G.R. Seifullina [iD], O.T. Arinova [iD]*, S.M. Zhakin [iD]

Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: galiya-magavina@mail.ru, arinova.kargu@gmail.com, samatsky7@gmail.com)

Digital identity in the space of digital culture

The dynamism of the modern epoch in many ways requires the same dynamic definition of its role and significance in this rapidly changing world, and it is also necessary to designate the identification code of this period of history. Obviously, the problem of any historical space, any historical period is the definition of identity. Only when the boundaries and contours of identity are found can a person adequately understand his role and place in the flow of history, in social practice. Modern reality, which is being realized in the context of the intensification of the total digitalization process, requires a search for your identification code. Especially on the scale of an actively becoming digital culture. It was this research perspective that determined the content of this article. The authors, relying on socio-philosophical research techniques, analyzed digital identity within the framework of the phenomenon of digital culture. The authors pay special attention to the risks that such an identity carries; the authors also point out the possibility of dissonance in digital and real identities. The authors' scientific interest is related to the objective difference between real identity and the identity that they present in the digital space. As a rule, these types of reality do not coincide and contradict each other. This state can lead to dissociative personality and a feeling of one's own uncertainty. And in this sense, the task of society is to create a digital situation in which a person would objectively evaluate himself both in real life and in the field of digital space. The state and society bear a certain responsibility for the possible risks and challenges that the active process of digitalization brings, which does not exclude, of course, the personal responsibility of each participant in digital communication.

Keywords: digital culture, identity, networks, Internet, digitalization, communicative rationality, self-esteem, virtual reality.

Introduction

The Kazakh state is guided in its reforms and its development by the idea of renewal, the idea of novelty ("New Kazakhstan", "Just Kazakhstan"), the search for its place in the civilizational flow is in the mode of serious transformations, the formation of such a conceptual space within which the development of new sociocultural algorithms. This search can only be successful when it is provided with conceptual matrices, and these matrices correspond to reality, and allow us to shape the future of such reality. It is important to understand that work and activities will be carried out in a format ahead of this reality. We can talk about the idea of social providentialism, which will inspire and prevent the turns of history in the future.

We can speak in the context of conceptualizing the sociocultural historical process of the 20th-21st centuries as specific turns (ontological, linguistic, iconic, anthropological, theological, performative, pragmatic, etc.) also about a new, digital turn of civilization.

Research methods

The catalogue of humanities methodologies for various kinds of heuristic interpretations of the digital turn and its consequences is quite wide:

1. Now classic theory of M. McLuhan [1], that the direction of human history depends on the nature of the media sources people use. And since, according to McLuhan, media is defined as the expansion of the human body, the expansion of its functions and the capture of new space, we can say that digital media contribute to the symbolic deterritorialization of a person through the formation of network identity.

2. The term "theory fiction" by J. Baudrillard [2], within the framework of which the modern process of digitalization can be defined as a transition from the third stage of image development, where the forgery and concealment of the immediate absence of reality occurs, to the fourth stage, where there is a complete loss of any connection with reality, the transposition of the sign from the order of appearance to the level simulations. J. Baudrillard claimed postmodernity was defined by a shift into hyperreality in which simulations have replaced the real.

---

* Corresponding author's e-mail: *arinova.kargu@gmail.com*

3. The theory of the "Integrated Perfomance Society" by Guy Debord [3], created at a later time, a theory that explains the paradoxical combination of bureaucratic-police control and the oppressive practices of the pseudo-pleasure of neo-capitalist consumerism. It is important to note that one of the main roles in this theory relates to digital technologies, which displace the content of social reality into the sphere of endless representations.

4. Mediology R. Debray [4], that describes digitalization as a new stage in the struggle of media in a permanent polemos of ideological, political and religious clashes, which ultimately end in the establishment of mediacracy — the power of an intermediary who always turns everything into mediocrity.

5. Electronic media theory F. Kittler [5], a theory that continues the line of Freud and Foucault in understanding culture as a constellation of technical aids that will become the prosthesis of culture, which at the same time defends the autonomy of digital media, and they, in turn, leave behind both the image of man and his written history.

