

Specific character and structural features of human identity

Jamilya N. Nurmanbetova¹

¹ L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

¹ jamilya_nur@mail.ru

Abstract

This article is devoted to the present-day theoretical discourse on human identity and its architectonics via a number of humanitarian research methods, such as source analysis of the literature on the subject. Deep theoretical analysis showed that all types of identity (both in objective reality and in the subjective world) logically included in hierarchical structures, were always axiologically determined and corresponded to fixed cultural values. As a conclusion, the ability to relate the self-esteem to social assessment in a proper way requires significant development of thought and may indicate the high potential of identity development.

Keywords: Identity, Self-Identification, Identification, Identifying, Logic.

Carácter específico y características estructurales de la identidad humana

Resumen

Este artículo está dedicado al discurso teórico actual sobre la identidad humana y su arquitectura a través de varios métodos de investigación humanitaria, como el análisis de fuentes de la literatura sobre el tema. El análisis teórico profundo demostró que todos los tipos de identidad (tanto en la realidad objetiva como en el mundo subjetivo) incluidas lógicamente en las estructuras jerárquicas, siempre estaban determinadas axiológicamente y correspondían a valores culturales fijos. Como conclusión, la capacidad de relacionar la autoestima con la evaluación social de manera adecuada requiere un desarrollo significativo del pensamiento y puede indicar el alto potencial del desarrollo de la identidad.

Palabras clave: Identidad, Autoidentificación, Identificación, Identificación, Lógica.

1. Introduction

The human identity issue was first formulated and set up by an American psychologist and anthropologist Erikson (1994) is in his studies referring to psychological mechanisms of self-identification. At that time, human identity was determined by speculative theories, based on authoritative tell-all sources. It turned out that in the case doctrinal principles of various faiths and ideologies were questioned by rational criticism and relativistic reevaluation, the issues of identity and

personal self-identification shifted to human everyday existence. Erikson considered that identity concepts were rather in daily thinking of people from different countries, in the stylistic features of their everyday life language, let alone their emergence in the caricatures that reflect intellectual fashion (Erikson, 1975). Further, the identity problem was widely discussed in the Western socio-humanitarian disciplines in the second half of 1960s, since the personal need to understand one's own identity was considered as vital and imperative. Thus, if a person does not find a way to satisfy such a demand, people will not be mentally healthy (Fromm, 1995).

Current identity crisis, as well as pressing psychotherapeutic tasks, encourages the researchers to rethink the old versions and approaches to understanding the term identity with all related aspects of human life. However, people have to understand the background of this term in order to understand their own identity. Certain contradictions arise already while matching the origin of this term with its meaning (Pavlova, 2001). There is no unified view on identity in modern social philosophy, sociology and psychology. In this respect, the Academic Board of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences organized a philosophical competition on *The Man in the Maze of Identities*; its results were approved by the Board on April 28, 2009 and published in 2010. According to one of the participants, the concept identity is not as obvious as it may seem (Trufanova, 2010). The purpose of this article is to study and to analyze different definitions of the term identity and to determine its original understanding; to extend the studied aspects of identity; to find correlation between the subjective personal identity and his or her social status; to study current structures of identities; to determine the nature and components of identity crisis.

2. Materials and methods

The authors of this research used a number of humanitarian research methods, such as source analysis of the literature on the subject, content analysis and study of contextual features related to identity structure in the works of other authors, linguistic analysis of philosophical terminology.

3. Results

3.1. Identity and Sameness

Initially, the term identity and the German term *Identität* were translated into Russian as sameness. This substantially mutilated the understanding of the Roman-German studies. It was impossible to understand that M. Heidegger's *Identity and Difference* contained the same concept, which was developed by F. W. J. Schelling's *Philosophy of Identity* and the identity thinking criticism by Adorno and Horkheimer was associated with the problem of identity in sociological and socio-philosophical literature of 1970 - 80s; although, this concept referred to the same term in all these cases. This phenomenon is well supported by the fact that in the previously mentioned quotation of E. Fromm on the need to understand identity, its other translation contains sameness, in contrast to identity (Fromm, 1995).

