RUDN Journal of Philosophy. ISSN 2313-2302 (Print), ISSN 2408-8900 (Online) 2025 Vol. 29 No. 2 535–547
Вестник РУДН. Серия: ФИЛОСОФИЯ http://journals.rudn.ru/philosophy

https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-535-547
EDN: UPNDZW

Research Article / Научная статья

Kazakhstan's Digitalization Format: Identity and Future

Baizhol I. Karipbayev, Samat M. Zhakin, Galiya R. Seifullina ✉

Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
✉galiya-magavina@mail.ru

Abstract. These days, digitization is commonly recognized as a global phenomenon. Digital lifestyles are emerging and continually evolving, further amplifying this phenomenon. Technologies such as artificial intelligence, virtual reality, robotics, and autonomous systems are becoming increasingly pervasive. Consequently, human life is undergoing profound digitization. Progressively, the extent of digitization progress is regarded as a crucial determinant of future public and state policy. Successful implementation of digitization projects has significantly influenced human communication, prompted a rethinking of value frameworks, and altered individuals' perceptions of life's meaning. In this context, examining the sociocultural and psychological effects of digitization in general – and network identity in particular – is highly pertinent. This study scrutinizes the nature of digitalization through its impact on individuals' ideological beliefs and on the formation of their identity codes. Given digitalization's contradictory character, Kazakhstan's experience stands out: it juxtaposes the risks of migrating human activity into the digital sphere with the ambitious goals of digital transformation and their ensuing achievements. The peculiarities of Kazakhstan's digitalization policy, with its emphasis on advanced technologies, underscore the need to thoroughly understand the broader phenomenon of digitization. The relevance of this research perspective derives from three imperatives: assessing the potential negative consequences of digitalization, grounding the process in a robust theoretical humanitarian framework, and pinpointing the primary risks associated with network identity in today's digital landscape. This research leverages the epistemic resources of psychology, sociology, cultural studies, and philosophy. Such interdisciplinary synergy enables a more thorough understanding of digitalization's role in shaping a new humanistic worldview. These analytical perspectives enable a comprehensive assessment of both Kazakhstan's specific context and the wider digitization process.

Keywords: worldview, culture, personality, society

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.
Funding of Sources. The research was prepared within the framework of the Scientific Project (Grant number BR21882302) "Kazakhstan's society in the context of digital transformation: prospects and risks", funded by the grant from the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Contribution of authors. All the authors contributed equally to the conception, preparation and writing of the manuscript.

Article history:
The article was submitted on 17.12.2024
The article was accepted on 07.03.2025

For citation: Karipbayev BI, Zhakin SM, Seifullina GR. Kazakhstan's Digitalization Format: Identity and Future. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy.* 2025;29(2):535–547. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-535-547

Формат цифровизации Казахстана: идентичность и будущее

Б.И. Карипбаев, С.М. Жакин, Г.Р. Сейфуллина✉

Карагандинский университет им. академика Е.А. Букетова, Караганда, Казахстан
✉galiya-magavina@mail.ru

