Revista Univap
CIÊNCIA • TECNOLOGIA • HUMANISMO
Uma publicação da Universidade do Vale do Paraíba | Desde 1993 • Publicação contínua

IDENTITY AS A MACRO- AND MICRO-DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCT: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE

LA IDENTIDAD COMO CONSTRUCTO MACRO- Y MICRODISCURSIVO: UNA PERSPECTIVA INTERDISCIPLINARIA

A IDENTIDADE COMO CONSTRUTO MACRO- E MICRODISCURSIVO: UMA PERSPECTIVA INTERDISCIPLINAR

Tetiana Davydova[1]
Elvira Bondarenko[2]
Iryna Korniiko[3]
Oleksandr Muntian[4]

Abstract: The article explores interdisciplinary approaches to the study of identity as a dynamic discursive construct shaped by both dominant D-Discourses and d-discursive practices. From a constructionist perspective, identities are formed through mythologems, ideologemes, and symbols within myth-symbolic systems shaped by Discourses and grand narratives. This study adopts a social constructionist perspective, aligning with discourse-oriented theories of identity associated with Foucault and Hall, in which identity is understood as discursively produced and continuously rearticulated. In this context, identity is conceptualized through critical discourse analysis, social semiotics, macro-narrative analysis, memory field theories, and ethno-symbolic concepts. The formation of identity through D-Discourses relies on a secondary semiotic system, which infuses signs with ideological or mythological meanings, shaping recipients' worldviews. Micro-approaches to identity analysis view it as a conditional product of verbal interactions, in which individuals engage in both self-categorization and mutual categorization. Micro-approaches, such as positioning theory, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and narrative-in-interaction research, conceptualize identity as an emergent, positional, intersubjective, and variable category. Both approaches have limitations: micro-approaches may overlook the influence of institutional and sociocultural structures on identity formation, while macro-approaches tend to overgeneralize and underestimate individual agency. The study highlights the potential of integrative analysis using approaches such as interactional sociolinguistics, narrative-in-interaction analysis, and positioning theory, which connect micro-level interactions with macro-level cultural and social processes. In contemporary technologically mediated contexts, identity formation is increasingly influenced by social media platforms and AI-assisted communication systems, which intensify processes of digital fragmentation and raise new challenges related to authenticity and platform-mediated self-representation.
Keywords: identity construction; "capital-D" discourses; "small-d" discursive practices; integrative approach.

[1] Sumy State Teacher Training University named after A.S.Makarenka.
[2] Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[3] Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[4] Institute of Law and Modern Technologies at Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Resumen: El artículo explora enfoques interdisciplinarios para el estudio de la identidad como un constructo discursivo dinámico, moldeado tanto por los D-Discursos dominantes como por las prácticas discursivas d. Desde una perspectiva construccionista, las identidades se forman a través de mitologemas, ideologemas y símbolos dentro de sistemas mítico-simbólicos configurados por los Discursos y las grandes narrativas. Este estudio adopta una perspectiva del construccionismo social, en consonancia con las teorías del discurso asociadas a Foucault y Stuart Hall, donde la identidad se entiende como un producto discursivo y en constante rearticulación. En este contexto, la identidad se conceptualiza a través del análisis crítico del discurso, la semiótica social, el análisis de macro-narrativas, las teorías del campo de la memoria y los conceptos etno-simbólicos. La formación de la identidad mediante los D-Discursos se basa en un sistema semiótico secundario que dota a los signos de significados ideológicos o mitológicos, configurando las visiones del mundo de los receptores. Los enfoques micro analizan la identidad como un producto condicional de las interacciones verbales, en las que los individuos participan tanto en la auto-categorización como en la categorización mutua. Enfoques como la teoría del posicionamiento, el análisis de la conversación, la sociolingüística interaccional y la investigación narrativa en la interacción conciben la identidad como una categoría emergente, posicional, intersubjetiva y variable. Ambos enfoques presentan limitaciones: los microenfoques pueden pasar por alto la influencia de las estructuras institucionales y socioculturales en la formación de la identidad, mientras que los macroenfoques tienden a la sobre-generalización y subestiman la agencia individual. El estudio destaca el potencial de los enfoques integradores, como la sociolingüística interaccional, el análisis narrativo en la interacción y la teoría del posicionamiento, que conectan las interacciones micro con los procesos socioculturales macro. En los contextos contemporáneos tecnológicamente mediados, la formación de la identidad está cada vez más influida por las plataformas de redes sociales y los sistemas de comunicación asistidos por inteligencia artificial, lo que intensifica los procesos de fragmentación digital y plantea nuevos desafíos relacionados con la autenticidad y la autorrepresentación mediada por plataformas.
Palabras clave: construcción de la identidad; “D-Discursos” (con “D” mayúscula); prácticas discursivas “d” (con “d” minúscula); enfoque integrador.