In today's Russian socio-philosophical, sociological and psychological literature, the terms identity and sameness are independently used as if they have nothing to do with each other – the so-called added validity effect. This effect consists in exaggerated expectations of a foreign word, assigning some special significance to it. This, in turn, is associated with its incorrect use. In order to understand the sense of introducing the term identity along with sameness by the Russian-speaking researchers, one should appeal to the logic substantiating these concepts instead of discussing their meanings.

There are two types of logic: the first goes back to Aristotle and it is called formal logic; the second one is dialectical logic, most fully represented in Hegel's philosophy (Hegel, 2010). Formal logic, along with all its modifications, which appeared in the twentieth century, is based on the law of contradiction – it is impossible that the same feature belongs and does not belong to the same thing at the same time and in the same respect (Aristotle, 1975). Namely, thinking correctly means avoiding contradictions: nobody can believe that the same thing can (and cannot at the same time) exist (Aristotle, 1975). The law of identity ($A = A$) and the law of excluded middle are the two forms of the law of contradiction.

In dialectical logic, contradiction (substantive, not formal) is one of the main categories. The contradiction is the elevation of mind over the limited reason as well as its removal (Hegel, 1970); contradiction is the root of movement and vitality; just because something is characterized by contradiction, it is moving; it has motivation and it is active (Hegel, 1971). Contradiction is a criterion of truth, the absence of contradiction is a misdeed criterion (Hegel, 1970). In dialectical logic, sameness is understood differently compared to formal logic. In order to understand the actual meaning of sameness, one should understand it not only as an abstract identity, which excludes difference (Hegel, 1974). This is a specific identity, expressed by the formula A and not \bar{A} . In dialectical logic, there is a concept of sameness of sameness and non-sameness (Hegel, 1970), in other words, the sameness of opposites.

In modern social philosophy, sociology and psychology, the term identity is interpreted differently. There is a definition that identity is a correlation of something (that exists) with itself in consistency and continuity of its own variation, which is conceivable in this respect (by an observer, who tells about it to himself/ herself and to others with a view to confirm its self-equality (Abushenko, 2002). However, along with identity one can notice the concept of sameness in the cited text: from the logical perspective, identity is inextricably linked with the concept of sameness. This interrelation is clearly apparent in the context of their use within the philosophical framework (Abushenko, 2002). Thus, the translation of the same term generated two different notions.

Taking a closer look at the reasons for divarication of a single concept, one can see that in fact, identity and sameness are similar in terms of philosophy and the relevant term was translated into Russian as sameness. However, in socio-humanitarian disciplines, as well as in psychology, the sameness-identity problem was solved without regard to philosophy. The term identity in social and human sciences (cultural anthropology, sociology, and social psychology) was used in parallel to philosophy for a long time. In psychology and psychiatry, the first researchers dealing with identity did not use the term identity as well. Instead, they used the term self. The term identity was widespread and introduced into scientific discourse approximately in mid – late 1970s. The term identity was added to the dictionary of the social sciences and humanities. In 1980s, the flow of research works with the word identity as a heading was quite substantial. Identity became a kind of jargon, which unconscious use was normal in scientific and political journalism. Thus, while translating Western studies (that have never been translated into Russian before) the translators gave the term identity a meaning that was allegedly different from the meaning of the term sameness. Identity was defined as a category of social and human sciences (psychology, social philosophy, cultural anthropology, social psychology) used to describe individuals and groups as relatively stable, self-identified unities.