Аннотация. В наши дни цифровизация – это глобальное явление. Появляются и постоянно развиваются цифровые стили жизни, что еще больше усиливает это явление. Такие технологии, как искусственный интеллект, виртуальная реальность, робототехника и автономные системы, становятся все более распространенными. Как следствие, человеческая жизнь подвергается глубокой цифровизации. Степень развития цифровизации все чаще рассматривается как важнейший фактор, определяющий будущую государственную и общественную политику. Успешная реализация проектов цифровизации существенно повлияла на человеческое общение, заставила переосмыслить ценностные ориентиры и изменила представления людей о смысле жизни. В этом контексте изучение социокультурных и психологических последствий цифровизации в целом и сетевой идентичности в частности представляется весьма актуальным. В данном исследовании природа цифровизации рассматривается через ее влияние на идеологические убеждения людей и формирование их кодов идентичности. Учитывая противоречивый характер цифровизации, опыт Казахстана выделяется: здесь сопоставляются риски миграции человеческой деятельности в цифровую сферу с амбициозными целями цифровой трансформации и вытекающими из них достижениями. Особенности казахстанской политики цифровизации с ее акцентом на передовые технологии подчеркивают необходимость глубокого понимания более широкого феномена цифровизации. Актуальность данного исследования обусловлена тремя императивами: оценкой потенциальных негативных последствий цифровизации, обоснованием этого процесса в надежной теоретической гуманитарной базе и определением основных рисков, связанных с сетевой идентичностью в современном цифровом ландшафте. В этом исследовании задействованы эпистемологические ресурсы психологии, социологии, культурологии и философии. Такая междисциплинарная синергия позволяет более тонко понять роль цифровизации в формировании нового гуманистического мировоззрения. Эти аналитические перспективы позволяют всесторонне оценить как специфический казахстанский контекст, так и более широкий процесс оцифровки.

Ключевые слова: мировоззрение, культура, личность, общество

Конфликт интересов. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.
Финансирование. Исследование подготовлено в рамках Научного проекта (Грант № BR21882302) «Казахстанское общество в условиях цифровой трансформации: перспективы и риски», финансируемого по гранту Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан.
Вклад авторов. Все авторы внесли равный вклад в концепцию, подготовку и написание текста.

История статьи:
Статья поступила 17.12.2024
Статья принята к публикации 07.03.2025

Для цитирования: *Karipbayev B.I., Zhakin S.M., Seifullina G.R.* Kazakhstan's Digitalization Format: Identity and Future // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Философия. 2025. Т. 29. № 2. С. 535–547. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2025-29-2-535-547

Introduction

The digital turn may be understood as the most recent stage within a continuum of socio-cultural-historical "turns" that have defined the twentieth and twenty-first centuries – ontological, linguistic, iconic, anthropological, theological, performative, pragmatic, and others. In this light, endeavors to proffer speculative, introspective examinations of "humanity and digital reality" risk encountering a fundamental paradox in conventional philosophical discourse, which customarily opens with the formula "human and…" (most often "world," "society," or "science").

Cartesian epistemological optimism concerning the bifurcation of subject and object underlies ideological constructs framed as "man and …." Given today's digital milieu, it becomes both imperative and advantageous to reconceptualize this discourse from an alternative vantage. In particular, by adopting a reverse lens, one merely transposes the conventional formulation "man and digital reality" into "digital reality and man." This inversion is justified because digital reality – rather than humanity – constitutes the foundational condition of our anthropological existence. Consulting the pertinent studies [1–4] further demonstrates that this reordering effectively neutralizes any essentialist or substantialist critiques.

Consequently, the following preliminary disclaimers and theoretical frameworks are essential for a comprehensive examination of network identity:

The process of digitization is fundamentally technological rather than merely technical. Accordingly, technologies are not just mechanically integrated into human existence; they constitute its very foundation [5]. Therefore, in the context of this paradigmatic leap – rather than a gradual transformation – a systemic-structural analysis is required instead of a purely functional one.

We might infer that the essence of network identity is not digital, just as Heidegger famously asserted that the essence of technology is not technological

[6. P. 221–238]. In other words, we should avoid reducing this issue to a purely technical perspective concerned only with specific tools and skills required to operate them.

Contemporary scientific research employs the following conceptualizations of "network identity":

A) A dimension of network community membership pertains to the primary activities in which participants engage, particularly those associated with computer technology.

B) A concept that denotes identity as dynamic, multifaceted, and malleable.

C) The manifestation of an individual's virtual persona or a "double" as they curate and project themselves on social media.

D) An autonomous agent endowed with a distinct virtual identity that operates within digital environment and exhibits characteristics separate from its offline persona [7].

