

Resources for Flourishing Within Self-Image-Shaping Digital Environments

Alexandra Reill

ORCID: 0009-0000-2976-1186

kanonmedia. conceptual media developments

info@kanonmedia.com

September 2026

Abstract

In an age in which digital images increasingly mediate memory, self-understanding, social recognition, and everyday experience, the central question of this paper is not how accurately an image represents a person, but what conditions enable a person to flourish within an image-saturated environment. This conceptual paper examines flourishing in light of positions from cognition theory, creativity and happiness research, and algorithmic agency. Its central argument is that flourishing provides a productive organizing concept for understanding self-image because flourishing is multidimensional, relational, embodied, culturally situated, and open-ended. Drawing on 4E cognition, interdisciplinary research, relations between digital archives and algorithmic memory, the paper develops an Image–Experience–Algorithm model. The image level concerns forms of self-representation; the experience level concerns embodied, affective, cognitive, social, and existential responses; and the algorithmic level concerns systems that select, organize, preserve, transform, or generate representations. The model is used to argue that digital technologies may support flourishing when they expand agency, reflection, connection, creativity, and meaningful participation, but may constrain flourishing when they narrow self-understanding, intensify comparison, externalize authority over memory, or privilege standardized accounts of the good life. The paper offers a conceptual framework for interdisciplinary research capable of bringing psychology, neuroscience, cultural inquiry, and technology studies into dialogue. Its principal contribution is to reposition self-image research within a broader science and practice of flourishing, in which the important question is not whether the self can or shall be represented, but whether representational practices help people and communities develop lives characterized by meaning, purpose, relationships, agency, health, creativity, and the possibility of becoming otherwise.

Keywords: flourishing, self-image, interdisciplinary research, 4E cognition, digital memory, algorithmic narration, well-being

Introduction

Flourishing is the central theme of this paper. Digital images matter here not because they provide a representation of the self, but because they increasingly participate in the environments within which people attempt to live meaningful and worthwhile lives. Images can support memory, belonging, creativity, recognition, and communication. They can also become sources of comparison, self-surveillance, dissatisfaction, exclusion, or externally imposed standards. The relevant scientific question is therefore not only what an image does to self-perception, but also how image-mediated environments contribute to or constrain flourishing.

This interdisciplinary research paper provides the conceptual basis for this approach. It treats flourishing as multidimensional and context-sensitive. It also emphasizes the limitations of universal measurement and the importance of cultural and situated perspectives. These premises make flourishing particularly useful for examining digital self-image: the meaning of a representation depends on the person, the relationships and practices surrounding it, the cultural context in which it is interpreted, and the technological systems through which it circulates.

Contemporary well-being scholarship has increasingly moved beyond narrow conceptions of happiness toward broader accounts of flourishing. Ryff (1989) distinguished psychological well-being from a simple hedonic model of happiness, while Keyes (2002) conceptualized mental health as a continuum extending from languishing to flourishing. Seligman (2011) further developed a multidimensional account of flourishing, and subsequent scholarship has emphasized relationships, purpose, meaning, health, social circumstances, and other dimensions of a good life. The Global Flourishing Study represents an important

contemporary attempt to examine flourishing across geographically and culturally diverse populations, while also illustrating the methodological challenge of studying a construct that is both broad and context-sensitive (VanderWeele et al., 2025).

The present paper asks how this flourishing framework changes the way we think about self-image. Instead of treating self-image as an isolated psychological variable, it is considered part of an ecology of cognition and action. A person's image of themselves is influenced by bodily experience, memory, affect, social recognition, cultural expectations, material environments, and digital infrastructures. In this sense, the self-image is not merely something a person has; it is something continually enacted, interpreted, revised, and situated.

The paper is conceptual rather than empirical. It does not claim new experimental findings. Its contribution is to synthesize arguments from different disciplines and organize them around flourishing as the principal outcome and interpretive horizon. The paper first establishes a conceptual and methodological position, then considers embodied cognition and self-image, interdisciplinary research as a flourishing-fostering practice, neuroscience and the biology of flourishing, digital memory and algorithmic narration, cultural situatedness, spirituality and meaning, and finally a multi-disciplinary research model. Each section begins from the premise that the value of studying self-image lies in understanding its relationship to the possibility of flourishing.