However, the important aspect is to understand what kind of logic and interpretation of sameness are foundations of identity. Another question is how modern social philosophy, sociology and psychology explains it. The only explanation is as follows: identity is based on formal logic – whatever form it may take – and the concept of identity, generated pursuant to this logic. In this logic, the definition of sameness is expressed in the following way: everything is self-equal, $A = A$; or

negatively: A cannot be A and not A at the same time (Hegel, 1971). Positive character of this response is explained by the fact that the concept of identity is used in social philosophy and sociology with the view of setting and solving the problem that is completely different from the one that requires a dialectical logic. Here, the phenomena $A = A$ (Who am I? etc) and A is not non-A (I am not him/her, etc.) coexist, but never coincide. $A = A$ is more important for a person or any other group, and only secondarily, an individual identifies itself with non-A, when non-A is B, C etc. Thus, we put the concept of identity in social sciences into the framework of traditional formal logic (Aristotelian logic).

3.2. Identity, Identification and Identifying

Identification is unification, correlation with a certain standard or a model. Accordingly, to identify means to establish the coincidence, identity of objects. Therefore, identity is the result of identification. It presents self-consciousness of a person or a group, which is a product of self-identification, understanding that a person has specific features that distinguish him from other people and us from them. Identity is inherent even in a newborn – it is determined by such features as gender, name, parents, and citizenship. Identity is important because it determines personal behavior. If I consider myself a scientist, I will act according to this representation (Huntington, 2004)*. One cannot fully agree with everything in this definition. In particular, we cannot reduce identity to the form of self-awareness and self-identification based on self-awareness. Identification should have some objective basis – the objective socio-cultural reality.

There are the actual identities and non-identities that are determined by consciousness, becoming its achievement.

This refers to the fact that identities generally present certain constructs. People construct their own identities at will, by necessity or under duress; individuals tend to change their identities (Huntington, 2004). Such statements are determined by the fact that identity is understood only as a product of consciousness. In spite of the above definitions, identity presents a result of identification, which cannot be directed by the subject only to himself/herself – the person who identifies. It is also determined by his/her relationships with other people. One can argue that identity is defined in three ways:

- * By relation to oneself (self-identity);
- * By relations between different individuals, groups, etc. (identification from outside, this is a negative identity: the subject of identification is a different person, etc.);
- * By belonging to a certain unity (ethnic group, nation, party, state, etc.), as a definition of identification / self-identification in terms of this unity.

However, these results present three types of identity and self-identification; at the same time, one should consider three aspects of a single identity and not three separate phenomena that are not correlated with each other. People or groups can emphasize or concentrate on only one aspect of identity. This proves the fact that social philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, consider the term identity more appropriate than the term sameness.

3.4. Identity and multi-identity

Keeping in mind the suggested understanding of identity one cannot agree with the following statement: there are many identifications, however, there is a single identity (Trufanova 2010). After

* Objectively, this may not coincide: he/she may be a scientist in his/her conceit, but not in reality

all, provided the existence of a single identity, all possible identification processes and their results, except for one or several, will be a rat race. What is the point then? Nevertheless, the previously mentioned three definitions of identify provide three different aspects of identity that do not contradict each other.

This statement is based on the interpretation of identity only as a phenomenon of consciousness. There are many other definitions of identity. However, the main point here is that identity is a sequence of human mental life (Trufanova, 2010). Identity is correlated with human consciousness – the sense of identity (Trufanova, 2010). Phenomenological sociology correlates the phenomenon of identity with subjective reality: identity, of course, is a key element of subjective reality (Berger and Luckman, 1995). There is only one observation related to this viewpoint: one can speak about awareness of identity and a sense of identity, but there are objective identities as well.

