Scientific Journal "Newsletter on the results of scholarly work in sociology, criminology, philosophy and political science" | www.sci-result.de
ISSN (Print) 2699-9382 | ISSN (Online) 2699-9005
Volume 4, Issue 2, 102-113, Published: September 17, 2023
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61439/SHND1344

The Identity of the Modern Human as a Problem Of Social and Humanitarian Knowledge

Dr. Vadym Palahuta
National University of Technology
Email: palaguta@ua.fm
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4254-1625

Abstract

The article examines the problem of subjectivity and identity formation, the specifics of individual and collective identity research. It is noted that the study of subjectivity, "I" (self), which is the source of the formation of individual identity, actualizes the study of this problem in many social and humanitarian sciences. It has been established that in a broad interdisciplinary context, it is a search for an effective methodological toolkit for determining the dynamic matrix of subjectivity, which is constantly changing in the modern globalized society. In the context of the study of the phenomenon of subjectivity and identity, the socio-psychological theory — the theory of traits, the theory of roles and the humanistic theory — is briefly considered. It was found that all these theories cannot adequately investigate the subject's identity, the possibility of using E. Erikson's identity theory and the direction of social constructionism, where human subjectivity is constructed here and now in relations with other people using speech practices of discourse, was analyzed. It was determined that the discourse in the understanding of social constructionists is a kind of material basis of the practices of social construction of reality, thanks to which the "I"-construction of subjectivity is constructed.

Keywords

subject, subjectivity, identity, "I" (self), (self) identification, "self"-construction, discourse, discursive practices

Introduction

This article delves into the intricate terrain of understanding the human condition within the contemporary globalized world, aiming to assess the potential for substantial anthropological

shifts and transformations. This topic is undeniably complex and interdisciplinary in nature (Cover, 2016; Delaney, 2016; Grimalda et al., 2018; Oliver et al., 2022; Von Sivers et al., 2014). The focal point of interest lies in exploring the modern dimensions of the concept of "subjectivity" as a determinant of human identity in the realm of social and humanistic inquiries, particularly within the sphere of philosophical exploration. Given a wide range of modern human science topics, this issue is relevant for discussion (Cover, 2021; see also Ashforth & Schinoff, 2016; Rašković, 2020; Thulien et al., 2019; Udall et al., 2020).

In the backdrop of modern society, characterized by a culture of excessive consumption, a profusion of artificial subjectivities has flourished, often detached, either partially or entirely, from their biological underpinnings. This encompasses an array of diverse individuals marked by distinct sexual identities, including artificially constructed identities such as male and female homosexuals, BDSM practitioners, transvestites, transsexuals, bisexuals, and anti-sexuals, among others. The proliferation of these identities is marked by the rallying cry to "be oneself," to unearth one's identity, and to seek moments of personal happiness. This transformation has been facilitated by the infusion of neoliberal identity politics into Western society, a phenomenon that gained momentum in the 1970s and 1980s and has since permeated various levels of state and societal existence in the capitalist realm (MacLeavy, 2020; see also Abildgaard & Jørgensen, 2021; Apostolopoulou et al., 2021; Moralès et al., 2014; Sikka, 2015). The ideology of neoliberalism today is given a lot of attention by various scholars and experts (Bettache et al., 2020; Eskin & Baydar, 2022; Grossi & Pianezzi, 2017; Saltman, 2023; Sweet, 2018). This brand of identity politics is accompanied by persuasive discourse surrounding human rights, personal freedom—encompassing self-determination, self-expression, and autonomous existence—yet, simultaneously, it erodes traditional family models and deeply ingrained ways of life. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that scholarly investigations into post- and transhumanism theories, queer theory, and projections concerning the future human condition as a precursor to the emergence of a novel anthropological type have proliferated (Ferrando, 2019).

Analysis of Recent Research

This unfolding scenario has captured the attention of notable contemporary philosophers, among them A. Badiou, S. Žižek, G. Agamben (2021), and others, who find themselves deeply concerned. During the closing chapters of the 20th century, the prescient Italian philosopher foresaw the ascendancy of an enigmatic anthropological archetype, Homo Sacer, in our contemporary society — a prediction that continues to manifest today (Agamben, 2021). Echoing this sentiment, the distinguished Swiss-German philosopher P. Bieri (2017) embarks on an exploration of the multifaceted nature of human dignity as a defining trait of subjectivity. He points out that we must contemplate the essence of being a subject. What attributes lend us the sense of being subjects — distinct from objects, things, or mere bodies? This query delves into the characteristics that Bieri postulates constitute the bedrock of "inner identity" (Bieri, 2017).