Results

Today digitalization has become a global trend. The degree and level of digitalization have become almost the main criterion in assessing the prospects of the vector of state and public policy. It must be admitted that when it comes to digitalization, the favorable climate for the business community and the economy is mainly assessed. Although it is obvious that this process actively influences and sometimes determines the humanitarian picture of the world. Modern achievements in the implementation of digitalization programs have sufficiently influenced the formats of human communication, the formation of new value guidelines, and the adjustment of meaning and life attitudes. Therefore, it is extremely important to study and understand the sociocultural and psychological consequences of digitalization in general and network identity in particular. Such scientific understanding will help, in our opinion, to avoid the possible negative consequences of digitalization in terms of network identity. And such (negative consequences) are already observed. This article attempts to explore the nature of digitalization from the standpoint of its influence on people's worldviews and on the construction of their identification code. The relevance of this research perspective is determined, first of all, by the need in the current conditions, on the current scale of digitalization, to assess all possible negative consequences of this process, to provide a deep theoretical humanitarian basis for the digitalization process, and to identify the main risks in the space of network identity. For this study, the epistemological potential of a number of sciences is used: philosophy, cultural studies, sociology, psychology and religious studies. Such an interdisciplinary symbiosis will allow us to gain a more complete understanding of digitalization as a factor in the formation of a new humanistic picture of the world. This interdisciplinary approach to the study of digitalization, taking into account the specifics of the Kazakhstan format, is being carried out for the first time in the domestic scientific space. It seems that the proposed research optics will provide an opportunity for a panoramic assessment of the digitalization process in general and in the conditions of Kazakhstan in particular.

The focus of traditional philosophical thematization, which begins, as a rule, with the thesis that "man and..." (hereinafter, the following nominations are most often used: world, society, science, etc.), an attempt to act in the usual way and in two or three speculative reflexive explications on the topic "man and digital reality" may encounter a fundamental difficulty. The fact is that the ideological subtext of typical semantic and verbal constructions "man and..." is filled with the epistemological optimism of the Cartesian subject-object topic. In the case of modern digital realities, it is necessary to look at the problem from a different point of view and formulate the topic differently. Therefore, in simple inverse optics it looks like it's enough to swap the words: not "man and digital reality", but "digital reality and man". In this case, second place will go to man for one reason — it is digital reality that constitutes anthropological reality, and not vice versa. Any essentialist and/or substantialist objections in this case can be easily disavow by reference to the relevant works [6–9].

Therefore, in our opinion, a relevant analysis of digital identity, in particular, and digital culture in general, requires comment:

– Digitalization is not so much a technical as a technological process. This means that technologies are not only mechanically added to human life, but also fundamentally build human life and become its basis [10]. Therefore, what is needed is not a functional analysis, but a system-structural analysis, in the context of a paradigmatic transition, or more precisely, a shift (a developmental leap, rather than a gradual, evolutionary transformation).

– Digital identity is not an additional option to the classical subject (person), which can be viewed in a purely instrumental manner. This is a new way of organizing and representing the subject in social (and therefore in cultural, historical, political) space.

The consequences of digital identity are not a local, but a transversal issue that permeates through all significant areas of human activity. In the extreme, such strengthening of the status of network identity can lead to a revision and change of rules in the field of law, politics, economics, and ultimately in the field of culture. Such a perspective requires careful and detailed forecasting, where the first reasonable step may be a comparative analysis to capture basic differences in order to increase awareness of the inevitability of the end of the old world and the onset of a new reality, fundamentally complex and incomprehensible.

Just as Heidegger once heralded by that the essence of technology is not technical [11]. We suggest that the essence of digital identity is not only digital. That is, this problem should not be understood narrow conception, in a special technical sense, in connection with technology and the skills of their use.

Currently, the needs of the concept of "digital identity" in scientific research have the following meanings:

A) Characteristics of belonging to a community in which the main activities of its members are related to computer technology;

B) Synonym for multifactorial, dynamic, shifting identity;

C) The result of a person's self-presentation on social networks, his virtual image, "twins" or "project";

D) An independent subject, an alternative identity, operating in the virtual world and having characteristics different from the real identity [12].

Despite the demand for specialized subject-specific research and obtaining local results, in general, in most of the modern humanitarian works on understanding the phenomenon of digitalization, there is not enough scale to grasp the historicity and epochal nature of this event.

In this case, it is necessary to use a broader contextual-semantic framework for the correct interpretation of network (virtual) identity. It is necessary to abandon such an understanding of the virtual, when the virtual is understood as only relating to the Internet or social networks.