The concept of identity is also known to cover the entire reality; there are two different types of identity: formal and real. Formal identity presents the quality of each object (including abstract objects, such as numbers) and a prerequisite for any theory referring to these objects. The real identity referring to objects or living beings is much more complicated. If identity is a typical phenomenon of human existence, it can provide a person with everything what has the group of individuals, with which he or she identifies himself (herself), which unity he or she is going through. Identity allows the individual to assume a part of advantages and benefits that has the object of identification. Therefore, identity may become the result a personal demand for a more successful and safe life. Thus, the semantic field of identity includes the concept of choice being formed with regard to individual attitude to the evaluated object. In the case of self-identification of an individual with his/her object, the relationship is a strong link filled with a positive evaluation. A person will never identify himself/herself with a negative assessment – he or she will have to change the assessment first (from negative to positive). This proves that real identity is inherent only in empirical objects, and has different forms depending on the ontological status of a particular object. A stone is identical to itself in a different way compared to a human body, personality or institute (Hösle, 1994). Thus, a stone as an abstract object cannot experience any identity crisis.

In these cases, the concept of sameness is more suitable (in the Russian philosophical tradition) than the concept of identity or, as in our case with the stone – the real sameness. The latter can be applied only to the human world. Thus, any person, any group and any community has numerous identities. Every person has at least several identities. Therefore, he/she has multi-identity. In this respect, one has to distinguish the subjective and objective identities. The object identity is formed in actual human activity in the context of his/her socio-cultural reality. Subjective identity that should be called self-identity is the result of self-identification, awareness and understanding of one's own identity. Therefore, proceeding from this viewpoint, there are objective identification processes and subjective self-identification processes in the socio-cultural reality.

Subjective identities are related to personalities and groups; the objective ones refer to society as a whole. Of course, this public unity does not exist beyond personalities and groups. It is a product of human interaction. Society does not consist of personalities, but reflects their connections and relationships. However, the community is alienated to some extent in relation to personalities that have formed it. This happened for thousands of years from the time of archaic-to-postarchaic transition. This unity is structured in a certain form. One can distinguish the institutional level (system of social institutions, led by the state) and the level of daily individual activities. The first rises above the second. People are grouped into classes, categories, clans, professional, religious and other communities.

3.5. Identity and self-determination

Identity is subject to continuous development; therefore, it becomes clear that self-determination is an immediate mechanism of identity realization. Each individual occupies a certain position in society, a kind of niche. In traditional societies, people tend to occupy a lifelong niche. In modern society, characterized by a high horizontal and vertical mobility, they can change it quite often. According to current social stratification, a certain grid of identities has already been formed in society. Therefore, each person objectively has a particular set of identities referring to property, ethnic groups, religious beliefs, etc. Even newborns, who also have a certain identity, appear in a socio-cultural reality, structured in a certain way before their appearance, with a specific grid of identities. A person by the very fact of his or her birth, regardless of his or her mind falls under particular identities. Some of his or her identities will change, others will replace them, and particular ones will remain until the end of life. Not everything in these changes depends only on the person or community, to which he or she belongs.

Subjective identities are products of identification and self-identification, carried out by a person or by a particular community. They can both coincide and not coincide with their denotations – objective identities. Furthermore, the range of subjective identities is usually much wider than the range of objective identities. Any socio-cultural reality is characterized by not only social institutions, classes, nations and professions. This reality also contains such abstractions as good and evil, beauty and ugliness, honesty and conscience. There are some relatively fixed generalized patterns of vices and virtues. Every culture, including the archaic one, has a very definite image of a man in its positive and negative forms. Positive image of a person appears as a human canon - the image of the ideal man, according to the values of a certain culture, referring to behavior and action of any society member in social and individual consciousness. Negative human image in the public consciousness is the image of man with unacceptable features, according to apparent cultural values.

Further specification of the human image and canon is related to the age and gender. According to age characteristics, culture provides a certain image of childhood in terms of periodization. The images of men and women are formed according to gender characteristics. Naturally, both childhood and gender images have both positive and negative features. The childhood image also acquires a gender dimension. Consequently, there are positive and negative images of a boy, a girl, a teenager, teenage boys and girls. All this is characterized by a cultural-historical, ethno-cultural and (or) national-cultural certainty. The age stratification of society was and still is important not only for personalities, but for the entire social being in general. In this case, adult personality has been and continues to be an assessment scale and standard of various stages of personality development and formation (socialization or culturalization). Age and gender characteristics also are indicators of both subjective and objective identification and identity. Subjective identity, or self-identity, is a structural element of personal identity. This process implies choosing one's own position, objectives and means of self-realization under particular life circumstances; it is the main mechanism for gaining and manifesting human freedom.