Conceptual and Methodological Position

Flourishing requires a methodological approach capable of holding together dimensions that are often separated in research. The author argues that cognition, well-being, creativity, and spirituality cannot be adequately understood through a single disciplinary lens. This paper follows that premise. It treats flourishing as a multidimensional construct and self-image as a

situated phenomenon that may be examined through psychological, neuroscientific, phenomenological, cultural, technological, and other perspectives.

A central methodological principle is that the present paper should not collapse flourishing into measurement. Diener et al. (2010), Huppert and So (2013), Hone et al. (2014), and Węziak-Białowska et al. (2021) demonstrate the value of psychometric approaches, while Willen (2022) emphasizes why critical and qualitative perspectives remain necessary. Measurement can make dimensions of flourishing visible and comparable, but the breadth of the construct also creates a risk of reducing lived complexity to indicators. The same methodological caution applies to self-image. A scale measuring self-evaluation, an image-rating task, or a physiological response may provide useful evidence, but none should be treated as equivalent to the person's flourishing life.

The methodological position adopted here is therefore integrative but non-reductive. Quantitative methods are valuable for identifying patterns; qualitative methods are valuable for understanding meanings; interdisciplinary research can open forms of inquiry that remain difficult to conceptualize; and neuroscientific approaches can investigate biological correlates and mechanisms. The purpose of interdisciplinarity is not to produce one master explanation but to allow different forms of evidence to illuminate different dimensions of the same phenomenon.

This approach is consistent with the idea of boundary objects developed by Star and Griesemer (1989). Flourishing can function as such a boundary object because it can be meaningful within psychology, medicine, neuroscience, philosophy, cultural studies, happiness and creativity research, and technology analysis and development without requiring these fields to become methodologically identical. Self-image can be examined within the same

interdisciplinary space, but flourishing remains the broader question that gives the inquiry social and human significance.

Flourishing and the Embodied Self-Image

Flourishing begins from lived experience rather than from representation. The discussion of 4E cognition—embodied, embedded, extended, and enacted cognition—offers a strong theoretical basis for understanding why self-image should be approached as part of a flourishing ecology. Cognition is not confined to an isolated brain; it is shaped through bodily processes, environmental relations, external supports, and active engagement with the world. This perspective shifts attention from the question of whether a self-image is accurate to the question of what forms of experience and action it enables.

Embodied cognition is particularly relevant because self-image is connected to how a person inhabits their body and environment. A photograph, mirror, video recording, avatar, or digitally modified representation may prompt recognition, curiosity, discomfort, pleasure, memory, or renewed attention to bodily experience. These responses are not purely visual judgments. They are part of a broader process through which humans interpret themselves in relation to their histories, relationships, aspirations, and social surroundings.

The extended dimension of cognition is equally important. Digital self-representation illustrates how memory can rely on external material structures. An image archive, a database, a social media platform, an AI thread can become an external support for autobiographical memory, allowing a person to revisit earlier periods of life and construct continuity across time. This can support flourishing when it enables communication, connection, meaning-making, or reflective understanding. (Interactive and deep learning) registers can also complicate flourishing

when they become a source of repetitive self-comparison or when the platform's selection of memories becomes more authoritative than the person's own interpretation.

The enactive dimension further emphasizes agency. Cognition develops through action and interaction. A person does not merely see images of themselves; they create, select, edit, share, delete, interpret, and respond to them. These practices may become part of identity formation. Flourishing therefore depends partly on whether people experience themselves as agents within image-mediated environments rather than merely as objects of representation.

From this perspective, self-image should be treated as a possible resource of flourishing rather than as a fixed indicator of flourishing. It can support self-knowledge, (creative) expression, memory, and social connection. But its contribution depends on context and use. Flourishing-oriented research must therefore examine not only what people think about their appearance or representation, but also what their image practices make possible in the wider conduct of life.