Moreover, it's worth noting that the intensified scrutiny of the state of subjective identity, coupled with its practical assimilation into quasi-collective forms of identity meticulously imposed by structures of power, has incited the attention of other distinguished luminaries within the humanities, transcending geographical bounds. Take for instance the Italian philosopher Franco Berardi (2009), who observes the emergence of a novel human type over the past two decades — one relentlessly driven by the calculus of maximizing personal gain. Berardi (2009) contends that we find ourselves confronting a perilous mutation, inflicting irrevocable harm upon life, culture, and social cohesion. In a parallel vein, the recent work of prominent American sociologist and psychologist S. Zuboff (2019) accentuates apprehension regarding the present state of subjectivity formation, witnessing an alarming slide into rudimentary forms of behaviorism. The author conducts an examination of A. Pentland's seminal work "Social Physics," wherein a notable connection is drawn to his predecessor, the renowned B. Skinner. Pentland advocates a form of subjectivity that erases autonomy, the inner essence, the homunculus, and the very spirit

that traditionally animates an individual — a spirit championed by literature upholding principles of freedom and dignity. However, the contemporary landscape presents a stark contrast, as we now find ourselves living "under the dominion of the social environment" (Zuboff, 2019).

The contemporary state of Western society, and its influence upon the recalibration of subjectivity, finds detailed exploration in the oeuvre of the German philosopher of Korean heritage, Byung-Chul Han (2015), notably in his succinct yet profoundly insightful work "The Burnout Society." Similarly, the Argentine philosopher and writer Jorge Alemán (2023) offers a critical analysis of neoliberal ideology from the vantage of contemporary psychoanalysis in his work "Lacan and Capitalist Discourse: Neoliberalism and Ideology," uncovering how this ideology molds a novel breed of modern individuals and their artificial identities. This research theme is also embraced by the renowned contemporary Brazilian researcher Maria Rita Kehl (2018) in her work "Time and the Dog: Society and Depression," along with numerous researchers from various fields of socio-humanistic knowledge, spanning diverse directions of social and humanitarian cognition.

Methods

The examination of the (self-)identification process, viewed from the perspective of the "I" (self), has become a focal point in contemporary social and human sciences. This issue has gained interdisciplinary significance (Albarello et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2023; Knight & Saxby, 2014; Wang & Tucker, 2021; Woźniak, 2018). Employing an effective methodological toolkit is essential to elucidate various aspects of this complex problem and advance further research (Gill, 2020; Widdicombe & Da Silva Marinho, 2021). One of the primary factors influencing the identity of a social subject is the diverse speech or discursive practices employed by the subject, shaping their discursive identity. The research methodology, aligning with the exploration of discursive identity, is inherently complex. It amalgamates constructivism as a general method for constructing constructs, social constructionism for the subject's construction of social reality and their own "I" within discursive practices. This methodology relies on the constant utilization of methods such as comparative, phenomenological, interpretative, and lexical-linguistic methods in constructing lexical expressions of one's own "I" (self).

Purpose. The study aims to develop an optimal strategy for researching the interdisciplinary socio-humanitarian problem of identity. Specifically, the focus is on formulating a concept that explores the mechanism and primary factors influencing the formation of subjective identity. This represents the overarching goal of the study.

Results. Upon examining the problem, it was discerned that the foundation of discursive identity construction lies in the continual subjectivation of an individual across various discursive practices. These practices are delineated into distinct statements made by the subject within the realm of their speech. The study unveiled the antinomian nature of discursive practices in shaping identity. Consequently, a balanced concept of identity rooted in the subject's "I" (self) was constructed, drawing from social constructionism, M. Foucault's discourse theory and microphysics of power, Ten van Dijk's discourse of power, and P. Ricoeur's dual identity concept (Foucault, 2002, 1990; Ricoeur, 1996, Van Dijk, 2008). Simultaneously, identified were problematic aspects necessitating further interdisciplinary socio-humanitarian research into the broader realm of collective identity. This expansion aims to delve into the foundational aspect of the subject's identity at large.

Therefore, a crucial avenue for further exploration in understanding the problem of the subject's identity within the discursive space inherent in each socio-humanitarian perspective involves delving into the mechanism of transitioning from the "I" (self) and the internal sociality of the subject to the mastery and appropriation of its position in the external social space. Conversely, the study would also encompass the movement from the position in external social reality to the processes of interiorization, enculturation, and socialization. These processes collectively determine the intricate processes of (self-)identification for the subject. The reciprocal

processes of subjectivization in both directions contribute significantly to the construction of the subject's discursive identity.

Discussion

The exploration of subjectivity, centered around the concept of the "I" (self), which serves as the wellspring of individual identity development, brings to the forefront a significant research focus within numerous fields within the social sciences and humanities. By skillfully selecting and applying an appropriate conceptual framework (a task often intricate in interdisciplinary studies), coupled with delving into the intricate facets of identity and meticulously tracing the impact of various social factors and circumstances on the individual, this avenue of inquiry emerges as a notably auspicious area of investigation. Within the broader context of interdisciplinary scholarship, there exists a quest for effective methodological instruments capable of delineating the dynamic matrix of subjectivity — an entity in constant flux within the modern, globalized society.