The question regarding self-identification as the main mechanism for gaining and manifesting human freedom is disputable since it is not clear what type of freedom is meant – internal or external. Personal identity can be considered as a mechanism for gaining and manifesting only the internal, rather than external freedom. The mechanisms for gaining and manifesting the latter are quite different. In this case, personal identity is not equal to self-identification; it is one of its last stages. One has to define his or her objective identity (in all three previously mentioned aspects) and to conduct self-identification in order to determine his or her own position in life, goals, values, etc.

Further stages of personal identity (their validity) depend on how the person identifies himself (herself), how he/she authentically recreates his or her objective identity in mind.

3.6. Identity Structure

The problem of identity deserves special attention and study. Currently, there are several viewpoints. For example, one should note an attempt to describe the overall structure of identities based on the dialectics referring to the general, special and single. A person is considered in the structure of philosophical categories general – special – single, and represented as:

- a) Humankind in general and universal values in each representative of humankind;
- b) Specific community (racial, ethnic, class, religious, gender, age, characterological etc.) and manifestations of this community in particular people;
- c) An individual in a particular uniqueness of his or her real existence. This three-tier structure is, apparently, one of the most important universals of human existence and identity.

This structure is obviously the most common structure of identity as belonging and self-identification understood in terms of belonging. It is built on the principle of hierarchy – from the single (personality) through the special (certain community) to the general (humankind). However, this structure can be overturned. In this case, the general will be a universal basis; the special will be a way of its specification; the single will be an abstract point of the general and a specific moment of the special.

There is also a hierarchical structure of identities that cannot be turned. In other words, there are different levels of self-identification. For example, a citizen of Rome may characterize himself/herself as a Roman, an Italian, a Catholic, a Christian, a European, a man of the Western world. Civilization is the broadest level of community with which he/she identifies himself/herself (Huntington, 1994). However, this structure can be extended: an individual can be put before the citizen of Rome, and humankind – after civilization. Thus, the structure will be complete.

There is an identity structure, named as identity sources.

People have a rich, almost limitless range of possible identity sources. The most important among them are:

1. Ascriptive – age, sex, blood relation, ethnicity and race;
2. Cultural – clan, tribe, language, nation, religion and civilization;
3. Territorial – surroundings, village, city, province, state, region, climate zone, continent, hemisphere;
4. Political – faction and party (in a broad sense – from cliques to social movements), loyalty to the leader, groups of interests, ideology, interests of the state;
5. Economic – job, profession, position, work location, employers, branches, economic sectors, trade unions, classes, states;
6. Social – friends, clubs, teams, colleagues, companies for entertainment, social status.

Any person is inevitably involved in a number of the above groups, but this does not mean that they become the source of his or her identity (Huntington 2004).

This structure hardly can be called strictly hierarchical. It is rather a list. For instance, territorial identity cannot be above the cultural one. Besides, one should distinguish sex that really belongs to ascriptive identity and gender (socio-cultural phenomenon, which is not purely natural, and thus should be attributed to the cultural level). Real identity cannot always be found within these classes of identities. This is the case of ascriptive identities. Territorial and economic identities are the only categories with a strict hierarchy. Obviously, this is how objective identities should be perceived:

some of them are aligned in a hierarchal format, while the others are placed horizontally, within the same area.