Generally, most contemporary humanities studies of digitization lack the scope necessary to fully apprehend its historicity and epochal significance, even when grounded in discipline-specific research and localized data collection. An explicit understanding of the network (virtual) identity requires a substantially broader contextual and semantic framework. We must move beyond conceiving the virtual realm solely in terms of social networks or the Internet.

We may conceptualize the virtual as an ontological condition of genuine emergence formation – an unpredictable emergence of the new [8] – thereby introducing productivity and creativity into our framework, in keeping with the spirit of critical theory [9] and the skeptical tradition [10]. Hence, a network identity can be conceived as an emergent presence, a contingent entity. Moreover, the virtual may be considered a resource endowed with a "chaosmotic" capacity to generate actual forms across a plurality of possible trajectories [11]. Consequently, the socio-cultural virtual may be accorded genuine ontological significance – regarded as the foundational substrate of human reality – rather than being confined to the traditional epistemological function of unmasking mere appearances [12].

In addressing Korzybski's [13] conundrum on the relationship between symbol and referent – here, technique and phenomenon – the postmodernist interpretation of network identity proves especially apt. This homology emerges in the communicative and informational dimensions of network identity, which can be conceived metaphorically as a text: a tapestry woven from diverse narrative modes and structures. Taking into account that multiplicity, dynamism, and mobility constitute the primary attributes of network identity [14. P. 42–57], we can reintroduce elements of Derrida's textual theory [15] to conceptualize network identity as a complex, polysemic structure that emerges through the ongoing interaction of heterogeneous semiotic spaces and structures. This approach guarantees an infinitely branching semantic multiplicity.

Digitalization in contemporary Kazakhstan demands a thorough reconceptualization of the basic frameworks underpinning traditional sociocultural

practices, which will inevitably be shaped by both positive and negative factors within the context of global networked communication. In this regard, concerns such as the ethical dimensions of digital culture and preservation of traditional axiology amid globalization are intrinsically linked to the challenges of network identity and its broader implications.

Engaging with the rhizomatic space of digital reality, which hosts radically new cultural practices, requires psychological readiness, technological proficiency, and, above all, cognitive agility.

In the Lacanian sense [16], the discourse of capitalism readily integrates into contemporary Kazakhstani society, which has not yet adapted to the new-media era. Thus, the central questions shift from "why?" and "for what purpose?" to "how?" Specifically: How can we navigate and sustain ourselves in this environment?

Materials and methods

Digitalization is a complex, multidimensional process that requires a sophisticated methodological foundation, given its impact on all significant aspects of both public and private life.

Numerous humanitarian techniques were employed in order to construct the conceptual framework of the paper and to theoretically substantiate many clauses. However, there is a broad variety of humanitarian approaches for various heuristic interpretations of the digital transition and its effects:

1. According to M. McLuhan's [17] already-classical thesis, the type of media that people utilize determines the course of human history. Moreover, insofar as McLuhan characterizes media as extensions of the human body that amplify its capacities and appropriate novel domains, one may infer that digital media symbolically deterritorialize the human subject by enabling the emergence of networked identities. With an emphasis on examining how the media affects culture and society, McLuhan's theory combines elements of media theory, sociology, and philosophy. The cornerstone of McLuhan's theory is "technological determinism", which asserts that communication media shape both the content and structure of cultural processes and, in turn, govern how individuals perceive and participate in society. His concept of the "global village" conveys that modern communication technologies generate conditions in which people transcend temporal and spatial boundaries, drawing them closer and fostering deeper interconnection.

2. In light of Baudrillard's theory of the simulacrum [18], contemporary digitalization may be regarded as a recontextualization of the sign – from the register of visibility into the sphere of simulation – advancing from the third order of the image, defined by counterfeiting and the occlusion of reality's absence, to the fourth order, distinguished by the utter obliteration of any correspondence with reality. Baudrillard's simulacrum theory offers a conceptual framework that synthesizes critical theory, postmodernism, and poststructuralism. According to the core tenet of this theory, reality progressively diverges from any originals in the

contemporary world, becoming a "simulacrum" – a copy without an original, or even one that never existed.