Consequently, across the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (with certain existentialist and postmodernist perspectives forming exceptions), the prevailing approach to shaping subjectivity has been through sociocultural means. In essence, society molds the contours of individual subjectivity, defining the scope of the subject's identity. This leads to an intriguing inquiry: to what extent can individuals achieve freedom and autonomy within contemporary society, consciously crafting their genuine "self"- a debatable notion in today's interconnected world-and gradually self-actualizing without infringing upon established social, legal, and particularly ethical norms?

As an illustrative case, consider the domain of social psychology. Throughout much of the twentieth century, three distinct paradigms regarding the "I" (self) as the bedrock of subjectivity took precedence:

1. The trait theory. Advanced by H. Eysenck (1947) and R. Cattell (1950).
2. The role theory. J. Herbert Mead (1934), C. Cooley (1902), L. Festinger (1957), and E. Goffman (1956).
3. The humanistic theory. Espoused by F. Perls (1969), A. Maslow (1954), and C. Rogers (1961).

Each of these psychological theories of the "self" asserted its exclusive relevance, whether rooted in profound phenomenological insights into human nature (humanistic theory), supported by robust psychometric research (trait theory), or constructed as a highly rational analytical framework within the social sciences (role theory). Regardless of the specific approach — whether driven by phenomenological introspection or meticulous collection and analysis of extensive empirical data — all these theories share a common theoretical stance, aiming for a systematic, incremental exploration and accrual of new, cumulative knowledge about humanity and its inner "I". The ultimate objective is to unravel the authentic nature of the "I," the subject, irrespective of the method employed. These theories continue to wield significant influence across the psychological scientific community, higher education, and beyond. Psychometric tests and questionnaires derived from these theories remain widely employed tools for investigating human psychology in various domains, including social, communication, and other branches of psychology.

Hence, a pertinent inquiry emerges: Do these theories align with the trajectory of modern society's evolution, which undoubtedly triggers substantial shifts in subjectivity, along with a transformation in the methodologies of comprehending humanity across the broader spectrum of social sciences and humanities? If we presuppose the ascendancy of societal shaping of subjectivity and the subject's identity, does the individual retain the agency to autonomously impact and reshape their identity at certain junctures? Moreover, how do the aforementioned psychological theories address this query? In the realm of psychological traits theory, the subject is viewed as an amalgamation of personal traits that collectively contribute to an imagined, dispositional identity. However, how does this theory reconcile with the findings of psychoanalyst Erik Erikson (1974), who posits that individuals undergo identity crises at various life stages? Similarly, within the context of role theory, how can it be postulated that these roles represent genuine, divergent identities often at odds with each other, as opposed to mere social facades adopted to conform to societal norms?

Erik Erikson's research, as a foundational contributor to the concept of individual identity, is notably encapsulated in his renowned works "Identity: Youth and Crisis" and "Childhood and Society" (Erikson, 1950, 1974). These seminal works propose a perspective wherein human identity remains perpetually engaged in psychosexual, psychosocial, and psychohistorical development throughout an individual's lifespan, steadfastly oriented toward the future. Central to Erikson's theory is the notion of "development" within a personality, enabling the traversing of the various identity crises that individuals commonly encounter, particularly during adolescence. Addressing the question of how one perceives their own identity, Erikson (1974) posits that it surfaces as a subjective sense of inspiring integrity and uninterrupted continuity. Continuity, integrity, and development emerge as pivotal tenets in Erik Erikson's theory of individual identity. Therefore, when posed with the question of "what the condition of a person's well-being should entail, and how one experiences their identity upon recognizing the definite existence of it," Erikson (1974) answered that it presents itself as a subjective sensation of an inspiring integrity and an uninterrupted continuum (pp. 17-19). Continuity, integrity, and development stand as the principal tenets within Erik Erikson's theory of individual identity. Yet, a pertinent query emerges: Does this forward-looking theory concerning the shaping of the individual "self" and its identity adequately address the contemporary challenges we face?

Hence, it becomes imperative to illuminate an alternative approach to examining the issue of "self" formation, introduced in the 1980s by social constructivists, including K. Gergen, R. Harré, and J. Shotter. This avenue of inquiry gave rise to discursive psychology by J. Potter and M. Wetherell, narrative psychology by R. Sarbin, and the dialogical "self" theory by H. Hermans. Notably, this realm thrives on interdisciplinary collaboration. Apart from drawing from postmodernism and poststructuralism, advocates of social constructionism incorporate elements from narratology, hermeneutics, the philosophy of dialogue, the theory of speech acts, and literary studies. A distinguishing hallmark of this paradigm within social and humanistic cognition is the acknowledgment of discourse's primary role and interpersonal relationships in shaping the world and one's own sense of "self." This perspective entails moving beyond the quest for the essential nature of the "self" or identity, established norms of human attributes and behavior, and the absolutization of differentiating mental states and processes.