Interdisciplinary Research and Creativity as a Resource for Flourishing

Flourishing is also a question of how humans encounter possibilities that exceed established categories. The present paper gives interdisciplinary research a distinctive epistemological role because such practice can expose forms of knowing that are difficult to express propositionally; and some disciplines can remain close to pre-reflective experience. Borgdorff (2026), for example, links artistic research with 4E cognition and proposes that artistic research can function as an empirical laboratory for investigating cognition beyond purely conceptual forms. This is highly relevant to flourishing because a flourishing life involves not only knowing facts but also developing ways of sensing, imagining, relating, creating, and acting. Similar approaches can be found in contemporary spirituality research, psychology, and the cognitive sciences.

Polanyi's (1966) concept of tacit knowledge is important here. People may know more than they are explicitly aware of. In relation to self-image, a person may experience a representation as familiar, alien, comforting, or unsettling without immediately possessing a conceptual explanation. Various approaches, such as creative practice, can give shape to such a pre-reflective experience. Through drawing, painting, photography, performance, installation, movement, sound, or digital transformation, a person can explore dimensions of self-experience that conventional verbal questioning may not capture.

This matters for flourishing because creative activity can function as a mode of reflection and possibility. In art history, it is evident that art has often functioned as a producer of futures and as a practice capable of keeping open what has not yet been determined. A self-presentation does not have to reproduce the existing self. It can explore possible selves, alternative narratives, memories, aspirations, and relationships. Creative self-representation can thus become a practice of becoming rather than a search for a definitive image.

An important implication follows for research methodology. Interdisciplinary methods should not be treated merely as decorative additions to conventional research. They can generate data about experience, produce new questions, and reveal tensions between traditional disciplines and lived reality. One scientific value of interdisciplinary research lies in the examination of the meanings, emotions, actions, and possibilities that emerge during the process.

The bricolage method, as currently applied in business development, serves as another example in this context. Apart from fostering unforeseeable new business ideas and management development, bricolage can contribute to flourishing in two interconnected ways. First, it can provide a means of exploring experiences that exceed conventional conceptualization. Second, it can challenge the assumption that identity must be stabilized in order to be scientifically

intelligible. If flourishing includes growth, purpose, creativity, and openness to future possibilities, then an unfinished self-image may be more informative than a supposedly definitive one.

Neuroscience and Biology

Flourishing has biological as well as psychological and social dimensions. Happiness is connected with biological processes. Ryff et al. (2004) argued for a positive-health framework connecting well-being with biology, while Heller et al. (2013) reported associations between sustained striatal activity and eudaimonic well-being. Ryff et al. (2016) further connected purposeful engagement and healthy aging with brain processes. These studies demonstrate that flourishing can be investigated biologically without reducing flourishing to biology.

This distinction is crucial for self-image research. Neuroscience may help explain processes involved in self-referential thought, affect, memory, motivation, reward, and bodily representation, but no neural measure should be interpreted as a complete representation of a person's flourishing. A biological correlate is evidence about one level of organization. Flourishing itself remains a multidimensional construct involving subjective experience, relationships, purpose, agency, material conditions, and broader social context.

A neuroscience oriented towards human flourishing would therefore investigate how representations interact with broader processes of well-being. Research might examine whether different forms of self-representation are associated with changes in affect, attention, (autobiographical) memory, stress regulation, or motivation. Such research should also consider longitudinal and contextual questions. An image may have one effect in isolation and another when repeatedly encountered within a social or technological environment.

The 4E framework provides an important safeguard against reductionism. If cognition is embodied, embedded, extended, and enacted, then neural processes are part of a larger dynamic system. Neuroscience can illuminate mechanisms within that system, but it cannot by itself determine whether a particular self-image practice contributes to a good life. That judgment requires dialogue with psychology, qualitative research, cultural analysis, ethics, and so forth, as well as the person's own account of what matters.

The contribution of neuroscience to this field is therefore strongest when it is treated as complementary. It can help identify mechanisms and correlates while other disciplines address meaning, values, social context, and lived experience. This pluralistic approach is consistent with the broader flourishing literature, which increasingly recognizes the need to connect different levels of explanation rather than selecting one as universally sufficient.