3. Debord's notion of the "integrated spectacle society" [19] elucidates the paradoxical convergence of coercive pseudo-pleasure modalities – anchored in neoliberal consumerism and bureaucratic-policing apparatuses. Within this paradigm, digital technologies assume an instrumental function by transposing the substance of social reality into a boundless expanse of representations. Debord's theory, grounded in situationist critique and poststructuralist thought, aims to furnish a critical diagnosis of contemporary society. The basic premise is that modern life has devolved into a show, in which illusion and reality blend together to provide the appearance of reality.

4. According to R. Debreu's mediaology [20], digitalization represents a new phase in the media's ongoing dialectic of ideological, political, and religious conflicts, ultimately giving rise to "mediaocracy", the rule of intermediaries that inevitably descends into mediocrity. Debreu's mediaological framework offers a comprehensive analytical lens for examining the interplay between various mass communication channels and sociocultural dynamics. Grounded in semiotics, philosophy, and cultural studies, this theory posits that media play a decisive role in shaping social consciousness and cultural evolution.

The two-faced digitalization, traditions and understanding

The ambiguity of digital culture is expressed in many works of various directions. If the "bright part" of informatization is obvious: speed, miniaturization of technology, precision, and intelligence, then the "gray part" worries many researchers.

First, let's consider, perhaps, the obvious, but at the same time complex idea of the virtue of digitalization. Technology in general makes people's lives better in qualitative and quantitative terms. Analog technology, preceding digital, is essential, it can be understood and touched. Digital in this regard is almost magical, based on numbers, and like the Pythagorean system is comprehensive.

An interesting model for considering digitalization was developed by Bhutani and Paliwal. They presented the 5C model – Conscious, Connected, Compliant, Collaborative, and Contended – as a basis for achieving sustainable and inclusive growth through digitalization [21]. This model represents main attributes of the digital society.

It is digital technologies that now allow us to communicate at a distance, send rockets into space, develop ideas and implement them. The positive part of the digital world is undeniable, however, like any human invention, it has a "gray part". Hassan argues that digitalization introduces a special form of alienation that diverges from analog culture. The transition to digital has created a "radical alienation", where digital consumption increases control and separation from traditional culture, creating new problems for human self-realization and social

connections. This alienation is exacerbated by a shift in the processes of cultural formation, which are increasingly mediated by technology. Hassan criticizes theorists such as Lev Manovich and Bernard Stiegler for their optimistic but ultimately "unsuccessful" vision of digital culture. Manovich's notion of "transcoding" (where analogue forms are processed into digital formats) and Stiegler's "telecracy" (the political potential in digital environments) are seen as limited frameworks that ignore the profound impact of digital consumerism and its disconnection from human-centred values [22].

Digitalization, while often being beneficial, has always had unintended negative consequences. These include such phenomena as technostress, technology addiction, privacy concerns, and deviant online behavior (for example, cyberbullying).

By viewing the "digital human" as a product of converging technologies and cyber-physical systems, the essence of human identity is assumed to be lost. There is a risk of reducing humans to automated functions or "digital zombies", disconnected from the full human experience.

Results and discussion

As such, the process of digitalization of Kazakhstan began from the moment of independence. The end of the 20th century is a period of the formation of a real digital reality. The first president of independent Kazakhstan in his address to the people in 1997 highlighted the long-term priority of the development of telecommunications and issued a decree on the creation of a "Single Digital Space".[1] From 2000 to 2010, a number of laws and decrees was adopted, approving the country's digitalization policy. The most significant are the law on "Electronic Document and Electronic Digital Signature" and the launch of the e-government portal eGov.kz in 2006.[2] Subsequently, the programs "Informational Kazakhstan" and "Digital Kazakhstan" were adopted and implemented. All of them were aimed at increasing the informatization of all life spheres of the citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan. As for local studies of digitalization as of a necessary process, and in some sense vital, a simple idea is postulated: the technological digital development of Kazakhstan is an important condition for creating a competitive and successful state [23]. The authors argue that Kazakhstan needs a unique digitalization model that not only stimulates the adoption of technology but also enhances social justice. This dual focus reflects an innovative perspective, linking digital equality with broader goals of social equality. The motivation for total digitalization is simple: economically and culturally successful countries have high digitalization rates [24]. The results of self-determination of the digital Kazakhstan