Put differently, individuals must consistently harness various discursive practices and narratives to proficiently articulate their sense of self ("I"), and engage in the process of self-experience. This entails employing a diverse range of means for self-expression, self-presentation, and the ability to present oneself to others, thus perpetuating a sustained level of subjective identity (Gergen, 1994).

As J. Potter and M. Wetherell (1987) emphasize, the "self" is verbalized within discourse in a manner that optimizes the grounds for one's voice to be acknowledged. Expounding further by drawing upon R. Harre's insights, they assert that the core objective of this transformative movement is to shift attention from the 'I' as a fixed entity to the mechanisms that construct the "self". In essence, the inquiry revolves not around the inherent nature of the self, but rather around how we discourse about the self. There is no single "self" awaiting recognition, but rather an array of 'I's' that manifest through diverse linguistic practices" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This underscores the continuous construction of "self"-constructs. Furthermore, discourse and its practices do not merely depict social reality; rather, they construct it afresh within each context.

In the lens of social constructionism, human subjectivity takes shape in the present moment through interactions with others, facilitated by language practices, discourse, and narrative. Distinct perceptions of the world are intricately tied to intra-group consensus within various communities (ethnic, professional, scientific, religious) regarding existence and value. Inadvertently, subjective identity emerges, often unconsciously, driven by social objectives. In the realm of social constructionism, the creation of diverse and fluid "self"-constructs is guided by a spectrum of rhetorical devices, including metaphors, analogies, allegories, personifications, and metonymies.

Yet, despite the dissolution of an intrinsic "self" within the "I," it becomes challenging to dismiss the profound symbolic facet of subjectivity. This feature surfaces not solely in discourse-based "self" construction but is profoundly shaped by a myriad of discursive forms of identity. Within these, the "self" might even dissolve entirely, becoming a mere façade or simulation. Summarizing the foregoing, discourse, as perceived by social constructionists, serves as a tangible foundation for the construction of reality. Its underlying motif aligns with the idea championed by the French philosopher J. Derrida, "Everything is a discourse." This notion has significantly influenced the development of these particular strands of American social and humanistic thought during the 1970s and 1980s.

Undoubtedly, social constructionism focuses on taking into account such a crucial component of discourse as the preconditions for the formation of subjectivity and identity and as its power characteristic, and the latter is completely set by the ideological guidelines of neoliberalism and is tightly controlled by modern power structures at all levels, from global to state and local.

By the way, the construction of one of the varieties of the "self" in the discourse simultaneously constructs a certain type of dependence, sometimes rigid and undeniable. This is the so-called power characteristic of discourse, and it is already fully within the presumption of power. Discourse as a special speech practice also has a kind of "internal" power over subjects due to the inherent human need for self-determination and self-naming as components of identity and, thus, marking one's place or position in the fields of social reality. The power characteristic of discourse or discursive practice a priori implies the continuous, sometimes hidden, at the level of the unconscious, imposition of domination, manipulation, and subordination to the social group or its nominal representative on the subjects of relations, which define the individual's identity.

A well-known representative of critical discourse analysis (CDA), Teun van Dijk (2009), in one of his works notes that to dominate today means to have not so much an apparatus of coercion as the ability to determine (describe, explain, predict, construct) the current situation in society, formulating criteria of objectivity, impartiality, authority, truthfulness, and veracity.

This viewpoint is indeed contentious due to its limited pertinence, primarily within a narrow circle of humanities scholars. Notably, these scholars are often entrenched in widely accepted conceptual norms. This perspective remains largely unacknowledged among ordinary citizens, who are guided to varying degrees by ideological notions throughout their daily lives. This stance bears resemblance to the notion of subjectification — an idea introduced by the French philosopher L. Althusser (2001) in the last century. According to Althusser's proposition, dominant ideologies (whether they are neoliberal, conservative, nationalist, communist, or of another orientation) and the state and public institutions implementing these ideologies wield a process of ideological interpellation to mold individuals into ideological subjects. This process imparts upon the individual a distinct sense of responsibility that reflects their collective identity, often eliciting feelings of guilt or shame (Althusser, 2001).

However, Althusser's concept of subjectification no longer comprehensively addresses the challenges posed by modernity and the consumer society, with its proliferation of notions concerning free choice and autonomy in various forms. In this landscape, the dictum "do whatever you want" has become a guiding principle. M. Foucault's concept of the microphysics of power holds greater relevance today. It profoundly extends our grasp of the inherently powerful nature of discourse. According to Foucault's viewpoint, individuals, invariably enmeshed within discursive practices, unknowingly succumb to invisible forms of coercion (Foucault, 2002). This coercion effectively imposes a specific identity upon them, contingent on the place or role they occupy, expressed as: The speaker's identity is less significant than their positional context (Foucault, 2002). Hence, discourse and its domains encompass an array of identification frameworks, dispersed in alignment with social standings within the discourse's realm. These matrices of identity are recognized by individuals through distinct markers of social positioning.