Digital Memory and Algorithmic Narration

Flourishing unfolds through time, and memory is one of the principal ways humans connect past experience with present purpose and future possibility. Engaging with archives, datasets, and algorithmic memory is therefore of direct relevance to flourishing. Digital systems increasingly mediate which images and experiences remain available for recollection, how they are ordered, and which moments are repeatedly returned to attention. Algorithmic calculations operating independently of human curators generate futurity directly. In the here and now, dynamic-interactive systems influence the material a person uses to interpret—and subsequently shape—their own history, presence, and future.

The concept of algorithmic narration is useful for describing this process. Narration does not require a conscious storyteller. Selection, ordering, repetition, recommendation, and omission do create narrative structures. When a digital system repeatedly presents particular

images as important memories, it participates in the conditions under which autobiographical continuity is constructed. Today's systems do not possess an identity of their own; nevertheless, through their memory and autonomous learning processes, their structures are autobiographical.

This has both flourishing-promoting and flourishing-constraining possibilities. Digital memory can preserve relationships, accomplishments, places, creative work, and meaningful transitions. It can foster ethically oriented questioning, reflection, human learning, and connectedness. At the same time, persistent archives can repeatedly reactivate painful experiences or encourage a person to compare their present life with selectively preserved versions of the past. The problem is not the existence of memory technology but the assumption that technological availability is equivalent to meaningful remembrance.

Algorithmic selection also introduces questions of agency. A person may understand a life event as significant even when an automated system does not. Conversely, a system may repeatedly elevate images because they are frequent, visually distinctive, or computationally salient rather than because they express what the person considers meaningful. Research oriented towards human flourishing should therefore examine the connection between algorithmic relevance and human significance, rather than—in the interest of optimizing operator objectives—merely subjecting both individuals and communities to statistical analysis.

The attention to non-human agency and algorithmic memory extends this problem further. Algorithms can participate in the production of cultural futures by organizing archives and datasets and by influencing what becomes visible. This certainly is one of the challenges in the further development of corresponding algorithms and technologies. The flourishing question is consequently not only psychological, but definitely ethical and political: who has the power to organize the memory environment within which people construct their lives?

A flourishing-oriented digital culture would ideally increase reflective agency rather than replace it. Users should be able to interpret, contest, contextualize, reorganize, and refuse algorithmic narratives. The purpose of technology should not be to decide which version of a person's life matters, but to provide resources through which people can make meaningful use of their own histories.

Culture and Situated Knowledge

Flourishing cannot be separated from culture. One of the most important aspects in this context is the criticism of globalizing—and thus generalizing—assumptions in well-being research. Lomas (2022) traces the historical development of well-being scholarship and identifies the dominance of particular cultural traditions, while Willen (2022) calls for critical interdisciplinary attention to power, inequality, and culturally situated conceptions of health and the good life. The Global Flourishing Study responds to part of this challenge by examining flourishing across a large and geographically diverse population, while its scale also demonstrates how difficult it is to represent the full complexity of flourishing through standardized instruments (VanderWeele et al., 2025).

Self-image must be understood within the same cultural framework. The meaning of an image is never produced by visual properties alone. It is interpreted through social norms, histories, relationships, values, and expectations. What counts as an admirable, authentic, healthy, successful, or desirable self can vary substantially across communities. Digital systems, however, can reproduce particular norms at scale. This creates a risk that culturally specific assumptions become invisible precisely because they are embedded in widely used technologies.

Donna Haraway's (1988) concept of situated knowledges provides a useful methodological response. Knowledge is produced from particular positions rather than from an

imaginary view from nowhere. A flourishing-oriented study of self-image should therefore ask whose experiences are represented, whose interpretations are treated as authoritative, and which forms of flourishing are made visible or invisible by research instruments and digital systems.

This also has implications for participation. Users should not be reduced to sources of images or measurements. They should be able to interpret their own representations and explain what flourishing means in their contexts. Qualitative inquiry is especially valuable because it can reveal dimensions that standardized questions may overlook. At the same time, qualitative research should remain reflexive about its own situatedness rather than assuming that it automatically produces neutral knowledge.

Cultural plurality does not mean that comparative research is impossible. Rather, it means that comparison should be undertaken carefully and with attention to the meanings attached to concepts across contexts. Flourishing can provide a shared research question while allowing different communities to articulate what a worthwhile life consists of. In this sense, the aim is not to discover one universal image of flourishing but to understand the plurality of forms through which flourishing can be pursued.