Resumo: O artigo explora abordagens interdisciplinares para o estudo da identidade como um construto discursivo dinâmico, moldado tanto pelos D-Discursos dominantes quanto pelas práticas discursivas d. A partir de uma perspectiva construcionista, as identidades são formadas por meio de mitologemas, ideologemas e símbolos inseridos em sistemas mítico-simbólicos configurados pelos Discursos e pelas grandes narrativas. Este estudo adota uma perspectiva do construcionismo social, em consonância com as teorias do discurso associadas a Foucault e Stuart Hall, nas quais a identidade é compreendida como um produto discursivo em constante rearticulação. Nesse contexto, a identidade é conceitualizada por meio da análise crítica do discurso, da semiótica social, da análise de macro-narrativas, das teorias do campo da memória e dos conceitos etnossimbólicos. A formação da identidade por meio dos D-Discursos baseia-se em um sistema semiótico secundário que atribui aos signos significados ideológicos ou mitológicos, configurando as visões de mundo dos receptores. As abordagens micro analisam a identidade como um produto condicional das interações verbais, nas quais os indivíduos participam tanto da autocategorização quanto da categorização mútua. Abordagens como a

teoria do posicionamento, a análise da conversação, a sociolinguística interacional e a pesquisa narrativa na interação concebem a identidade como uma categoria emergente, posicional, intersubjetiva e variável. Ambas as abordagens apresentam limitações: os microenfoques podem negligenciar a influência das estruturas institucionais e socioculturais na formação da identidade, enquanto os macroenfoques tendem à sobregeneralização e subestimam a agência individual. O estudo destaca o potencial das abordagens integradoras, como a sociolinguística interacional, a análise narrativa na interação e a teoria do posicionamento, que articulam as interações micro com os processos socioculturais macro. Nos contextos contemporâneos mediados tecnologicamente, a formação da identidade é cada vez mais influenciada pelas plataformas de redes sociais e pelos sistemas de comunicação assistidos por inteligência artificial, o que intensifica os processos de fragmentação digital e levanta novos desafios relacionados à autenticidade e à autorrepresentação mediada por plataformas.
Palavras-chave: construção da identidade; “D-Discursos” (com “D” maiúsculo); práticas discursivas “d” (com “d” minúsculo); abordagem integradora.

1 INTRODUCTION

The issue of identity construction remains one of the most relevant topics in contemporary interdisciplinary research, addressing a wide range of problems related to the discursive, narrative, semiotic, symbolic, and other aspects of identity construction. A common thread among different approaches to studying identity is its conceptualization as a discursive phenomenon—a flexible discursive construct that is constantly transforming through social interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). The entire range of studies dealing with the issue of identity within a discursive framework can be broadly divided into two groups: those examining identity construction through “capital-D” social Discourses and “small-d” discursive practices (Gee, 1999; Bamberg et al., 2011) or, in other terminology, “discursive-constructionist” (semiotic) and “discursive-interactive” approaches (Kravchenko et al., 2021, p. 143). This diversification of research approaches raises the question of how they can be systematized through a comparative analysis that highlights commonalities and differences in models of identity construction.

2 BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW

In the micro-discursive approach, theorists examine identity as a conditional product of local interactions, as “an intersubjectively achieved social and cultural phenomenon” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 607) connected to role positioning based on situationally determined communicative experience, self-categorization, and mutual categorization into identity categories (Bamberg et al., 2011; McAdams, 2011; Schegloff, 2007; Siivonen & Korhonen, 2024). In this context, identity research is guided by Erikson’s principle that identity primarily develops through constant, minute-by-minute communication, which involves “mutual affirmation” (1968, p. 219) between the self and the other. In this vein, Arundale (2024) argues that the “self” and the “other” are dialectically linked and, as such, mutually define one another through communication.

As a result of micro-discursive interactions, identity is characterized by researchers as emergent, relative to the positions of others, partial, and fluid, based on indexical processes, including: (a) overt mention of identity categories and labels; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one's own or others' identity positions; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footing and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, pp. 588, 592, 594, 598). The issue of the d-discursive construction of identities is studied on the basis of both one-on-one and one-to-many interactions. In the former case, researchers focus on the role of participants as agents of identity formation in various interactions, such as those between doctors and patients (Seymour-Smith et al., 2002), friends, and peers (Sugimura et al., 2021), among others. The study of one-to-many interactions focuses on how public settings transform the ways in which public figures manage their face in front of multiple audiences (Kravchenko & Pasternak, 2018, pp. 142–143) and on the strategies they use to construct their social identities, sometimes without being aware of doing so.

From a constructionist perspective, identity is conceptualized as a product of capital-D Discourses, including master narratives (Kravchenko & Yudenko, 2023; Morales-López & Floyd, 2017), with a focus on the world-modeling function of Discourses. In the present study, this perspective is grounded specifically in social constructionism, whereby identity is understood as discursively produced within sociocultural and historical contexts, rather than in psychological constructivism, which emphasizes individual cognitive meaning-making processes. This approach is consistent with discourse-oriented theories of identity developed within cultural studies and critical discourse analysis, particularly in the works of Stuart Hall (1997a, 1997b), who conceptualizes identity as a dynamic, historically contingent, and discursively constituted process.

An important vector of research in this regard is associated with the formation of identity through the internalization of cultural and social contexts by group members, involving the integration of discursive ideologemes, mythologemes, and social practices prevailing in society into their own identities (Assmann & Czaplicka, 1995; Bell, 2003; Binbin et al., 2022; Kravchenko et al., 2023; Kravchenko & Yudenko, 2023). Discourse influences the construction of identity through its semiotic code, imposing a specific value structure on everything it represents.