To affirm the importance of dispositivity as an outcome of the power characteristic of discourse, it is logical to perceive it as an ontological element of power. This perspective draws from the insights of M. Foucault, who famously interprets the Nietzschean notion of power. Accord-

ing to Nietzsche, authority, characterized as the will to power, is neither an entity possessed by anyone nor a manifestation of domination; rather, it primarily signifies the interrelation of force with force. Elaborating on Nietzsche's interpretation, J. Deleuze (1983) asserts that the essence of force lies in its relational nature — for the essence of force is that force relates to others; it is this force that acquires essence and quality.

Much like F. Nietzsche, M. Foucault (1990) conceives power as a subtle essence pervasive in all social relations, permeating "the very thickness and into all the pores" of society. M. Foucault (1990) identifies the origin of power, alongside subjectification and self-identification, in the confluence of mechanisms and focal points that shape the "microphysics of power" on the microsocial level of discursive practices. Consequently, M. Foucault's concepts of discipline, disciplinary society, and disciplinary spaces find relevance in discussions centered around contemporary forms of subjectivation, where the prominence of disciplinary spaces diminishes. "It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them" (Foucault, 1990, p. 90). Thus, subjectification, embodying the subject's reflection upon themselves through self-identification, entails that the subject's engagement with external forces that influence them gives rise to an internal self-relationship, shaping their identity. In this light, the subject emerges as the "effect" of external forces mirrored internally, representing the force's relation to itself. In essence, the subject aligns with the microphysics of power operating upon itself — power transmuted into an internal regulatory principle that underpins the subject's ontology through manifold dispositions within discourse and its practices. It can be contended that this portrayal of subjectivity within discourse resonates closely with the contemporary notion of collective identity.

Addressing the shift from the Cartesian individual subject's desubjectification, epitomized by the phrase "I think, therefore I am," to the contemporary discursive principle of collective subjectivity, encapsulated in "I exist because I make others talk about me," the eminent Armenian philosopher Karen Swassjan (2005) underscores: "The personal is always just an unfortunate fragment in the unanswered (like a corpse) vastness of the linguistic continuum." It can be considered a requiem for individual identity, as it no longer exists in its pure form. Renowned Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben (2002) highlighted this aspect in his work . Through a careful examination of the tragic experiences of Auschwitz prisoners and drawing on the research of French linguist E. Benveniste (1971), particularly in his collection of articles titled "Problems in general linguistics", Agamben arrived at the paradoxical conclusion that language and actual discourse are entirely detached from each other in reality. There is no transition or connection between them; a gap exists between language and discourse statements. However, to make language its own, the subject employs special signs known as shifters or deixis. These are indicative symbols lacking a signifier, denotation, or referent. Notable examples of these indicative symbols include adverbs like "here," "now," "there," and pronouns such as "that," "this," "you," "he," and most significantly, "I."

The subject can only appropriate the "I" in an utterance, in the moment of live speech. However, as highlighted by J. Agamben (2002), another paradox emerges: when the subject masters the formal apparatus of utterances, and there is seemingly no transition from language to discourse itself according to the first paradox, the use of "I," "you," "this," "that," "now," "here," and other indicative symbols in speech results in the subject being "deprived of any referential reality and can be defined only through pure and empty correlation with the given speech act." According to Agamben's study, the subject of an utterance becomes fully immersed in discourse, constituting entirely from it, yet paradoxically, unable to express anything within it, unable to speak. This leads to the realization that it is not the subject himself who speaks, but rather the discourse speaking through him. Consequently, the question arises: what kind of subjectivity and discursive identity can be discussed in this context?

In light of this standpoint, a specific issue comes to the forefront, warranting dedicated research attention—how do external societal and material factors and conditions translate into an

individual's inner realm, shaping the process of subjectification and identity formation? A notable point is that these processes of internalization, inculturation, and socialization, encompassing language structures, inherently unfold without the individual's conscious guidance or control. This echoes the observations of T. A. van Dijk (2008), previously mentioned, who emphasizes that we will not understand how social situations or social structures invade text and language unless we understand how people interpret and represent these social conditions within specific mental models - contextual models. The same is true for the 'effects' of discourse that influence people - effects that must be described in terms of mental representations (Van Dijk, 2008).

This complex predicament centers on deciphering the mechanisms that facilitate the conversion of external elements into internal processes, the implementation of the identification process, and the relevance of contemporary notions of identity. In our viewpoint, the theory of double structuring, advocated by sociologist P. Bourdieu and epitomized by his concept of habitus, appears inadequate in today's context. P. Bourdieu (1990) outlines habitus as an acquired system of ingrained patterns that enables the unrestricted generation of thoughts, perceptions, and actions within the confines inherent to the specific conditions that produced the habitus. This leads to a dialectical fusion of external and internal identification, allowing external influences to be actualized in accordance with the distinct logic of the organisms they become integrated into — sustainably, systematically, and devoid of mechanization (Bourdieu, 1990). According to the French sociologist, habitus is designed to furnish diverse responses to varied situations encountered by individuals, grounded in a constrained collection of existing a priori templates for action and thought. Thus, the internal mirrors the external and vice versa, resulting in complete transparency.