Spirituality, Meaning, and Consciousness-Related Dimensions of Flourishing

The present paper places spirituality in the sense of creating meaning, purpose, reflection, and life review within the broader discussion of well-being. These dimensions are important because a flourishing life and one's self-image cannot be derived solely from outward appearance or digital visibility—factors that can indeed elicit the experience of recognition and acceptance, which is so fundamental to human beings, or potentially influence a person's reputation within their community or beyond.

A person may experience meaning and purpose that are largely absent from their public representations. This paper's discussion of spiritual health describes it in terms of dealing with everyday life in ways that support potential, meaning, purpose, and fulfillment. Such perspectives broaden flourishing beyond immediate positive affect. They also reinforce the importance of self-reflection. A self-image may prompt reflection on suffering, change, relationships, values, the meaning of life, and—not to be forgotten—one's own mortality; however, its true significance lies more in the process of interpretation than in a self-contained act of self-identification.

Spiritual and existential dimensions also help explain why the concept of flourishing cannot be reduced to optimization. If a flourishing life involves purpose, meaning, responsibility, relationship, or transcendence, then technological systems designed primarily around prediction and engagement may not capture what matters most.

This distinction is especially relevant when digital technologies become increasingly capable of generating personalized representations. A system may produce an aesthetically pleasing or socially effective image without addressing the existential question of whether the person feels that their life is meaningful. The flourishing framework therefore provides an open horizon that exceeds technological performance.

Studies on the influence of digital memory and future-shaping systems on human self-conception should therefore incorporate the individual's capacity for participation as a key factor—a capacity that affords the individual space to develop and articulate values and meanings that cannot be derived from standardized or normalized representations. This does not require researchers to adopt a particular spiritual worldview. It requires methodological openness to the

possibility that people understand flourishing through existential, spiritual, philosophical, or relational frameworks that are not captured by purely scientific or technological categories.

The Image–Experience–Algorithm Model of Flourishing

Flourishing is the organizing principle of the proposed Image–Experience–Algorithm model. The model is designed to prevent self-image research from becoming isolated from the wider conditions of human development. It distinguishes three analytically different but recursively connected levels.

At the image level, research examines forms of self-representation, including photographs, videos, avatars, creative works, personal archives, and other digital or material representations. The key flourishing question is what these representations make possible: reflection, creativity, connection, recognition, comparison, aspiration, or constraint.

At the experience level, research examines how people encounter representations through embodied, affective, cognitive, social, and existential processes. This includes recognition, estrangement, memory, emotional response, self-evaluation, agency, meaning, and purpose. Here, qualitative research methods are particularly important because the same representation may have different meanings for different people.

At the algorithmic level, research examines systems that capture, classify, select, rank, archive, recommend, transform, or generate representations. The relevant questions include transparency, agency, cultural assumptions, power, governance, and the relationship between computational relevance and human significance.

The three levels are recursive. Algorithms can alter images; altered images can influence experience; repeated experiences can shape futurity; and new representations can become material for subsequent algorithmic processing. Flourishing can therefore be supported or

constrained across the entire cycle. The model does not claim that technology determines flourishing. Rather, it identifies technological mediation as one component of the conditions within which flourishing is pursued.

A mixed-methods and interdisciplinary research could operationalize the model without reducing it to a single measure. Experimental studies could compare responses to different forms of self-representation and explore forms of self-representation that deliberately resist standardized categories. Longitudinal research could examine how repeated digital memory practices relate to well-being trajectories. Neuroscientific or physiological measures could provide complementary evidence about mechanisms. Cultural research could examine how meanings vary across communities.

The model also supports participatory research. Participants should have opportunities to annotate, contextualize, reinterpret, and contest their representations. Such participation is not merely an ethical addition; it is epistemically relevant because flourishing includes agency. A research design that removes interpretive agency may inadvertently reproduce the very reductionism it seeks to study.

The Ethics of Collection, Archiving, and Evaluation

Flourishing gives ethical direction to the study of self-image. Research should not merely ask whether representations are accurate or technologically sophisticated; it should ask whether the practices surrounding representation respect dignity, agency, relationships, personal development, and the possibility of a good life.