[1] On the formation of a unified information space in the Republic of Kazakhstan. Available from: https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/U970003787_/info (accessed: 04.12.2024). (In Russian).

[2] On Electronic Document and Electronic Digital Signature. Available from: https://adilet.zan.kz/eng/docs/Z030000370_(accessed: 04.12.2024).

are currently based on the Digital Kazakhstan program. We consider this Program as the main vector of self-determination of Kazakhstani society in the digital era and highlight the main supporting aspects.

The initial direction and, in general, the problem of digitalization of Kazakhstan is development of the digital infrastructure. It is considered to be a foundation for digital self-determination. Kazakhstan, focusing on high-speed Internet and improving telecommunications networks, creates the basis for access to information and technology. Digital infrastructure becomes a means through which society perceives reality. By creating its own infrastructure, Kazakhstan forms a unique "digital being" that reflects national values and culture. The development of digital infrastructure provides a wide range of the population with access to information, education and electronic services. This contributes to an increase in standards of living and opens up new opportunities for self-development. By investing in infrastructure in remote and rural areas, Kazakhstan seeks to reduce inequality between urban and rural residents, providing equal opportunities for all. This can be traced by the level of digital literacy of the population: since 2018, this level at the age of 6–74 was 79.6%, and by 2024 it amounted to 91.2%.[3]

Modern infrastructure attracts foreign investment, promotes development of technology startups and increases country's competitiveness on the global stage. Developed infrastructure, in turn, allows Kazakhstan to participate in global supply chains and electronic trading platforms. Of course, the construction and maintenance of infrastructure require significant investment, which can become a burden on the state budget. The use of imported equipment and technologies can lead to dependence on foreign suppliers and potential security threats. Infrastructure development raises questions about the role of technology in society. According to J. Ellul, technology can become an autonomous force influencing social structures. Therefore, the issue of not just the introduction of technology is acute, but also the need to understand an impact on culture and society [25].

The next aspect of digital self-determination is the functioning of e-government. The introduction of e-government is aimed at increasing the transparency and efficiency of public services. This reduces bureaucracy and brings the state closer to its citizens. It should be noted that Kazakhstan was one of the first countries in the CIS to form a fairly successful "E-government" system. Currently, Kazakhstan ranks 24th in the e-government development index. For instance, in 2022, Kazakhstan was in 28th place, which indicates the development of the e-government system.[4]

Through the prism of Foucault, power and knowledge are interconnected [26]. E-government redistributes power by making information available to citizens and,

[3] Information and communication technologies and communications. Available from: https://stat.gov.kz/en/industries/business-statistics/stat-it/dynamic-tables/ (accessed: 04.12.2024).

[4] UN E-Government Survey 2024. Available from: https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/#0 (accessed: 04.12.2024).

thus, changes the dynamics between the state and society. However, not all citizens have the necessary skills or access to technology, which may limit their ability to use e-services. Electronic systems may become a target for cyber-attacks, which puts data privacy at risk.

The implementation of e-government is associated with Max Weber's ideas on the rationalization of bureaucracy [27]. However, excessive rationalization can lead to an "iron cage" of bureaucracy, where the human factor and individuality are lost. Therefore, it is important to maintain the balance between efficiency and human interaction.