The habitus is not only reproduced in familiar situations but also demonstrates the ability for subjective innovation when confronted with unfamiliar situations. This adaptability arises from the habitus combining a variety of social experiences in a specific manner.

P. Corcuff (1999), a follower of the French sociologist, delved into this aspect of discursive identification. He identified, at the core of the subject's self-identification, not only a relatively constant identity represented by the "I" (self), addressing the question "what am I?" but also an identity that answers the question "who am I?"—a dynamic process of becoming or subjectivation. This framework suggests that the subject is continuously engaged in an endless process of identification within the context of their life.

However, these theories both extend the domain of subjectivity research and complicate the comprehension of the identity phenomenon. On one hand, societal constructs of identity are imposed by society, encompassing its manifold communities, ideologies, governmental institutions, mass media, computerized potential of social networks, and advertising prevalence, among others. On the other hand, individuals, to some degree, endeavor to seek their own identity voluntarily. Yet, this identity is constructed through discursive practices, causing it to no longer be exclusively owned by the individual. The origin now rests within social or collective identity. The paramount query herein is to elucidate the very question previously mentioned: to what extent can an individual shape their identity, and where can this influence materialize? In this context, it's noteworthy that towards the conclusion of the preceding century, the renowned French philosopher Paul Ricoeur (1996), in his work "Oneself as Another," advocated a dual-level approach to individual identity: one as bodily identity (Latin idem), signifying the individual level as a substance and entity, and the other as the mental self of the individual (Latin ipse). This framework amalgamates within the concept of "identity" a fusion of certain constancy and the ongoing alteration it undergoes, whether immediate or enduring. Additionally, the "I" or the subject's "self", in turn, determines the characteristics of identity that remain unwavering over time, encompassing traits, behavioral archetypes, distinctive habits, preferences, tastes, and more. There are those facets that are malleable, even programmable through diverse methods. This implies, and permits, the construction of identity on the level of mental constructs throughout the process of individual and collective identification. According to P. Ricoeur, this underpins a subject's capability to associate with diverse collectives or communities based on values, norms,

ideals, recognized social models, or ideal human figures. It's pertinent to acknowledge that during the early 1990s, the establishment of collective identity emerged as a predominant focus in political science, anthropology, and sociology, wherein the contrast between identity (largely understood as collective) and the "I" (self) became increasingly pronounced. The French philosopher's primary concern lies in the (self-)identification process of the subject — an integral prerequisite for subsequent integration into comprehensive communities marked by varying content and potential influences through collective identities (Ricoeur, 1996).

Conclusions

In light of the preceding discourse, it's crucial to acknowledge that the discussion not only revolves around the discursive aspect of the subject's identity as its primary contemporary feature but also encompasses the assimilation of individual identity into diverse collective identities. These collective identities endeavor to reshape individuals towards specific directions through the widespread influence of mass media, modern social networks, and comprehensive state structures. Individuals must resist these forces to align with their unique individual identities.

Consequently, the force attribute of discourse or discursive practice inherently entails the continuous, occasionally concealed, and unconscious imposition of domination, manipulation, and subordination by the social group or its nominal representative. This imposition shapes the subject's identity. The notion of power or the power characteristic of discourse and discursive practices is contextualized within M. Foucault's microphysics of power, L. Althusser's ideological subjectivity, and Teun van Dijk's discourse of power. Within the realm of identity formation, P. Bourdieu's concept of habitus and P. Ricoeur's dual identity proposition are examined. It becomes evident that these individual theories and concepts fall short of comprehensively elucidating the intricate phenomenon of identity. Thus, an interdisciplinary approach is required, one that integrates modern developments in theoretical psychoanalysis and other social and humanitarian fields dedicated to exploring the multifaceted nature of identity.

The succinct analysis underscores the complexities entailed in studying identity within the contours of contemporary social and humanitarian knowledge, which is gradually being transformed into the study of collective identity, which is now becoming a decisive factor in considering the problem of identity. Future investigations will necessitate delving into the psychoanalytic theory of identity, particularly the evolution of modern theoretical psychoanalysis, as expounded by figures such as H. Alemán (2023), S. Žižek (2022), M. Dolar (2020), S. Benvenuto (2018), L. Chiesa (2016), R. Salecl (2022), M. R. Kehl (2018), and other scholars advancing S. Freud's theory of identity, contemporized by J. Lacan (1970). However, this theory of identity should be synergized with theories from other social and humanitarian domains dedicated to the exploration of identity. It is paramount to adopt the perspective that a novel interdisciplinary approach is indispensable for comprehending modern subjectivity, its myriad forms, and the diverse manifestations of identity.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Abildgaard, A., & Jørgensen, K. M. (2021). Enacting the entrepreneurial self: Public-private innovation as an actualization of a neoliberal market dispositive. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 37(4), 101179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2021.101179

Agamben, G. (2002). Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Zone Books.