Discussion

If we remain true to the spirit of critical theory [13] and Schoolfor Suspicion [14], then you can also add the parameter of productivity and creativity for comprehension and consider the virtual as an ontological condition for authentic formation, the unpredictable creation of a new [15]. In this case, digital identity can be conceptualized as a contingent entity that arises emergently in the form of presence. And in the order of pluralism of hypotheses, we can assume that the virtual is a resource that has the chaos potential to generate actual forms [16]. Then what we call a sociocultural-virtual phenomenon can be presented in the epistemological sense as the exposure of illusions, and in the ontological status — as a new status of human reality, virtual in its essence [17].

Perhaps the most homologous in terms of overcoming/bringing together A. Korzybski dilemma [18], which is the dilemma of the relationship between symbol and object (in our case, methodology and phenomenon) will be a postmodern understanding of digital identity. Homology in this case will lie in the information and communication nature of digital identity, which should be understood as a text, which is, as a complex interweaving of different narratives and narrative strategies. Then it is necessary to take into account that the main characteristics of digital identity are plurality, dynamism and mobility [19], we will be able to revive some concepts of the textual discourse of J. Derrida [20] and present digital identity as a complex polysemic formation that arises as the deployment and continuous interaction of heterogeneous semiotic spaces and structures, which ensures the generation of a differentiated multi-vector semantic set that cannot be fully understood.

For modern Kazakhstan, digitalization means the need for a total transformation of basic traditional socio-cultural practices, which are in the context of global network communication and therefore must inevitably be subject to various impacts, both positive and negative.

The blurring of the boundaries of the usual anthropological configuration, the gradual loss and replacement of the humanistic concept of man is a challenge facing modern humanity. And any manifestations of opposite (polar) reductionist decisions (for example, reactionary or progressivism) can lead to tragic consequences at the level of changes in the destinies of countries.

In this context, the problem of digital culture, digital identity and its consequences is closely related to such phenomena as the ethical aspects of digital culture and the preservation of traditional axiology in the context of globalization.

Digital reality is a rhizomatic space of fundamentally new cultural practices that require a certain level of psychological preparation, technical training, and most importantly, appropriate cognitive relevance.

Modern society of Kazakhstan has not yet learned to exist in the world of new media, which is why society finds itself in a state of rapid assimilation from the discourse of capitalism (in the sense that J. Lacan understood) [21]. J. Lacan created a meaning that shifted the focus from the key question "why?" and "for what?" to "how?" (How can I live in this world?)

Over time, new generations of people, as a collective subject, historically adapt to the 21st century, but the speed of this adaptation will largely depend on the effectiveness of knowledge institutions.

Actively changing the environment or, more precisely, increasing its level to the required threshold of cognitive requirements of digital practices is possible only through the transformation of the subject through knowledge.

The consequences of digital identity can be very diverse and will cover various aspects of human life, from banal cybersecurity (insufficient protection of personal data can lead to fraud), social transformations (the emergence of new professions, a new logic for the distribution of economic resources) and ending with changes in the very form of human existence (creation of fundamentally different ethical ideas and rules of behavior). In this range of problems, it is important to correctly assess the relationship between a person's online and real identity. In this sense, a person within the network identity appears as the "master of the situation", "filmmaker", and the author's formed network identity may not correspond to the real identity, and sometimes aggressively oppose it. Sometimes in digital identity a person presents himself as a set of meanings and meanings that do not reflect his true values and priorities. A split personality occurs. And this is one of the most disturbing possible consequences of this kind of identity. Perhaps it is necessary to form a so-called digital, network "diet", when the network space is only an opportunity for adequate self-expression (without idealization, total decoration). The network provides an opportunity for active self-presentation and popularization, but it also carries with it the possibility of leaving the real "Self" and losing touch with reality.

If we consider this problem in a broad ideological sense, it is important to understand that digital culture is part of information culture. Recently, information culture has become a defining component of this cultural field. The formation of an information culture that corresponds to the main civilizational trends and challenges of the time is determined by the need for a nuanced approach to the construction of new ethical meanings, new formats of social practice in the process of digitalization.

Despite the general positive assessment of the digitalization process, as a process that gives dynamism to all types of social practices, it is important to clearly understand that this process must be absolutely under control (without aggressive censorship). This control must correspond to the basic humanistic meanings of the era and guarantee safety and ethical sustainability.

Conclusion

Digital identity, despite its attractiveness from a self-presentation point of view, can undoubtedly create an illusory picture of one's self-esteem. And when this self-esteem collides with reality, destruction of self-awareness occurs, which, in turn, leads to the erosion of the ontological foundations of existence. In these circumstances, it is very important to build such ideological boundaries that would allow maintaining a stable, not loose self-perception. It is necessary to form a culture digital code that will prevent random assessments and characteristics. The formation of a digital culture means a culture of critical reflection, detailing the information offered by digital media.