In the context of this world-modeling function, critical discourse analysts have taken up and developed Foucault's idea (1981) that identities are "constructed" categories, "fragmented and fractured," and "constantly in the process of change and transformation" (Hall, 1997, p. 17). In this regard, one of the research focuses in the discursive-analytical study of identity is the dualism between structure and agency: is the subject free to construct their own role identity, or do institutional power structures constrain them, forcibly placing subjects within the bounds of existing discourses? In particular, Fairclough (1993) illustrates how medical professionals, through the discourse they use, can position patients as objects of medical knowledge (e.g., "cases") rather than as individuals with agency or personal identities. This can lead to the depersonalization of patients in the clinical context, reducing their identities to medical symptoms or conditions.

"Capital-D" Discourses and "small-d" discursive practices have been applied in previous research on education, media and communication, corporate culture and organizational behavior, among other areas. In particular, the study by Grant et al.

(1998) examines how organizational Discourses (capital-D) shape corporate culture and identity, while simultaneously focusing on the “small-d” discursive practices of communication and interaction within workplaces, such as leadership styles, decision-making processes, and internal communications. Both types of discourse have been applied to the study of family relationships and identities, which, on the one hand, have been seen as reflecting concepts and underlying beliefs, that is, the dominant capital-D Discourse that “fuels” existing family ideologies, and, on the other hand, as products of “small-d” discourses—current conversations embedded in the “into being” of families (Bamberg, 2014). Holmes (2006) explores how employees’ narratives and small-d discursive practices (such as casual workplace talk, meeting exchanges, and emails) contribute to the construction of professional identities and the maintenance of hierarchical structures within organizations. Gee (1999) explores how students’ participation in academic Discourses is influenced by smaller, everyday discursive practices that impact their identities.

In contemporary communicative environments, these dynamics are increasingly mediated by digital platforms, where identity construction unfolds across fragmented interactional spaces (e.g., social networks, algorithmically curated feeds, and AI-assisted communication) (Bucher, 2018; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). This introduces new tensions between coherence and multiplicity in self-representation (Turkle, 2011), as well as between perceived authenticity and performative self-staging in technologically mediated discourse (Boyd, 2015).

The diversity of identity studies raises the need to synthesize theoretical perspectives by identifying commonalities and differences in models of discursive identity construction, as well as exploring potential points of integration between macro- and micro-level approaches.

In view of this, the aim of this article is to present a systematic review of theories related to the issue of identity construction, focusing on the discrepancies between constructionist and interactionist approaches and potential points of integration between them. The review is based on a theoretically motivated selection of sources representing key strands of research in discourse-oriented identity studies, with priority given to works that explicitly address the interplay between macro- and micro-discursive dimensions.

3 METHODOLOGY

This review article on the discursive construction of identity incorporates the following methods to enhance the depth and scope of the analysis. The synthesis method was employed to summarize theoretical perspectives on models of identity construction. Comparative analysis was used to contrast two directions in identity research: identity as a product of capital-D Discourse and identity as a product of small-d discourse. Systematization was used to highlight key trends in approaches that (a) link identity construction to the world-modeling function of Discourse and (b) view identities as products of local interactions related to role positioning and categorization. Thematic analysis was employed to identify and analyze recurring themes or patterns in both capital-D Discourse and small-d discourse on identity construction, with the aim of identifying trends and correlations across the research landscape.

The study is based on a qualitative interdisciplinary review of scholarly sources selected according to explicit inclusion criteria. The corpus comprises works in critical discourse analysis, social semiotics, interactional sociolinguistics, positioning theory,

conversation analysis, and related fields that (1) conceptualize identity as a discursive construct, (2) address either macro-level (capital-D Discourse) or micro-level (small-d discourse) processes of identity formation, and (3) demonstrate relevance to contemporary sociocultural contexts. Particular attention was paid to studies that enable the integration of macro- and micro-discursive perspectives.

The selection of sources combined targeted database searches (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar) using keywords such as “identity construction,” “discourse,” “social semiotics,” and “discursive practices,” with backward reference tracking of influential publications. Priority was given to peer-reviewed articles, foundational theoretical works, and widely cited authors in the field. The final corpus was constructed as a theoretically representative rather than exhaustive sample, ensuring both conceptual depth and coherence in the interdisciplinary synthesis.

The study unfolds in three stages: reviewing macro-level approaches to national and consumer identities, analyzing micro-level identity as an interactive category, and exploring the integration of both approaches.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 D-DISCOURSES: CONSTRUCTING CONSUMER IDENTITY

Given the impossibility of conducting a comprehensive review that takes into account all types of D-Discourses underlying the construction of identity, we will focus on approaches related to national and consumer identities.