It is well known that cybersecurity is becoming critical in the era of digitalization. Kazakhstan seeks to protect its digital borders from cyber threats while maintaining the integrity of national systems and data.[5]

The balance between protecting citizens and preserving their rights and freedoms is a difficult ethical dilemma. According to Kant, moral actions should be based on the categorical imperative, that is, on principles applicable to everyone [28]. In relation to cybersecurity, this means creating such protection measures that do not infringe on human rights. That is what sometimes technologies cannot practically implement. These contradictions arise at the level of values. Freedom of privacy can be used to violate laws, an example of such cases is Telegram and France's claims against the creator of the messenger P. Durov.[6]

Lavazza and Farina suggest that datafication may inherently limit human freedom by promoting instrumental thinking and reducing people to data points. This reductionism is seen as antithetical to the classical notion of autonomy and freedom, where people have the ability to make unique, context-dependent decisions [29].

This logically brings us to data sovereignty, which implies state control over domestically generated data. Kazakhstan is developing policies to ensure that data is stored and processed in accordance with national interests. In Hegel's view, a state is an embodiment of the common spirit of people [30]. Thus, the data control becomes a modern expression of this spirit, where data represents collective knowledge and experience. However, the question of individual versus collective rights arises. J. Locke argued that personal property and rights should not be violated by the state. Thus, the balance between national sovereignty and citizens' rights to privacy becomes a central philosophical question [31].

Discussing digitalization, we primarily touch upon the digital economy. The world's leading companies are engaged in digital technologies. A transition to the digital economy allows Kazakhstan to diversify its economic sources, reducing its dependence on natural resources. Which is very important for the country, since the main source of income for the country's treasury comes from raw materials.

[5] On the approval of the Cybersecurity Concept ("Cyber Shield of Kazakhstan"). Available from: https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1700000407 (accessed: 10.12.2024). (In Russian).
[6] Telegram chief Durov denounces French charges as 'surprising' and 'misguided'. Available from: https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20240905-telegram-chief-durov (accessed: 10.12.2024).

Kazakhstan's digital self-determination is an act of existential choice reflecting the nation's desire for self-realization in the digital world. Sartrean existentialism emphasizes responsibility for one's own existence. Kazakhstan, choosing the path of digital transformation, takes responsibility for its future, forming a unique identity in the global context. Currently, it ranks 34th out of 64 countries in the digital competitiveness rating.[7]

Conclusion

The Kazakhstan digitalization format is a unique approach to integrating modern technologies into the socio-economic fabric of the country, taking into account its historical, cultural and geopolitical features. Having set an ambitious goal – to become a leader in the region in digital innovation, Kazakhstan is taking comprehensive measures aimed at transforming key areas of society. Kazakhstan, located at the crossroads of Europe and Asia, is forming its own path to the digital future, combining the best world practices with national priorities and values. The Kazakhstan digitalization format is not just a technical modernization, but also a profound transformation of society aimed at improving the quality of life of every citizen. Facing typical problems of digitalization, Kazakhstan is changing, becoming an increasingly technocratic state.

References

[1] Berger P, Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Rutkevich ED, transl. Moscow: Medium publ.; 1995. (In Russian).
[2] Foucault M. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Vizgina VP, Avtonomova NS, transl. Saint Petersburg: A-cad publ.; 1994. (In Russian).
[3] Bostrom N. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies.* Filin S, transl. Rapoport T, editor. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov i Ferber publ.; 2016. (In Russian).
[4] Haraway D. *Staying with the Trouble. Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Pisarev A, Khamis D, Khanova P, transl. Perm: Gile Press publ.; 2020. (In Russian).
[5] Kutyrev VA, Slyusarev VV, Khusyainov TM. *Humanity and Technos: Philosophy of Coevolution.* Saint Petersburg: Aleteiya publ.; 2020. (In Russian). EDN: AQWUIZ
[6] Heidegger M. The Question Concerning Technology. In: *Time and Being: Articles and Speeches*. Bibikhin VV, transl. Moscow: Respublika publ.; 1993. (In Russian).
[7] Kosenchuk L. Conceptions of Virtual or Network Identity: Critical Analyses. *Modern problems of science and education.* 2014;(5). Available from: https://science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=14630 (accessed: 02.12.2024). (In Russian).
[8] Meillassoux Q. Subtraction and Contraction: Deleuze, Immanence, and Matter and Memory. *Collapse*. 2007:63–107.
[9] Markov A. *Critical Theory*. Moscow: Ripol-Klassik publ.; 2021. (In Russian). EDN: EIOXSI
[10] Vizgin V. *On the way to the Other. From the school of suspicion to the philosophy of trust.* Moscow: ID YaSK publ.; 2011. (In Russian).