It is obvious that digital identity in this case in the space of digital culture should be opposed to real identity, and perhaps should complement it within a general axiological framework.

Thus, digital identity is a factor that allows us to carry out the process of self-assessment and self-actualization from new positions, from new angles. Such an identity corresponds to the matrix of real self-esteem, does not oppose it, but complements it, giving another scale of self-awareness. This is possible only in the conditions of constructing a digital culture that has stable ideological meanings.

Acknowledgements

References

1 McLuhan M. War and peace in the global village. AST / M. McLuhan, K. Fiore. — 2012.

2 Baudrillard J. Simucra and Simulation. Ripol-classic / J. Baudrillard. — 2015.

3 Debord G. Comments on the society of the Spectacle / G. Debord. — Logos. — 2023.

4 Debre R. Introduction to Mediology. Praxis / R. Debre. — 2009.

5 Kittler F. Flechsig, Schreber, Freud: An Information Network at the Turn of the Century / F. Kittler // The Truth of the Technological World / F. Kittler. — Stanford University Press. — 2013. — P. 57–8.

6 Berger P. Social Construction of Reality. Treatise on the sociology of knowledge. Medium / P. Berger, T. Lukman // Jakarta. — 1995.

7 Foucault M. Words and things / M. Foucault // Archeology of the Humanities. Progress. — 1977.

8 Bostrom N. Artificial intelligence. Stages. Threats. Strategies. Mann, Ivanov and Ferber / N. Bostrom. — 2016.

9 Haraway D. Staying with the Confusion. Making relatives in Chthulucene / D. Haraway. — Gile Press. — 2020.

10 Кутырев В.А. Человечество и технос: философия коэволюции / В.А. Кутырев, В.В. Слюсарев, Т.М. Хусяинов. — СПб.: Алетейя, 2020. — 260 с.

11 Heidegger Martin. Die Frage nach der Technik / Martin Heidegger // Die Kunste im technischen Zeitalter. — 1954. — P. 70–108.

12 Kosenchuk L. Concepts of virtual or network identity: critical analysis / L. Kosenchuk // Modern problems of science and education. — 2014. — 5.

13 Markov A. Critical theory. Ripol-Classic / A. Markov. — 2021.

14 Vizgin V. On the way to the Other. From the School of Suspicion to the Philosophy of trust / V. Vizgin. — ID YASK. — 2011.

15 Meillassoux K. Subtraction and reduction: Deleuze, Immanence, Matter and Memory / K. Meillassoux. — 2012.

16 Deleuze J. Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. U-Factoria / J. Deleuze, F. Guattari. — 2007.

17 Plyutto P. Study of the reality of the sociocultural virtual: Experience in the analysis of sociocultural illusions / P. Plyutto. — Progress-Tradition. — 2014.

18 Korzybski A. Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics / A. Korzybski. — Institute of General Semantics. — 1994.

19 Doring N. Sozialpsychologie des Internet: Die Bedeutung des Internet für Kommunikationsprozesse, Identitaten, soziale Beziehungen und Gruppen / N. Doring. — 2003. — P. 42–57.

20 Derrida J. Positions. Academic project / J. Derrida. — 2007.

21 Boltanski L. The New Spirit of Capitalism. NLO / L. Boltanski, E. Chiapello. — 2011.

Г.Р. Сейфуллина, О.Т. Аринова, С.М. Жакин

Цифрлық мәдениет кеңістігіндегі цифрлық сәйкестік

Қазіргі дәуірдің динамизмі белгілі бір мағынада өзінің идентификациялық кодын белгілеу арқылы осы қарыштаған әлемде өз орнын динамикалық түрде анықтауды талап етеді. Бұл кез келген тарихи кеңістіктің, кез келген тарихи кезеңнің мәселесі. Тек өзінің жеке басының контурын анықтай отырып, адам өзінің рөлі мен тарих ағымындағы, әлеуметтік практикадағы орнын жеткілікті түрде біле алады. Цифрландырудың белсенді толқыны жағдайында қазіргі шындық өзінің сәйкестендіру кодын іздеуді және белсенді дамып келе жатқан цифрлық мәдениет ауқымында талап етеді. Дәл осы зерттеу шеңбері осы мақаланың мазмұнын анықтады. Авторлар әлеуметтік-философиялық зерттеу әдістерін қолдана отырып, цифрлық мәдениет феномені аясында цифрлық сәйкестікті талдады. Олар осындай сәйкестіктің тәуекелдеріне ерекше назар аударды, цифрлық және нақты сәйкестікте диссонанс мүмкіндігін көрсетті.