Research on consumer identity as a semiotic construct in advertising explores how brand mythology influences self-perceptions, consumer communities, and the mechanisms underlying advertising’s secondary level of signification, in which the brand and its product are associated with consumer motivations. This line of inquiry, rooted in Barthes’ concept of advertising mythology (1973) and expanded by Elliott (2004), Kartik et al. (2016), Kravchenko et al. (2021, 2024), Thompson (2004), and others, focuses on how consumers incorporate marketplace mythologies into their identities. From the perspective of social constructionism, such processes can be understood as forms of discursive articulation, whereby consumer identities are actively constituted through symbolic systems and cultural narratives, in line with Stuart Hall’s view of identity as a process of becoming rather than a fixed essence (Hall, 1997a, 1997b), and as a product of representation within culturally shared systems of meaning.

Thompson highlights that brand mythologies become part of interpretive communities, integrating cultural meanings and values from advertising into consumers’ lives. For instance, consumers seeking alternatives to medical identities adopt the mythology of natural health brands, which promise magical regeneration (Thompson, 2004, p. 170).

Consumer identity often manifests in brand communities—specialized, non-geographically bound groups built on shared consciousness, rituals, and moral responsibility, as Muniz and O’Guinn (2001) describe. Barthes (1973) explains how advertising appeals to consumer motivations through secondary semiology, whereby the functional meaning of products is transformed into connotative signifieds such as prestige, health, and creativity. This process forms the brand’s mythology, which aligns with the worldview and values of a specific consumer identity (Kravchenko et al., 2021, 2024). Archetypes play a significant role in constructing consumer identities. Mark and Pearson (2001, p. 32) note that brands use archetypes as a “software of the psyche” to create emotional connections with consumers by aligning

brand identity with internal values. Archetypes build subconscious bridges, enhancing emotional appeal (Kravchenko & Shanaieva-Tsymbal, 2023). While not inherently semiotic, archetypes shape the semiotic construction of both brand and consumer identities, with mythic characters and storylines forming a coherent whole in consumer texts (Caldwell et al., 2010, pp. 93–94; Thompson, 2004). Kravchenko et al. (2021) analyze how Apple's consumer identity evolved through archetypes such as the Explorer, Trickster, and Guardian, while Mark and Pearson (2001) attribute Nike's success to its foundation in the Hero archetype, which resonates with consumers' values of strength and courage.

In contemporary digital environments, consumer identity construction is further intensified by algorithmically curated content, influencer cultures, and AI-assisted personalization, which amplify the circulation of brand mythologies and contribute to the fragmentation and multiplicity of consumer selves across platforms (Arvidsson, 2006; Bauman, 2000; Couldry & Hepp, 2017; Khamis et al., 2017). This reinforces the fluid and situational character of identity emphasized in discourse-oriented approaches.

4.2 D-DISCOURSES: NATIONAL IDENTITY AS A DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCT

The construction of national identity, according to researchers, is based on master narratives rooted in symbolic structures of a usable past (Binbin et al., 2022; Sunstein, 1995). These narratives, shaped by the "semiotization" of the past, serve as symbolic resources for political purposes, including the creation of national identities. The meanings attributed to the past are influenced by social power and political mythology, which shape state history (Bourdieu, 1979, pp. 77–85), "expanding" the past from the perspective of the present. In line with social constructionist approaches and Stuart Hall's understanding of identity as discursively constructed through representation (1997b), national identity can be viewed as an ongoing process of narrativization, in which meanings of the past are continuously rearticulated in accordance with present sociopolitical contexts. In this vein, identity is explored through critical discourse analysis, semiotics, macro-narrative analysis, memory field theory, and the ethno-symbolic concept, emphasizing the role of ethnic symbols, myths, and values in nation formation (Smith, 2006, pp. 329–333). Dominant narratives invoke myths of common origin, a shared homeland, historical memories, "chosen injuries," and "chosen glory," reducing facts to symbolic archetypes.

Symbols, myths, and cultural codes are reinterpreted in accordance with the needs of national self-identification (Smith, 2006; Kravchenko & Yudenko, 2023) on the basis of "retrospective ethnicization" (Özkırımlı & Sofos, 2008, p. 9), with the identification of central and peripheral symbols that differ in their roles in the formation of group identity (Assmann & Czaplicka, 1995, p. 131; Binbin et al., 2022). National identity myths form "mythscapes," discursive realms where myths are forged, transmitted, and reconstructed (Bell, 2003, pp. 63–81). As a result, the formation of collective and national identities is based on textual resources (text communities), in which the thinking and actions of collectives are "rooted" (Wertsch, 2008).

In contemporary globalized and technologically mediated contexts, national identity is increasingly shaped by digital communication environments, where competing narratives circulate across transnational media spaces, social networks, and AI-generated content (Castells, 2009; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). This leads to both

the reinforcement and destabilization of national mythologies, intensifying tensions between cohesive identity narratives and their fragmentation in pluralistic discursive arenas.

The examination of macro-approaches to the construction of both national and consumer identities revealed that they are products of D-Discourses, shaped through mythologems, ideologemes, archetypes, and symbolic structures that are reworked by dominant Discourses and master narratives. This process utilizes a metalanguage in which signs acquire new meanings as carriers of mythological and mental concepts. As a result, reality is replaced by symbolic interpretations, allowing subjects to construct mythological images of themselves within the framework of norms established by Discourses.

