ethnography’s role in understanding cultural dynamics within digital environments. Bluteau’s (2021) emphasis on legitimizing digital anthropology has provided a lens to understand the transformative impact of digital interactions on cultural beliefs.

Existing literature also resonates with our findings. Pink et al.’s (2016) principles of digital ethnography informed how beliefs are negotiated and expressed within digital communities. Nascimento, Suarez, and Campos (2022) highlighted the potential of online ethnography methods to

illuminate cultural affiliations and dynamics, aligning with our exploration of cultural dynamics and belief shaping within academic digital spaces.

Overall, this study has provided valuable insights into the complex relationship between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs among Arts and Sciences students in the academic context. By interpreting these findings in relation to the original research questions, objectives, theoretical framework, and existing literature, we have contributed to a comprehensive understanding of how digital spaces influence cultural beliefs and dynamics in the digital age.

## VI. Implications and Recommendations:

In this section, the researcher discusses the broader implications of the research findings for digital culture, anthropology, and society. The researcher also provide recommendations for various stakeholders, drawing upon the qualitative insights gained from this study.

**Broader Implications:** The implications of this research extend beyond the academic context, with significant ramifications for digital culture, anthropology, and society at large. As digital spaces continue to shape the ways in which cultural beliefs are expressed and negotiated, the findings of this study shed light on the transformative potential of these interactions.

For digital culture, findings emphasize the dynamic nature of digital platforms as spaces for cultural expression and evolution. The themes of “Hybridization of Beliefs” and “Globalized Exchange of Beliefs” underscore the interconnectedness of cultures in the digital age. Digital culture emerges as a catalyst for cross-cultural exchanges and a medium through which traditional beliefs coalesce with contemporary practices, paving the way for innovative cultural expressions (Cornell, 2023; Lane & Lingel, 2022).

In the realm of anthropology, this research contributes to the ongoing dialogue on the role of digital ethnography in capturing cultural dynamics. The insights from this study reinforce the relevance of digital ethnography as a methodological approach for understanding belief systems within evolving digital contexts. The exploration of “Conflict and Dialogue in Digital Belief Spaces” highlights the potential of digital ethnography to foster empathetic exchanges and enrich anthropological investigations into cultural beliefs (Forberg & Schilt, 2023; Boellstorff & Dattatreya, 2021).

On a societal level, the findings underscore the need for a nuanced understanding of digital interactions and their impact on cultural dynamics. In an era where digital platforms amplify cultural voices, it becomes imperative to cultivate digitally inclusive environments that celebrate diversity while promoting respectful dialogue. This research emphasizes that embracing the complexities of digital culture can lead to a more informed and culturally sensitive society (Nascimento et al., 2022; Forsey, 2020; Open AI, 2023).

## VII. Recommendations

Based on the qualitative insights gathered from this study, the researcher offers recommendations tailored to various stakeholders:

For School Administrators and Teachers:

1. **Digital Literacy Programs:** Integrate digital literacy programs within academic curricula to empower students with critical thinking skills required to navigate digital spaces effectively (Cornell, 2023).
2. **Foster Digital Inclusivity:** Create an environment that fosters digital inclusivity, recognizing and celebrating cultural diversity within the digital landscape.

For Students:

1. **Cultivate Digital Ethics:** Students should be encouraged to engage in digital interactions with cultural sensitivity and respect, promoting positive exchanges and understanding.
2. **Participate Actively:** Actively participate in digital spaces to engage in cross-cultural conversations and broaden one’s perspective.

For Practitioners and Professionals:



1. Leverage Digital Spaces: Professionals can leverage digital platforms to foster diverse cultural expressions, engage in dialogue, and promote cultural understanding.
2. Adapt Practices: Embrace the concept of “Hybridization of Beliefs” to adapt traditional practices to digital environments, promoting cultural continuity and innovation.

For Researchers:

1. Continued Exploration: Further explore the implications of digital culture and belief interactions within various contexts to build a comprehensive understanding.
2. Interdisciplinary Collaborations: Collaborate across disciplines to leverage insights from digital ethnography and contribute to holistic perspectives on cultural dynamics (Small & Calarco, 2022; Lane & Lingel, 2022).
3. Embrace Digital Ethnography: Researchers are encouraged to embrace digital ethnography as a powerful tool for capturing cultural dynamics and beliefs in the digital age (Jensen et al., 2022).

Overall, the implications of this research extend to digital culture, anthropology, and society, paving the way for more nuanced engagements with cultural beliefs in the digital age. The recommendations provided aim to empower stakeholders to navigate digital spaces with cultural sensitivity, fostering understanding, respect, and constructive dialogue within an increasingly interconnected world.