Кілт сөздер: сандық мәдениет, сәйкестілік, желілер, интернет, цифрландыру, коммуникативті ұтымдылық, өзін-өзі бағалау, виртуалды шындық.

Г.Р. Сейфуллина, О.Т. Аринова, С.М. Жакин

Цифровая идентичность в пространстве цифровой культуры

Динамизм современной эпохи в определенном смысле требует столь же динамичного определения своего места в этом стремительном мире, обозначением своего идентификационного кода. Это проблема любого исторического пространства, любого исторического периода. Только, определив контуры своей идентичности, человек может адекватно осознать свою роль и место в потоке истории, в со-

циальной практике. Нынешняя реальность, в условиях активной волны цифровизации, требует поиска своего идентификационного кода и в масштабе активно становящейся цифровой культуры. Именно этот исследовательский ракурс и определил содержание настоящей статьи. Авторы, пользуясь социально-философскими исследовательскими приемами, проанализировали цифровую идентичность в рамках феномена цифровой культуры. Они обратили особое внимание на те риски, которые несет в себе такого рода идентичность, указали на возможность диссонанса в цифровой и реальной идентичности.

Ключевые слова: цифровая культура, идентичность, сети, Интернет, цифровизация, коммуникативная рациональность, самооценка, виртуальная реальность.

References

1 McLuhan, M. & Fiore, K. (2012). War and peace in the global village. AST.

2 Baudrillard, J. (2015). Simucra and Simulation. Ripol-classic.

3 Debord, G. (2023). Comments on the society of the Spectacle. Logos.

4 Debre, R. (2009). Introduction to Mediology. Praxis.

5 Kittler, F. (2013). Flechsig, Schreber, Freud: An Information Network at the Turn of the Century. *In The Truth of the Technological World.* Stanford University Press, 57–8.

6 Berger, P. & Lukman, T. (1995). Social Construction of Reality. Treatise on the sociology of knowledge. Medium. *Jakarta.*

7 Foucault, M. (1977). Words and things. *Archeology of the Humanities*. Progress.

8 Bostrom, N. (2016). Artificial intelligence. Stages. Threats. Strategies. Mann, Ivanov and Ferber.

9 Haraway, D. (2020). Staying with the Confusion. Making relatives in Chthulucene. Gile Press.

10 Kutyrev, V.A., Sliusarev, V.V., & Khusiainov, T.M. (2020). Chelovechestvo i tekhnos: filosofiia koevoliutsii [Humanity and technos: philosophy of coevolution]. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteiia [in Russian].

11 Heidegger, Martin (1954). Die Frage nach der Technik. *Die Kunste im technischen Zeitalter* (pp. 70–108).

12 Kosenchuk, L. (2014). Concepts of virtual or network identity: critical analysis. *Modern problems of science and education*, 5.

13 Markov, A. (2021). Critical theory. Ripol-Classic.

14 Vizgin, V. (2011). On the way to the Other. From the School of Suspicion to the Philosophy of trust. ID YASK.

15 Meillassoux, K. (2012). Subtraction and reduction: Deleuze, Immanence, Matter and Memory.

16 Deleuze, J., & Guattari, F. (2007). Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. U-Factoria.

17 Plyutto, P. (2014). Study of the reality of the sociocultural virtual: Experience in the analysis of sociocultural illusions. Progress-Tradition.

18 Korzybski, A. (1994). Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics. Institute of General Semantics.

19 Doring, N. (2003). Sozialpsychologie des Internet: Die Bedeutung des Internet für Kommunikationsprozesse, Identitaten, soziale Beziehungen und Gruppen (pp. 42–57).

20 Derrida, J. (2007). Positions. Academic project.

21 Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, E. (2011). The New Spirit of Capitalism. NLO.

Information about the authors

Seifullina Galiya — Candidate of philosophical sciences, associate professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan; http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3220-6233

Arinova Olga — Candidate of philosophical sciences, assistant professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan; http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3833-8328

Zhakin Samat — Lecturer of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan; http://orcid.org/0009-0000-4644-3788