4.3 IDENTITY AS A CONSTRUCT OF "SMALL d" DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

A significant contribution to the study of identity construction as an interactive process, through which people create new ways to describe and define themselves, has been made by positioning theory (Davies, & Harre, 1990; Siivonen, & Korhonen, 2024), conversation analysis (Antaki, 2013; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007), interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 2015), narrative analysis (Bamberg, 2011; Heikkinen, Keränen-Pantsu, 2024; Siivonen, & Korhonen, 2024), face theory (Arundale, 2024; Kravchenko & Pasternak, 2018; Spencer-Oatey, 2007). A common feature of these approaches is the understanding of identity construction based on alternative forms of self- and other-categorization, with a focus on which category is perceived as relevant by the participants in the interaction (Schegloff, 2007). These approaches also highlight the inherent connection between identity and the repertoire of enacted social or positional roles. This relationship is embodied in the concept of role identity (Kravchenko & Pasternak, 2018), which provides self-perception in the role, including the recognition of goals, values, beliefs, norms, and methods of interaction between relational roles.

Narrative approach (Heikkinen, & Keränen-Pantsu, 2024; Holmes, 2006; Siivonen, Korhonen, 2024) focuses on the microdiscursive features of the stories in order to tease out how identities are negotiated in the interaction. This approach focuses on exploring the potential of self-narratives to structure an individual's understanding of themselves (Bamberg et al., 2011; De Fina, 2003), thereby contributing to the narrator's identity. Self-understanding is achieved through self-interpretation and the reconstruction of one's life experiences, whereby the narrator highlights moments that hold personal significance. Identity is constructed around a "story" of the self: "through narrative identity, people convey to themselves and to others who they are now, how they came to be" (McAdams, & McLean, 2013, p. 232). To comprehend their identity, individuals turn to traditional storylines that help them structure life events and integrate them into a cohesive whole. These plots can be conveyed in the form of myths, fairy tales, or any other verbal or non-verbal medium, influencing a certain transformation of the narrator's identity by uniting the hero and the narrator into a single person with a shared consciousness. Narratives-in-interaction are explored in the communication of teenage drug addicts (Peley, 2002), with the identification of axes structuring the plot, such as "trust - distrust," "vulnerability – security"; women with autoimmune diseases (Laszlo, 2008), with an analysis of the roles played by the characters in the story (e.g. supporter, antagonist), etc.

Thus, narrative analysis contributes to identity theory by revealing how individuals become coherent and meaningful through their narrative work, constructing “versions of themselves” in conversation and storytelling. This approach emphasizes the fluidity, performativity, and inherent multiplicity of identity (Bamberg et al., 2011). Identity is understood as “not fixed or autonomous, but evolving as an unfinished story. We understand and construct ourselves as a narrative to explain ourselves to ourselves” (Rossiter, 1999, p. 62).

In contemporary technologically mediated interactional environments, such narrative construction is increasingly distributed across social media platforms and AI-assisted communicative systems, where identity formation is jointly shaped by users and digital platforms through content recommendations, AI-generated materials, and platform-mediated visibility that regulates what is seen and what remains invisible (Gillespie, 2018; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

A branch of narrative analysis is positioning theory (Davies, & Harré, 1990; Siivonen, Korhonen, 2024; Wetherell, 1998), which examines identities in the context of the relationship between local self-narratives and “basic” narratives – universal cultural scripts and intertextual storylines within which individuals consciously or subconsciously position themselves. An aspect of narrative identity analysis implies identifying how well the cultural scripts and associated roles of the participants are aligned. Roles involved in the understanding and construction of identity, are often linked with widely recognized cultural narratives, such as the macro-level narrative of miraculous transformation (Cinderella, The Ugly Duckling, etc.), stories of romantic love, or the cultural model of “Rocky,” representing masculine strength (often used in stories of "successful" men).

In digitally mediated communicative environments, it becomes more difficult for individuals to construct coherent identities, as digital platforms and AI systems shape the available ways of self-presentation (Turkle, 2011). Identity positioning is shaped by platform design and AI systems, which influence how individuals maintain a coherent sense of identity. This creates tensions between authentic self-expression and platform-influenced representations of identity.

Conversation analysis (Antaki, 2013; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007) focuses on the study of the interactional organization of discursive roles, or, in Sacks’ terms, categorical, operational, and relational identities. Mutual categorization encourages participants to continue the interaction, guiding its direction, or, conversely, deters further communication. Conclusions regarding the role differentiation of participants are based on observations of their communicative behavior, which changes depending on how membership identity categories are identified, maintained, ignored, or challenged by the participants during interaction.

In contemporary digital interaction, categorization practices are increasingly shaped by platform-specific visibility regimes and AI-generated cues (e.g., recommendations, predictive text, automated replies), which influence how participants recognize, maintain, or contest identity categories, thereby contributing to the fragmentation of interactional coherence across technologically mediated communicative spaces (Gillespie, 2018; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

In a number of studies, identity is closely linked to the concept of face as a public image of a person, formed through numerous interactions with other people. Spencer-Oatey (2007, p. 644) connects the concept of face with both the positively valued attributes that the speaker wants others to acknowledge (explicitly or implicitly) and the negatively valued attributes that the speaker wishes others not to ascribe to them. In this context, she distinguishes between identity face and quality

face (see also Kravchenko & Pasternak, 2018). Unlike quality face, which is based on individual roles that reveal personal “competence, abilities, appearance,” identity face correlates with social identities or roles, such as being a group leader, valued customer, or close friend.