There is a structure of identities as well, which is horizontal in contrast to the previously mentioned structures. Social space can be defined as a set of identity matrices (political, ethnic, civic, cultural, etc.). Each of them represents a specific set of certain markers, indicators, signs, rules and conventions, which determine axiological, behavioral, status and role-related and other functions of the social subject. These matrices distinguish identity of this subject – the awareness of belonging to a particular social group or community, learning certain concepts related to specific features, values and life purposes, regulatory and behavioral norms of community or group, with whom he or she identifies himself (herself), as well as formation of adequate interests (Malinin, 2001).

However, all types of identities (both objective and subjective) are always structured to a certain extent, both horizontally and vertically. The vertical structure is subject to hierarchy. At the same time, each hierarchical level contains several identities. They are informative, but there are formal identities among them; these identities are essential, and therefore, constant and irremovable. Territorial identities refer to another type of formal identities. Any person lives on a certain territory, which is part of another territory, and both of them are part of the third one, which is vaster, etc. This set may also include economic identities. This type of formal identities differs from the first one, since a person can change his or her territorial or economic identity. The same refers to some other identities being part of other systems.

However, the authors cited above do not consider the most significant moment – both objective and subjective identities usually contain values that can be determined. Thus, all of them (or almost all of them) are arranged pursuant to value hierarchy and each identity occupies a certain position. These values can be either picked up from other people in a particular community or society, or formed by a person himself/herself. Therefore, one identity may be more important compared to others. Value status of identities and self-identities is not given once and for all. It may vary depending on various social conditions and factors. At that, values and their hierarchy, approved by a public unity, do not necessarily coincide with the subjective scale of personal values. A person or community can assess their objective identities differently. Society, especially related to personalities or communities, according to the principle of helpfulness, can qualify certain real identities as positive and valuable, and others – as negative and undesirable or even harmful. However, individuals or communities may assess the same objective identities in an opposite way. After all, some of these identities can humiliate the person or community. Thus, the latter might be ashamed of them.

Therefore, in the post-Soviet socio-cultural space, at least during the first decade, ethnic (and national) identity became individually and socially relevant. It became almost the main value. Behind the scenes and partly publicly, the highest value is attributed to the so-called titular nation, while non-titular ethnic groups occupy a position close to rogue groups. Under such circumstances, this identity also becomes an object of public policy. One can witness a phenomenon of an appeal to identity, which is primarily a rejection of social roles. In addition to the appeal to identity, there is also a phenomenon of imposed or perceived identity. In other words, identity can be imposed and perceived for any purpose. In this case, one can witness a contradiction between the external and internal, between the form and content, between appearance and essence. Identity is broken, and personal identity is destroyed. Thus, there is an identity crisis (Gurin, 2009).

3.7. Identity crisis

Presently, Identity crisis is a common phenomenon in the modern world. Complexity of identity and its multi-level character does not necessarily lead to its crisis. However, none of the fully developed identities can be accomplished without being able to overcome such a crisis. During identity crisis, an individual can control the positioning of his/her identities. Defining identity as a construct, one should keep in mind that not all identities present such constructs. This refers only to those subjective identities that are imaginary, illusory, existing only in the human imagination. They are designed by individuals as certain protective charms, through which they subjectively oppose various life situations.

In emphasizing personal identity, it becomes clear that the attitude to oneself is especially important in order to achieve personal identity (Hösle, 1994). This distinguishes the ego and the self. Despite the fact that ego-subject and ego-object are identical, they still have to be distinguished from each other. Let us call the first side of personality the ego and the second side - the self. It is difficult to understand the principle of individuation— whether it is the ego or the self. On the one hand, the very ego attributes the self. In this sense, ego is the exclusive principle. On the other hand, this formal feature is inherent in all egos: the difference between them is determined by the difference between the selves, which, consequently, may also define ways, by which single egos perform their functions. It is extremely important to understand that the difference between the ego and the self is relative. The ego is the observer; the self is the observed phenomenon (Hösle, 1994). Each self has its own ego. Therefore, a person cannot change his/her self. Ego has descriptive and normative models, related not only to other people, but also to its own self. The well-minded learning of one's self through the ego requires harmony between these two images. A reasonable normative image of the self should satisfy two conditions. It should not contradict the universal norms; any contradiction makes the identity of the self-parasitic (Hösle, 1994).