The same principle applies to algorithmic systems. A classification or generated representation should be treated as provisional rather than authoritative. Systems that make consequential judgments about people without meaningful possibilities for interpretation or

contestation can undermine agency. From a flourishing perspective, the ability to participate in the construction of one's representation is itself part of what matters.

Ethical evaluation should also include questions of unequal exposure and power. Some people and communities may experience digital representation as a resource, while others may experience it as surveillance, exclusion, stereotyping, or pressure to conform. A flourishing-oriented framework therefore cannot evaluate memory and dynamic-interactive technologies only at the individual level. It must also examine institutions, infrastructures, and social conditions.

Finally, the ethical aim should not be to eliminate ambiguity. A person is not obliged—nor is it within their power—to remain forever who they are. The right to remain (partly) uncaptured can be understood as compatible with flourishing because identity includes the capacity to change, reinterpret the past, and imagine alternative futures.

Flourishing as an Open-Ended Research Horizon

Flourishing is the point at which the paper's different strands converge. The self-image matters because it is embedded in a life that may or may not be flourishing. Interdisciplinary research matters because it can open possibilities for reflection and becoming. Neuroscience matters because flourishing has biological dimensions. Digital memory matters because flourishing unfolds through time and technologies increasingly mediate remembrance. Cultural inquiry matters because no account of flourishing can be detached from situated meanings and power.

The conceptual synthesis also reveals a tension between measurement and openness. Flourishing research needs measures because measurement can support comparison, evaluation, and policy. Yet the breadth of flourishing means that measures remain partial. Willen (2022) emphasizes the importance of critical dialogue precisely because standardized accounts can

obscure structural and cultural differences. The implication for self-image research is that computationally tractable features should not automatically become the definition of the phenomenon.

The same tension appears in interdisciplinary research. Such practice can generate forms of knowledge that resist complete conceptualization. This does not make interdisciplinary inquiry unscientific; rather, it requires researchers to clarify what kind of evidence is provided in the course of the processes involved and how that evidence relates to other forms of inquiry.

The paper's central proposition is therefore deliberately modest: flourishing should be used as a higher-order framework within which self-image research is conducted. This does not mean that every image practice must increase flourishing or that flourishing can be inferred from self-representation. It means that researchers should examine the wider consequences of image practices for meaning, agency, relationships, health, purpose, creativity, and participation.

Some limitations should be acknowledged. First, this paper is a conceptual synthesis. The author brings together diverse approaches, some of which are exploratory or critical rather than empirical. Second, the proposed model requires testing. Third, the model requires cultural adaptation and should not be assumed to have identical meaning across populations.

These limitations are not merely weaknesses. They identify a research agenda. Futurity research should examine both beneficial and harmful trajectories rather than beginning from the assumption that digital technologies are either inherently liberating or inherently damaging. A mature science of flourishing in digital environments will need to integrate various elements: longitudinal data and cross-cultural comparative studies; in-depth qualitative analyses; the further development of research into happiness, creativity, and spirituality; the broader inclusion of other relevant scientific disciplines; and the critical analysis and further development of

technological systems with a view to fostering flourishing. It will also need to remain open to concepts and forms of evidence that are not yet fully established.

Conclusion

The identification of resources for flourishing within self-image-shaping digital environments is the central lens of this paper. The question is not simply what an image says about a person. The deeper question is what kinds of lives emerge or can become possible when humans increasingly encounter themselves and others through images, memory and dynamic-interactive archives, deep learning algorithms, and technologically mediated representations.

The present paper supports a multidimensional answer. Flourishing is not a single emotional state or a perfectly measurable endpoint. It involves psychological, relational, physical, social, volitional, material, and existential dimensions. It is also culturally situated and shaped by conditions of power. The Global Flourishing Study illustrates both the value and the difficulty of investigating such a broad construct across diverse populations (VanderWeele et al., 2025), while critical scholarship reminds us that measurement must remain open to qualitative and culturally specific understandings (Willen, 2022).