In digitally mediated communication, face-work is increasingly shaped by algorithmic visibility and AI-mediated feedback loops, where authenticity is context-dependent and not stable, and where identity is constantly managed across different and fragmented online audiences (Turkle, 2011; Gillespie, 2018).

4.4 AN INTEGRATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON IDENTITY RESEARCH: THE POSSIBILITY OF INTEGRATING CONSTRUCTIONIST AND INTERACTIONIST APPROACHES

Both micro- and macro-approaches to identity studies have limitations. Micro-analysis, focused on specific actions or utterances, often overlooks the influence of broader social structures, cultural norms, and institutional practices, which shape identity by imposing values and expectations on local interactions. Conversely, macro-approaches, such as constructivist views of identity as a product of dominant discourses, can oversimplify the complex dynamics of self-identification. They may underestimate situational factors and individual agency, neglecting the variability and adaptability of identity in everyday interactions.

Attempts to overcome these limitations, in our view, are made within the frameworks of positioning theory, narrative analysis of interactions, and interactional sociolinguistics. For example, in Wetherell’s (1998) work on narrative analysis and positioning theory, the so-called genealogical or synthetic approach was developed. Specifically, in her analysis of interviews with groups of men aged 17-18, the researcher concludes that conversational analysis alone does not provide an answer to why a particular subject chooses a certain position within an interaction, it is also essential to identify normative sociocultural practices, values, and meaning-making processes through intertextual, historical, and synchronic analysis. In this particular case, the following sociocultural scenarios are drawn upon: “a repertoire revolving around alcohol and stimulants, a sexual ethics of legalized relationships oriented toward play and achievement” (Wetherell, 1998). At the same time, the narrators’ positions related to these scenarios, which influence their awareness of their own identity, are not passively ‘borrowed’ by participants in the interaction. Rather, they perform situational interactional work.

Theorists engaged in narrative analysis have reached similar conclusions. They note that narratives function as highly variable forms of mediation between personal "models" and generalized cultural canons (McAdams, & McLean, 2013), meaning they simultaneously serve as models of the self and models of the world. "A complex subject emerges from relational positioning with respect to both ‘master’ narratives and the local discursive context" (Swan & Linehan, 2001, p. 403-427). This implies the need to incorporate social constructionist views on identity, as the practice of storytelling relies on the circulation and transformation of discourses. Each new story is oriented toward a Discourse to which the listener is presumed to have ‘access,’ and which they recreate and update through the details specific to the story and the subject.

Interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 2015) focuses on how contextualization cues establish links between local interactional processes and the broader contexts that frame these processes and are indexed by them. Bringing in sociocultural

knowledge as a form of metapragmatic frames (allows one to determine “who” the interactants are and assess their social identity (Gumperz, 2015). Thus, interactional sociolinguistics integrates the local analysis of micro-interactions (such as conversations) with the macro-discursive level, which affects the ability to recognize contextualization cues and is shaped by differences in the sociocultural and institutional identities of the interactants. Gumperz provides compelling examples of how the cultural identity of British-resident South Asians interviewed prevents them from recognizing contextualization cues used by an English interviewer. Additionally, the South Asian candidates have been socialized in a way that leads them “to treat interviews as hierarchical encounters, where candidates are expected to show reluctance to dwell on personal likes or preferences and avoid giving the appearance of being too forward or assertive” (Gumperz, 2015). Both factors, in turn, hinder their ability to demonstrate their professional identity.

The possibility of integrating micro- and macro-analysis of identities, in our view, is embedded in Sacks’ work on Membership Categorization Devices (Sacks, 1992), which shows how shifts in membership within various social group categories can influence the "work of identity" for conversational partners. Categories are organized into sets of related groups – such as male / female, Buddhist / Catholic / Jew / Muslim / Protestant, American / Canadian / Danish / French, etc. (Schegloff, 2007). The names of these sets would be things like sex, age, race, religion. Accordingly, categories are used as pre-existing sets of knowledge, storing “a great deal of knowledge that members of a society have about the society” (Sacks, 1992, p. 40-41). Essentially, in accordance with Membership Categorization Devices, the choice of role identity is determined by the framing organization of categories as associatively linked actions and predicates that predict the communicative behavior of interaction participants. Accordingly, the work on categorization, discursively producing multiple identities, is determined not only by membership categorization underlying the local turn-taking, but also by macro-social structures, which are shaped by previous discourses and gain relevance in the conversation.

Thus, interactional sociolinguistics, micro-discursive narrative analysis, positioning theory, and conversational analysis, in its direction such as Sacks’ Membership Categorization Devices, can be viewed as integrative approaches to the analysis of identity construction. On the one hand, identity is seen as a result of the action of local discursive factors, taking into account dynamic processes of self-identification during interaction. On the other hand, the dynamics of identity at the micro-level are considered in connection with underlying cultural-informational processes, social, cultural, ethnic, and psychological parameters of self-identification and the identification of interactants.