[7] IMD World Digital Competitiveness Ranking. Available from: https://imd.widen.net/s/xvhldkrrkw/20241111-wcc-digital-report-2024-wip (accessed: 10.12.2024).

[11] Deleuze G, Guattari F. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Kralechkin D, transl. Yekaterinburg: U-Factoria publ.; 2007. (In Russian).
[12] Plyutto P. *Research of the reality of the socio-cultural virtual: An attempt to analyze socio-cultural illusions.* Moscow: Progres-Traditsiya publ.; 2014. (In Russian).
[13] Korzybski A. *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*. New York: Institute of General Semantics; 1994.
[14] Doring N. *Sozialpsychologie des Internet: Die Bedeutung des Internet für Kommunikationsprozesse, Identitaten, soziale Beziehungen und Gruppen*. Göttingen: Hogrefe; 2003.
[15] Derrida J. *Positions.* Bibikhin VV, transl. Moscow: Academic project publ.; 2007. (In Russian).
[16] Boltanski L, Chiapello E. *The New Spirit of Capitalism.* Fokin S, transl. Fokin S, editor. Moscow: NLO publ.; 2011. (In Russian). EDN: QOMGMJ
[17] McLuhan M, Fiore Q. *War and Peace in the Global Village*. Letberg I, transl. Moscow: AST publ.; 2012. (In Russian).
[18] Baudrillard J. *Simulacra and simulation*. Kachalov AV, transl. Moscow: Ripol-klassik publ.; 2017. (In Russian).
[19] Debord G. *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. Moscow: Logos publ.; 2023. (In Russian).
[20] Debre R. (2009). *Introduction to medialogy*. Skuratov BM, transl. Moscow: Praksis publ.; 2009. (In Russian).
[21] Bhutani S, Paliwal Y. Digitalization: A Step Towards Sustainable Development. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development.* 2015;8(12):11–24.
[22] Hassan R. The Culture of Digitality. In: *The Condition of Digitality: A Post-Modern Marxism for the Practice of Digital Life.* University of Westminster Press; 2020. P. 129–158. DOI: 10.16997/book44.f
[23] Mamrayeva DG, Toxambayeva AB, Tashenova LV. Industry digitalization in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of Karaganda University.* 2022;1(1):54–67. DOI: 10.31489/2022ec1/54-67 EDN: NYHUEI
[24] Yermekbaeva D, Rakhmatullina A. The Importance of Implementing Digitalization in Kazakhstan. *Eurasian Journal of Economic and Business Studies.* 2020;3(3):40–55. DOI: 10.47703/ejebs.v3i57.19 EDN: KEXCSK
[25] Ellul J. *Technological Society.* New York: Random House; 1967.
[26] Foucault M. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of Prison.* Sheridan A, transl. New York: Vintage Books; 1999.
[27] Weber M. *Economy and Society.* Tribe K, transl. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; 2019.
[28] Kant I. *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals.* Gregor M, transl. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1998. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511809590
[29] Lavazza A, Farina M. Infosphere, Datafication, and Decision-Making Processes in the AI Era. *Topoi.* 2023;(42):843–856. DOI: 10.1007/s11245-023-09919-0 EDN: JPKSUU
[30] Hegel GWF. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right.* Nisbet HB, transl. Wood AW, editor. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1991. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511808012
[31] Locke J. *Two Treatises of Government.* Available from: https://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Lokk_Traktaty_1.pdf (accessed: 11.12.2024). (In Russian).