Agamben, G. (2021). Where Are We Now?: The Epidemic as Politics. Rowman & Littlefield.

Albarello, F., Crocetti, E., & Rubini, M. (2017). I and US: A longitudinal study on the interplay of personal and social identity in Adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47(4), 689–702. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0791-4

Alemán, J. (2023). Lacan and Capitalist Discourse: Neoliberalism and Ideology. Routledge.

Althusser, L. (2001). Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (B. Brewster, Trans.). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigations), 85–126.

Apostolopoulou, E., Chatzimentor, A., Maestre-Andrés, S., Mora, M. R. I., Pizarro, A., & Bormpoudakis, D. (2021). Reviewing 15 years of research on neoliberal conservation: Towards a decolonial, interdisciplinary, intersectional and community-engaged research agenda. Geoforum, 124, 236–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.05.006

Ashforth, B. E., & Schinoff, B. S. (2016). Identity under construction: How individuals come to define themselves in organizations. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3(1), 111–137. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062322

Badiou, A. (2022). The immanence of truths: Being and Event III (K. Reinhard & S. Spitzer, Trans.). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Benveniste, É. (1971). Problems in general linguistics (M. E. Meek, Trans.). University of Miami Press.

Benvenuto, S. (2018). The Après-Coup, après coup. Language and Psychoanalysis, 7(2), 72–87. https://doi.org/10.7565/landp.v7i2.1589

Berardi, F. (2009). The Soul at Work: From Alienation to Autonomy. Semiotext(e).

Bettache, K., Chiu, C., & Beattie, P. (2020). The merciless mind in a dog-eat-dog society: neoliberalism and the indifference to social inequality. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 34, 217–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.06.002

Bieri, P. (2017). Human Dignity: A Way of Living (D. Siclovan, Trans.). Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). Structures, Habitus, Practices. The Logic of Practice, 2, 52–65.

Braidotti, R. (2013). The Posthuman. Polity Press.

Cattell, R. B. (1950). Personality: A Systematic Theoretical and Factual Study. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Chiesa, L. (2016). The Not-Two: Logic and God in Lacan. MIT Press.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). Human Nature and the Social Order. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Corcuff, P. (1999). Le collectif au defi du singulier: en partant de l'habitus [The collective challenged by the singular: starting from the habitus]. In B. Lahire, Le Travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu: dettes et critiques [Pierre Bourdieu's sociological work: debts and criticism] (pp. 95–120). La Decouverte.

Cover, R. (2016). Identity, Internet, and Globalization. In Digital Identities. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-420083-8.00005-5

Cover, R. (2021). Identity in the disrupted time of COVID-19: Performativity, crisis, mobility and ethics. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 4(1), 100175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100175

Grimalda, G., Buchan, N. R., & Brewer, M. B. (2018). Social identity mediates the positive effect of globalization on individual cooperation: Results from international experiments. PLOS ONE, 13(12), e0206819. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206819

Delaney, J. J. (2016). Human enhancement and identity-affecting changes: The problem of controversial cases. Ethics, Medicine and Public Health. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2016.09.009

Deleuze, G. (1983). Nietzsche and Philosophy (H. Tomlinson, Trans.). Athlone Press.