CONCLUSION

Despite differing interdisciplinary approaches to identity studies, they share the understanding that identity is dynamic, variable, and discursive, constructed through both capital D-Discourses and d-discourses. In this study, constructionism is understood in its social form, which distinguishes it from psychological constructivism by emphasizing that identity is not an internal cognitive structure but a discursively produced phenomenon embedded in socio-cultural and historical contexts, in line with the perspectives of Foucault and Stuart Hall. In the discourse-constructionist view, identity is shaped by dominant discourses with world-modeling functions, while

the interactive perspective sees identity as a product of verbal interactions, where individuals self-allocate and categorize each other into identity categories. Macro-approaches to national and consumer identities reveal that these identities are constructed through D-discourses, shaped by mythologems, ideologemes, archetypes, and symbolic structures. These complexes are manipulated by dominant discourses and master-narratives, forming collective identities through a secondary semiotic system, where signs carry mythological and ideological meanings. This system allows individuals to construct mythologized images of themselves, based on ideological frameworks, suggesting that identities are not merely reflected in discourses but actively constructed through selective processes. Micro-approaches reveal that identity is emergent, relational, variable, and shaped by positionality and intersubjectivity. Micro-analysis often overlooks broader societal influences, while macro-approaches can overgeneralize, missing the complexity of local interactions and underestimating individual agency. Integrative methods like interactional sociolinguistics and positional theory bridge this gap by linking micro-level dynamics with broader social, cultural, and psychological processes.

In contemporary technologically mediated environments (2026), these dynamics are further complicated by the pervasive influence of social media platforms, algorithmic infrastructures, and AI-assisted communication systems. Such technologies intensify processes of digital fragmentation, where identity becomes distributed across multiple platform-specific contexts, and raise new challenges related to authenticity in virtual environments, where self-representation is continuously negotiated between user agency and algorithmic mediation. At the same time, technology-mediated globalization expands the circulation of discourses across transnational spaces, further destabilizing fixed identity categories and reinforcing their fluid and hybrid nature.

This study contributes to a comprehensive understanding of identity as shaped by both macro-discursive societal forces and micro-discursive interpersonal interactions. Future research is needed to explore how digital and globalized contexts continue to transform identity, especially in virtual and cross-cultural environments, and to develop advanced tools for analyzing identity fluidity in real-time discursive practices.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C. (2013). Conversation analysis and identity in interaction. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1000–1004). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0201

Arvidsson, A. (2006). *Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture*. Routledge.

Arundale, R. B. (2024). Facing differences in conceptualizing “Face” in everyday interacting. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *21*(4), 477–505. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2024-4001

Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, (65), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.2307/488538

Bamberg, M., De Fina, A., & Schiffrin, D. (2011). Discourse and identity construction. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.L. Vignoles (Eds.). *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 177-200). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_8

Bamberg, M. (2014). Narrative practices versus capital-D discourses: Ways of investigating family. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(1), 132–136. 10.1111/jftr.12033

Barthes, R. (1973). *Mythologies.* Paladin.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Polity Press.

Bell, D. S. A. (2003). Mythscapes: Memory, mythology, and national identity. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *54*(1), 63–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/0007131032000045905

Binbin, S., Kravchenko, N., & Matvieieva, S. (2022). Archaic archetypes and symbols of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples: To debunk the myth of a single people. *Amazonia Investiga*, *11*(59), 184–193. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.59.11.17

Bourdıeu, P. (1979). Symbolic Power. *Critique of Anthropology, 4*(13–14), 77–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275x7900401307

Boyd, D. (2015). *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. Yale University Press.

Bucher, T. (2018). *If...Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4–5), 585–614. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407

Caldwell, M., Henry, P., & Alman, A. (2010). Constructing audio-visual representations of consumer archetypes. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *13*(1), 84–96. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522751011013990

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press.

Couldry, N., & Hepp, N. (2017). *The Mediated Construction of Reality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x

De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in Narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. John Benjamins.

Elliott, R. (2004). Consumption as a symbolic vocabulary for the construction of identity. In K. Ekström, & H. Brembeck (Eds.) *Elusive Consumption* (pp. 129-140). Berg Publishers.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. Norton.

Fairclough, N. (1993). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.). *Untying the text: A poststructuralist reader* (pp. 48-78). Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003535935

Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. Yale University Press.

Grant, D., Keenoy, T., & Oswick, C. (1998). *Discourse and Organization*. Sage. Skelton.

Gumperz, J. J. (2015). Interactional Sociolinguistics. A Personal Perspective. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 309-323). John Wiley & Sons.

Hall, S. (1997a). Introduction: Who Needs “Identity”?. In S. Hall, & P. D. Gay (Eds.). *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1–17). London Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1997b). The work of representation. In HALL, S. (Org.). *Representation: cultural representation and cultural signifying practices* (pp. 13-74). Thousand Oaks; Sage.