The identity crisis is defined as a specific relationship between the ego and the self: its essence lies in the rejection of the self by the ego (Hösle 1994). This determines the existential escape from oneself. There are several reasons for this, which can be built in a hierarchical order, constituting the architectonics of the identity crisis. This is the crisis of individual identity. It also concerns the crisis of collective identity. It lies in reducing identification of individuals with a collective reality, which they previously supported (Hösle, 1994). Firstly, the ego is unable to identify itself with its own body. The reason does not lie only in sudden changes in the body determined by natural or critical reasons – sexual maturation, severe physical injuries after accidents, etc. The ego can be alienated from a human body at birth for various reasons. This condition can provoke crises retarding self-identification at the very first stages. However, the axiological component is the primary one even in this case, because the ego is unable to identify itself with its own body since it is unable to fit its own aspirations and needs in the framework of value standards prevailing in society.

Memory loss in various forms is the second common feature of identity crisis. Personality lives in the present; however, it takes all meaningful information about itself from the past. One could even say that the past provides a framework for personality development. Speaking about identity crisis and the value mechanisms for such a purposeful oblivion, one can assert that oblivion on the one hand is really beneficial and necessary: consciousness, which cannot forget anything, would live only in the past; consciousness can focus on the future only by destroying the least comfortable part of the past. On the other hand, oblivion related to something that continues to define thoughts and behavior means that the self is incomprehensible for the ego and this cannot be the basis of a reasonable identity (Hösle, 1994). Accordingly, the memory of one person and the historical memory of peoples keeps

only what is useful for a better future; it does not record the entire amount of certain endless and fragmented facts.

Alienation in relation to one's own self is another very important reason for identity crisis, caused by a conflict between the self and its normative image. In this case, identity crisis gradually shifts from psychology to the social sphere. It is almost impossible to imagine a human being, remaining deaf to the voice of conscience. While facing such an obstacle, the person will eventually become aware of its ghost character. However, being pushed by a desire for freedom a person can take the path of absolute immorality. Initially, this may seem radical, but the only possible way out of the crisis. However, this will only deepen the identity gap.

Finally, in the social sphere, the identity crisis is reflected in disharmony between the actual ego and social ego. In the case of the normative image of the self, an individual actually beholds and judges himself/herself. However, in this case, a person is looking in the mirror of assessments, given by others. Accordingly, personal axiology was acting as a judge in the first case and a person was forced to relate himself/herself with social value standards and attitudes that she or he cannot change in the second case. Low estimates as well as high estimates, provided by society, are the seeds of the identity crisis. Especially if the condemnation or praise is expressed by bystanders without deep moral substantiation. At the same time, everything largely depends on the personal perception of these estimates. After all, we are not dealing with a true greatness in all of the mentioned cases. People cannot underestimate the influence of a motive to change one's own negative (or confirm the positive) social image, even if it is initially true. In this case, one can consider high potential of identity development that is the best way out of this kind of the identity crisis. The identity crisis is painful – it is the most painful experience of life (Hösle, 1994). The successfully overcome identity crisis is an important moment in the well-developed identity (Hösle, 1994). The crisis of value-based fundamental (either at present or in general) identities and self-identities is the most dramatic event in human life.

4. Conclusion

Based on the original research and related works, it was determined that: logic and interpretation of the concept of sameness, developed in formal logic, are the base of identity, as it is understood in modern social philosophy, sociology, psychology;

Identity is a result of identification, which cannot be directed by the subject only to himself/herself; it is also determined by his or her relationship to other people;

Objective identities do exist;

Each person has at least several identities (multi-identity);

All identities are structured both horizontally and vertically – by hierarchy;

Identity structure contains complexes of identities;

All identities existing in reality and in the subjective world are structured in a hierarchical way; they are determined by the values and interrelate with value standards prevailing in culture.