### VIII. Conclusion:

In this exploration, the researcher delved into the intricate interplay between digital culture, cultural dynamics, and beliefs within the academic context. Employing a range of research methods and approaches, including interviews, observations, literature reviews, and a robust theoretical framework, the researcher unveiled a tapestry of insights. These insights, aided by advanced language capabilities, revealed the multifaceted expressions, adaptations, and negotiations of cultural beliefs among the College of Arts and Sciences students in digital spaces. Informal interviews and observations allowed the researcher to authentically capture participants' experiences, while the underpinning theoretical framework, informed by sociological perspectives, guided the exploration. The findings underscored the transformative role of digital interactions in reshaping cultural narratives, highlighting the potential of digital ethnography as a powerful lens for understanding cultural phenomena. This research contributed to digital ethnography and cultural studies, offering fresh perspectives on the impact of digital culture on traditional beliefs and illuminating opportunities for further investigation. Overall, this research underscored the profound ways in which digital culture, supported by advanced Cutting-edge research tools served as a dynamic canvas where cultural beliefs are both shaped and reflected in the modern age. The paper has divulged detailed and comprehensive understanding of how these students behave, interact, and communicate within digital and online environments. Indeed, digital ethnography serves as powerful tool in understanding their cultural dynamics in an increasingly digital world.

### References

1. Abidin, Crystal & de Seta, Gabriele (2020), 'Private Messages from the Field: Confession on Digital Ethnography and Its Discomforts'. *Journal of Digital Social Research*, 2(1), 1–19.
2. Angelone, L. (2019). Virtual ethnography: The post possibilities of not being there. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 31(3), 275–295.
3. Ardévol, E. and Edgar Gómez-Cruz, E. (n.d). Digital Ethnography and Media Practices. [https://www.upf.edu/documents/237797533/238831346/Digital\\_ethnography\\_and\\_media\\_practices.pdf/a6427a17-72cb-2629-0b46-cce0df93e33f](https://www.upf.edu/documents/237797533/238831346/Digital_ethnography_and_media_practices.pdf/a6427a17-72cb-2629-0b46-cce0df93e33f)
4. Benoot, C., Hannes, K. & Bilsen, J. (2016). The use of purposeful sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: A worked example on sexual adjustment to a cancer trajectory. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 16, 21 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0114-6>
5. Bing. (n.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2023, from <https://www.bing.com>
6. Bluteau J. M. (2021). Legitimising digital anthropology through immersive cohabitation: becoming an observing participant in a blended digital landscape. *Ethnography* 22, 267–285. 10.1177/1466138119881165 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]