Heikkinen, H. L. T., & Keränen-Pantsu, L. (2024). Making Sense of Narrativity. In E. K. Hyry-Beihammer, O. Ylitapio-Mäntylä, M. Uitto (Eds.). *Narratives in Educationa l Research. Methodological Perspectives* (pp. 179-200). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68350-3_11

Holmes, J. (2006). Workplace narratives, professional identity and relational practice. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.). *Discourse and Identity* (pp. 166–87). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511584459.009

Kartik, D., Willis, R., & Jones, C. (2016). Consumer identity and marketing implications: I ndian urban youth. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *40*(4), 435–443. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12267

Khamis, S., Ang, L., & Welling, R. (2017). Self-branding, ‘micro-celebrity’ and the rise of Social Media Influencers. *Celebrity Studies*, *8*(2), 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2016.1218292

Kravchenko, N., Zhykharieva, O., & Letunovska, I. (2024). Semiotics of Harley-Davidson advertising through stylistics and pragmatics: The concept of Freedom in constructing target consumer identity. *Revista Univap*, *30*(65). https://doi.org/10.18066/revistaunivap.v30i65.4526

Kravchenko, N., & Yudenko, O. (2023). Identity search: From divided to pro-European Ukrainian identity. *Selected Papers of the V International Conference on European Dimensions of Sustainable Development* (pp. 245–253). https://doi.org/10.24263/EDSD-2023-5-26

Kravchenko, N., Prokopchuk, M., Bondarenko, E., Korniiko, I., & Moyseyenko, I. (2023). An ideational level of Ukrainian counterpropaganda: The communicative-discursive dimension. *Amazonia Investiga*, *12*(66), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.66.06.4

Kravchenko, N., & Shanaieva-Tsymbal, L. (2023). Multimodal Ukrainian Brand Narrative: Semiotics, Structure, Archetypes. *Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University*. *Series "Philological Sciences*, *2*(26/2), 27-44. DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-2

Kravchenko, N., Valigura, O., Meleshchenko, V., & Chernii, L. (2021). “Simplicity is the ultimate sophistication” or half a century of IT consumer identity formation: A pragmatics approach: 141-169 [Application/pdf]. *Token: A Journal of English Linguistics*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.25951/4824

Kravchenko, N., & Pasternak, T. (2018). Claim for identity or personality face: The Oscar winners’ dilemma. *Lege Artis*, *3*(1), 142–178. https://doi.org/10.2478/lart-2018-0005

Laszlo, J. (2008). *The Science of Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Psychology*. Routledge.

Mark, M., & Pearson, C. (2001). *The Hero and the Out-law: Building Extraordinary Brands through the Power of Archetypes*. McGraw-Hill.

McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative Identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(3), 233–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413475622

McAdams, D. P. (2011). Narrative Identity. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Org.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research* (p. 99–115). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_5

Morales-López, E., & Floyd, A. (Org.). (2017). *Developing New Identities in Social Conflicts: Constructivist Perspectives* (V. 71). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.71

Muniz, A. M., & O’Guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand Community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *27*(4), 412–432. https://doi.org/10.1086/319618

Özkırımlı, U., & Sofos, S. (2008). *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. Oxford University Press.

Peley, B. (2002). Narrative psychological study of self and object representations with young deviant people. In J. Laszlo, & W.S. Rogers (Eds.) *Narrative Approaches to Social Psychology* (pp. 125-147). New Mandate.

Rossiter, M. (1999). A Narrative Approach to Development: Implications for Adult Education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *50*(1), 56–71.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (vol. 1 & 2). Basil Blackwel.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, *9*(4), 433–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607079162

Seymour-Smith, S., Wetherell, M., & Phoenix, A. (2002). Accounts of men's use of general practitioners 'My wife ordered me to come!': A discursive analysis of doctors' and nurses' accounts of men's use of general practitioners. *Health Psychology*, 7(3), 253-267.

Siivonen, P., & Korhonen, M. (2024). Accounts of Ruptures and Narrative Positioning in Qualitative Follow-Up Research. In E. K. Hyry-Beihammer, O. Ylitapio-Mäntylä, & M. Uitto (Org.), *Narratives in Educational Research* (p. 33–49). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68350-3_3

Smith, A. D. (2006). Epilogue: The Power of Ethnic Traditions in the Modern World. In A. Leoussi, & S. Grosby (Eds.). *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations* (pp. 325-336). Edinburgh University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(4), 639–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.12.004

Sugimura, K., Gmelin, J. O. H., van der Gaag, M. A. E., & Kunnen, E. S. (2021). Exploring Exploration: Identity Exploration in Real-Time Interactions among Peers. *Identity, 22*(1), 17–34.

Sunstein, C. R. (1995). The Idea of a Useable Past. *Columbia Law Review*, *95*(3), 601-608. https://doi.org/10.2307/1123225

Swan, C., & Linehan, C. (2001). Positioning as a means of understanding the narrative construction of self: A story of lesbian escorting. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10 (2), 403-427.

Thompson, C. J. (2004). Marketplace Mythology and Discourses of Power. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *31*(1), 162–180. https://doi.org/10.1086/383432

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other.* Basic Books, Hachette Book Group.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse & Society, 9*(3), 387–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005

Wertsch, J. V. (2008). Blank Spots in Collective Memory: A Case Study of Russia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *617*(1), 58–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207312870