Dolar, M. (2020). 7 Hegel as the other side of psychoanalysis. In Jacques Lacan and the Other Side of Psychoanalysis (pp. 129–154). https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822387602-008
Erikson, E. H. (1950). Childhood and Society. W. W. Norton & Company
Erikson, E. H. (1974). Identity: Youth and Crisis. Faber and Faber.
Eskin, M., & Baydar, N. (2022). Do neoliberal values provide a fertile soil for suicidal ideation? Journal of Affective Disorders, 314, 349–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.07.034
Eysenck, H. J. (1947). Dimensions of personality. Kegan Paul.
Ferrando, F. (2019). Philosophical Posthumanism (Theory in the New Humanities) (R. Braidotti, Ed.). ⁋ Bloomsbury Academic.
Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. In Stanford University Press eBooks. Stanford University Press.
Foucault, M. (2002). The Archaeology of Knowledge. Psychology Press.
Foucault, M. (1990). The History of Sexuality: An Introduction (Vol. 1). Vintage.
Freud, S. (1990). Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. W. W. Norton & Company.
Goffman, E. (1956). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Doubleday.
Gergen, K. J. (1994). Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction. Harvard University Press.
Gill, M. J. (2020). How Can I Study Who You Are? In A. D. Brown (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations (pp. 294–310). https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198827115.013.26
Grossi, G., & Pianezzi, D. (2017). Smart cities: Utopia or neoliberal ideology? Cities, 69, 79–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.07.012
Han, B. (2015). The Burnout Society. Stanford Briefs.
Han, B. (2017). The Agony of Eros. MIT Press.
Harré, R. (1984). Personal being: A Theory for Individual Psychology. Harvard University Press.
Hermans, H. J. M. (2001). The dialogical self: toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. Culture & Psychology, 7(3), 243–281. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067x0173001
Kehl, M. R. (2018). Time and the dog: Society and Depression. Verso Books.
Kim, Y., Gaspard, H., Fleischmann, M., Nagengast, B., & Trautwein, U. (2023). What Happens With Comparison Processes When "the Other" is Very Similar? Academic Self-Concept Formation in Twins. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 72, 102138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2022.102138
Knight, A., & Saxby, S. (2014). Identity crisis: Global challenges of identity protection in a networked world1. Computer Law & Security Review, 30(6), 617–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2014.09.001
Lacan, J. (1970). Of Structure as an Inmixing of an Otherness Prerequisite to Any Subject. In R. Macksey & E. Donato (Eds.), The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy (2nd ed., pp. 186–200). Johns Hopkins Press.
MacLeavy, J. (2020). Neoliberalism. In International Encyclopedia of Human Geography (pp. 353–358). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-102295-5.10673-0
Maslow, A. H. (1954). motivation and personality. Harper & Brothers.
Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self & society. University of Chicago Press.
Moralès, J., Gendron, Y., & Guénin-Paracini, H. (2014). State privatization and the unrelenting expansion of neoliberalism: The case of the Greek financial crisis. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 25(6), 423–445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2013.08.007
Oliver, T. H., Doherty, B., Dornelles, A. Z., Gilbert, N., Greenwell, M. P., Harrison, L., Jones, I. M., Lewis, A. C., Moller, S. J., Pilley, V. J., Tovey, P., & Weinstein, N. (2022). A safe and just operating space for human identity: a systems perspective. The Lancet Planetary Health, 6(11), e919–e927. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(22)00217-0
Perls, F. S. (1969). Gestalt therapy verbatim. Real People Press.
Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour. SAGE Publications Limited.

Ricoeur, P. (1996). Oneself as Another (K. Blamey, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
Rogers, C. R. (1961). On Becoming a Person: A therapist's view of Psychotherapy. Constable.
Pentland, A. (2014). Social Physics: how good ideas spread — the lessons from a new science. Scribe Publications.
Rašković, M. (2020). (Social) Identity Theory in an Era of Identity Politics: Theory and practice. AIB Insights, 21(2). https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.13616
Sarbin, T. R. (1986). Narrative Psychology: The Storied Nature of Human Conduct. Praeger.
Salecl, R. (2022). A passion for ignorance. Princeton University Press.
Saltman, K. J. (2023). Neoliberal education: from capitalizing on disaster to critical pedagogy. In International Encyclopedia of Education (4th ed., pp. 250–257). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-818630-5.02084-4
Shotter, J. (1993). Conversational realities: Constructing Life Through Language. SAGE Publications Limited.
Sikka, P. (2015). The corrosive effects of neoliberalism on the UK financial crises and auditing practices: A dead-end for reforms. Accounting Forum, 39(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2014.10.004
Skinner, B. F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. Alfred A. Knopf.
Swassjan, K. (2005). Discourse, terror and Jewish identity. Problems of Philosophy, 2, 56–102.
Sweet, E. (2018). "Like you failed at life": Debt, health and neoliberal subjectivity. Social Science & Medicine, 212, 86–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.017
Thulien, N., Gastaldo, D., McCay, E., & Hwang, S. (2019). "I want to be able to show everyone that it is possible to go from being nothing in the world to being something": Identity as a determinant of social integration. Children and Youth Services Review, 96, 118–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.11.005
Udall, A. M., De Groot, J. I. M., De Jong, S. B., & Shankar, A. (2020). How do I see myself? A systematic review of identities in pro-environmental behaviour research. Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 19(2), 108–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1798
Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and Power. Macmillan Education UK.
Von Sivers, I., Templeton, A., Köster, G., Drury, J., & Philippides, A. (2014). Humans do not Always Act Selfishly: Social Identity and Helping in Emergency Evacuation Simulation. Transportation Research Procedia, 2, 585–593. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2014.09.099
Wang, V., & Tucker, J. V. (2021). 'I am not a number': Conceptualising identity in digital surveillance. Technology in Society, 67, 101772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101772
Widdicombe, S., & Da Silva Marinho, C. (2021). Challenges in research on Self-Identity. In Cambridge University Press eBooks (pp. 57–76). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108755146.004
Woźniak, M. (2018). "I" and "Me": The Self in the Context of Consciousness. Frontiers in Psychology, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01656
Žižek, S. (2022). Surplus-Enjoyment: A Guide For The Non-Perplexed. Bloomsbury Publishing.
Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs.

Author Biography

Vadim Palahuta is a PhD in Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophical science, Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy of the National University of Technology.