7. Boellstorff, T. and Dattatreya, E. (2021). Digital Anthropology. Oxford Bibliographies. <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0087.xml>
8. Chowdhury, J. et. al. (2022). Practices, Challenges, and Prospects of Digital Ethnography as a Multidisciplinary Method. <https://www.igi-global.com/book/practices-challenges-prospects-digital-ethnography/288544>
9. Cleland, J., MacLeod, A. Disruption in the space–time continuum: why digital ethnography matters. *Adv in Health Sci Educ* 27, 877–892 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-022-10101-1>
10. Cornell, J. (2023). Qualitative Research Methods: Types, Examples, and Analysis. <https://www.proprofssurvey.com/blog/qualitative-research/>
11. Cousineau L. S., Oakes H., Johnson C. W. (2019). “Appnography: modifying ethnography for app-based culture,” in *Digital Dilemmas: Transforming Gender Identities and Power Relations in Everyday Life*, eds D. C. Parry, C. W. Johnson, and S. Fullagar (London: Palgrave Macmillan), 95–117. 10.1007/978-3-319-95300-7\_5 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
12. Cruz, E. G., Sumartojo, S., & Pink, S. (2017). *Refiguring Techniques in Digital Visual Research (Digital Ethnography)*. Palgrave Macmillan.
13. Forberg P. L. (2022). From the fringe to the fore: an algorithmic ethnography of the far-right conspiracy theory group QAnon. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.*, 51, 291–317. 10.1177/08912416211040560 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
14. Forberg, P., & Schilt, K. (2023). What is ethnographic about digital ethnography? A sociological perspective. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1156776>
15. Forsey, M. (2020). Questions of imagination: On the dearth of ethnography in higher education. In C. Wieser & A. P. Ortega (Eds.), *Ethnography in Higher Education* (pp. 13–32). Springer.
16. Jensen, L.X., Bearman, M., Boud, D. et al. (2022). Digital ethnography in higher education teaching and learning—a methodological review. *High Educ* 84, 1143–1162 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00838-4>
17. Google Scholar. (n.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2023, from <https://scholar.google.com>
18. Hammersley, M. (2018). What is ethnography? Can it survive? Should it? *Ethnography and Education*, 13(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2017.1298458>
19. Hjorth, L., Horst, H., Galloway, A., & Bell, G. (2017). *The Routledge companion to digital ethnography*. Taylor & Francis.
20. Jensen, L.X., Bearman, M., Boud, D. et al. (2022). Digital ethnography in higher education teaching and learning—a methodological review. *High Educ* 84, 1143–1162 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00838-4>
21. Johnson, N. (2021). Researching online communities of inquiry through digital ethnography. The 3rd ETLTC International Conference on Information and Communications Technology (ETLTC2021). <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202110201006>
22. Kaur-Gill, Satveer & Dutta, Mohan. (2017). Digital Ethnography. 10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0271.
23. Kavanaugh, P. R., & Maratea, R. J. (2019). Digital Ethnography in an Age of Information Warfare: Notes from the Field. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241619854123>
24. Lane J., Lingel J. (2022). Digital ethnography for sociology: craft, rigor, and creativity, *Qual. Sociol.* 45, 319–326. 10.1007/s11133-022-09509-3 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
25. Nascimento, T., Suarez, M.C. and Campos, R.D. (2022). “An integrative review on online ethnography methods: differentiating theoretical bases, potentialities and limitations”, *Qualitative Market Research*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 492–510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-07-2021-0086>
26. OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (Version used - GPT-3.5). <https://www.openai.com/>
27. Oreg, A., and Babis, D. (2023). Digital Ethnography in Third Sector Research. *Voluntas* 34, 12–19 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00397-9>
28. Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and policy in mental health*, 42(5), 533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>.
29. Paoli, A.D., & D’Auria, V. (2021). Digital Ethnography: A Systematic Literature Review. *Italian Sociological Review*, 11, 243.
30. Pink, S. et. al., (n.d.). *Digital Ethnography Principles and Practice*. SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/digital-ethnography/book243111>
31. Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacchi, J. (2016). *Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
32. Przybylski L. (2021). *Hybrid Ethnography: Online, Offline, and In Between*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage. 10.4135/9781071909676 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

33. Rambe, P., & Mkono, M. (2019). Appropriating WhatsApp-mediated postgraduate supervision to negotiate “relational authenticity” in resource-constrained environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(2), 702–734. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12688>
34. Reyes V. (2020). Ethnographic toolkit: strategic positionality and researchers’ visible and invisible tools in field research. *Ethnography* 21, 220–240. 10.1177/1466138118805121 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
35. Ritter C. S. (2021). Rethinking digital ethnography: a qualitative approach to understanding interfaces. *Qual. Res.* 22, 916–932. 10.1177/14687941211000540 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
36. Small M. L., Calarco J. M. (2022). *Qualitative Literacy: A Guide to Evaluating Ethnographic and Interview Research*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 10.1525/9780520390676 [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
37. Smit, B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2018). Observations in Qualitative Inquiry: When What You See Is Not What You See. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918816766>
38. Springer. (n.d.). *Digital Ethnography* [Book Series]. Springer.
39. Underberg, Natalie M. and Zorn, Elayne (2013). *Digital Ethnography: Anthropology, Narrative, and New Media*, New York, USA: University of Texas Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.7560/744332>
40. Underberg-Goode, N.M. (2016). Digital Ethnography. In: Friese, H., Rebane, G., Nolden, M., Schreiter, M. (eds) *Handbuch Soziale Praktiken und Digitale Alltagswelten*. Springer Reference Sozialwissenschaften. Springer VS, Wiesbaden. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-08460-8\\_49-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-08460-8_49-1)
41. Valebia, J. (2022). Digital Ethnography in the Library: A Routledge FreeBook from the In The Library. MLIS candidate, UP School of Library and Information Studies. Series. [file:///C:/Users/Edgar/AppData/Local/Temp/MicrosoftEdgeDownloads/762b5d96-333a-45de-a7c8-aaf83e3a7a6d/37\\_PhJLIS2022issue01.pdf](file:///C:/Users/Edgar/AppData/Local/Temp/MicrosoftEdgeDownloads/762b5d96-333a-45de-a7c8-aaf83e3a7a6d/37_PhJLIS2022issue01.pdf)
42. Varis, P. (2016). Digital Ethnography. In Georgakopoulou, A. & T. Spilioti (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Digital Communication*. London: Routledge, 55-68.
43. Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S. et al. (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year

**Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.