Within this framework, self-image becomes a resource and site of negotiation rather than a final representation of identity. Neuroscience can investigate biological correlates of flourishing while remaining one level within a larger ecology of experience. The 4E perspective shows that self-understanding is embodied, embedded, extended, and enacted. Experimental and interdisciplinary research integrating contemporary perspectives from creativity, happiness, and spirituality studies suggests that important dimensions of human experience may remain pre-reflective, embodied, or otherwise difficult to capture through factual analysis and conceptual reflection alone.

If flourishing can be (partly) experienced before it is conceptually represented, then environments increasingly organized around representations and deep-learning archives do not merely change what individuals think about themselves. They also change the conditions under which experience is retained, retrieved, interpreted, and brought into reflection and self-understanding.

The proposed Image–Experience–Algorithm model offers a way to organize these relationships. Its purpose is not to produce a single theory that replaces existing disciplines, but to create a shared framework for examining how representations interact with experience and technological mediation. The model places flourishing at the center because the ultimate significance of self-image is not the representational function. It is whether representation practices contribute to lives characterized by meaning, purpose, connection, agency, health, creativity, and the possibility of growth.

The ethical implication is equally important. Human beings should not be reduced to what can be represented, measured, predicted, or generated. A flourishing-oriented approach preserves the person's capacity to interpret their own experience, contest external representations, and become otherwise. The most productive research question is therefore not which image is the definitive self, but how practices of representation participate in the conditions of flourishing.

In this sense, the paper title *Resources for Flourishing Within Self-Image-Shaping Digital Environments* names both a research question and a methodological commitment. Imagery and other representations, memories, and (dynamic-interactive) technologies can all become resources of flourishing. Their value depends on how they are integrated into lived worlds. The task of interdisciplinary research is consequently not to capture persons in their self-images once

and for all, but to understand and cultivate the conditions under which persons and communities can flourish.

References

- Borgdorff, H. (2026). Artistic research and the lingering gaze of thought. *Journal for Artistic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.22501/jarnet.0095>
- Diener, E. et al. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143–156.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
- Heller, A. S. et al. (2013). Sustained striatal activity predicts eudaimonic well-being and cortisol output. *Psychological Science*, 24(11), 2191–2200.
- Hone, L., Jarden, A., & Schofield, G. (2014). Psychometric properties of the flourishing scale in a New Zealand sample. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(2), 1031–1045.
- Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. C. (2013). Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 110, 837–861.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(2), 207–222.
- Lomas, T. (2022). Making waves in the great ocean: A historical perspective on the emergence and evolution of wellbeing scholarship. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 17, 257–270.
- Lomas, T., Pawelski, J. O., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2023). A flexible map of flourishing: The dynamics and drivers of flourishing, well-being, health, and happiness. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v13i4.3665>

- Lomas, T., Pawelski, J. O., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2024). Flourishing as “sustainable well-being”: Balance and harmony within and across people, ecosystems, and time. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 20, 203–218.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Doubleday.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081.
- Ryff, C. D. et al. (2016). Purposeful engagement, healthy aging, and the brain. *Current Behavioral Neuroscience Reports*, 3(4), 318–327.
- Ryff, C. D., Singer, B. H., & Dienberg Love, G. (2004). Positive health: Connecting well-being with biology. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 359(1449), 1383–1394.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, “translations,” and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420.
- Timmermans, S. (2015). Introduction: Working with Leigh Star. In G. C. Bowker, S. Timmermans, A. E. Clarke, & E. Balka (Eds.), *Boundary objects and beyond*. MIT Press.
- VanderWeele, T. J. (2017). On the promotion of human flourishing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(31), 8148–8156.
- VanderWeele, T. J. et. al. (2020). Positive epidemiology? *Epidemiology*, 31(2), 189–193.

- VanderWeele, T. J. et. al. (2025). The Global Flourishing Study: Study profile and initial results on flourishing. *Nature Mental Health*, 3(6), 636–653. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44220-025-00423-5>
- Węziak-Białowolska et. al. (2021). Psychometric properties of flourishing scales from a comprehensive well-being assessment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 652209.
- Willen, S. S. (2022). Flourishing and health in critical perspective: An invitation to interdisciplinary dialogue. *SSM–Mental Health*, 2, 100045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmmh.2021.100045>