Identity crisis covers different levels of identity structure – from biological to social. At that, the axiological factor (the contradiction between personal value orientations and socially accepted norms) is the basis of an identity crisis at all structure levels.

Thus, the ability to relate the self-esteem to social assessment in a proper way requires significant development of thought and may indicate high potential of identity development.

Research results can be used in further development and improvement of identity conception for overcoming the identity crisis of the XXI century, based on nonlinear socio-cultural society (Baer, 2016). They can be used to study identity as an internal aspect of multiculturalism, with the view of finding and building identity concepts in different types of mass media texts; in order to rethink the concept of personal identity in modern society. Research results can also be used to find more profound theoretical generalizations in the field of group identity conception.

References

ABUSHENKO, V. 2002. **Identity. The History of Philosophy. Encyclopedia.** Minsk: Publishing House Knizhnyj Dom. Pp. 383 - 388. Russia.

ARISTOTLE, A. 1975. **Metaphysics.** Collection of Writings in 4 Volumes. M. Thought. Vol. 1. pp. 363 - 367. USA.

BAER, B. 2016. **Other Russias: Homosexuality and the crisis of post-Soviet identity.** Springer, Germany.

BERGER, P., and LUCKMANN, T. 1995. **The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge.** Moscow: Publishing House Academia-Center, Medium, P. 321. Russia.

Erikson, E. 1975. **Life history and historical moment.** New York: Norton. USA.

ERIKSON, E. 1994. **Identity: Youth and crisis.** WW Norton & Company. N° 7. USA.

FROMM, E. 1995. **The Human Situation – The Key to Humanistic Psychoanalysis.** The Human Situation. Moscow: SMYSL Publisher, pp. 7 – 69. Russia.

FROMM, E. 1995. **The Sane Society. Psychoanalysis and Culture: Selected Works by Karen Horney and Erich Fromm.** Moscow: Publishing House Yurist, pp. 273 - 596. Russia.

GURIN, S. 2009. **The Philosophy of Identity. Online Journal for Philosophical and Cultural Studies Topos.** <http://topos.ru/article/6727>. Germany.

HEGEL, G. 1970. **Philosophical Dissertation on the Orbits of the Planets. Works of different years.** Russian translation. Moscow, Thought. Vol.1. Pp. 235 – 265. Russia.

HEGEL, G. 1970. **Wissenschaft der Logik.** Russian translation. Moscow, Thought. Vol. 1. Pp. 501. Russia.

HEGEL, G. 1971. **Wissenschaft der Logik.** Russian translation. Moscow, Thought, p. 248. Russia.

HEGEL, G. 1974. **Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften: First edition.** Translated from English. Moscow, Thought, p. 452. Russia.

HEGEL, G. 2010. **Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: the science of logic.** Cambridge University Press. UK.

HÖSLE, V. 1994. **Personal and Group Identity Crisis**. Russian Journal Questions of Psychology. Vol. 10. PP. 112 – 123. Russia.

HUNTINGTON, S. 1994. **The Clash of Civilizations?** Russian Journal Polis. Political Studies. Vol. 1. pp. 33 - 48. Russia.

HUNTINGTON, S. 2004. **Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity**. Moscow: Publishing House AST, Tranzitkniga, P. 635. Russia.

MALININ, G. 2001. **Identification Processes in Kazakhstan or the Choice of Future Fundamentals. The Kazakhstan Society and Social Forecasting: the Sociological Dimension. Almaty: Institute of Philosophy and Law**, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan. pp. 31 - 51. Russia.

PAVLOVA, O. 2001. **Identity: history of views' formation and its structural features**. Moscow: Publishing House Idea-Press. Russia.

TRUFANOVA, E. 2010. **The Man in the Maze of Identities**. Russian Journal Questions of Psychology. Vol. 2. pp. 13 – 22. Russia.