Список литературы

[1] *Бергер П., Лукман Т.* Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания / пер. с англ. Е. Руткевич. М. : Медиум, 1995.

[2] *Фуко М.* Слова и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук / пер. с фр. В.П. Визгина, Н.С. Автономовой. СПб. : A-cad, 1994.
[3] *Бостром Н.* Искусственный интеллект. Этапы. Угрозы. Стратегии / пер. с англ. С. Филина, под ред. Т. Рапопорт. М. : Манн, Иванов и Фербер, 2016.
[4] *Харауэй Д.* Оставаясь со смутой. Заводить сородичей в Хтулуцене / пер. с англ. А. Писарева, Д. Хамис, П. Хановой. Пермь : Гиле Пресс, 2020.
[5] *Кутырев В.А., Слюсарев В.В., Хусяинов Т.М.* Человечество и технос: философия коэволюции. СПб. : Алетейя, 2020. EDN: AQWUIZ
[6] *Хайдеггер М.* Вопрос о технике // Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления / пер. с нем. В. В. Бибихина. М. : Республика, 1993.
[7] *Косенчук Л.* Концепции виртуальной или сетевой идентичности: критический анализ // Современные проблемы науки и образования. 2014. № 5. Режим доступа: https://science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=14630 (дата обращения: 02.12.2024).
[8] *Meillassoux Q.* Subtraction and Contraction: Deleuze, Immanence, and Matter and Memory // Collapse. 2007. P. 63–107.
[9] *Марков А.* Критическая теория. М. : Рипол-Классик, 2021. EDN: EIOXSI
[10] *Визгин В.* На пути к Другому. От школы подозрения к философии доверия. М. : ИД ЯСК, 2011.
[11] *Делёз Ж., Гваттари Ф.* Анти-Эдип: Капитализм и шизофрения / пер. с фр. Д. Кралечкина. Екатеринбург : У-Фактория, 2007.
[12] *Плютто П.* Исследование реальности социокультурного виртуального: Опыт анализа социокультурных иллюзий. М. : Прогрес-Традиция, 2014.
[13] *Korzybski A.* Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics. New York : Institute of General Semantics, 1994.
[14] *Doring N.* Sozialpsychologie des Internet: Die Bedeutung des Internet für Kommunikationsprozesse, Identitaten, soziale Beziehungen und Gruppen. Göttingen : Hogrefe, 2003.
[15] *Деррида Ж.* Позиции / пер. с фр. В.В. Бибихина. М. : Академический проект, 2007.
[16] *Болтански Л., Кьяпелло Э.* Новый дух капитализма / пер. с фр. С. Фокина, под ред. С. Фокина. М. : НЛО, 2011. EDN: QOMGMJ
[17] *Маклюэн М., Фиоре К.* Война и мир в глобальной деревне / пер. с англ. И. Летберга. М. : АСТ, 2012.
[18] *Бодрийяр Ж.* Симулякры и симуляция / пер. с фр. А. В. Качалова. М. : Рипол-классик, 2017.
[19] *Дебор Г.* Комментарии к обществу спектакля. М. : Логос, 2023.
[20] *Дебре Р.* Введение в медиологию / пер. с фр. Б.М. Скуратова. М. : Праксис, 2009.
[21] *Bhutani S., Paliwal Y.* Digitalization: A Step Towards Sustainable Development // OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development. 2015. Vol. 8. No. 12. P. 11–24.
[22] *Hassan R.* The Culture of Digitality // The Condition of Digitality: A Post-Modern Marxism for the Practice of Digital Life. University of Westminster Press, 2020. P. 129–158. DOI: 10.16997/book44.f
[23] *Mamrayeva D.G., Toxambayeva A.B., Tashenova L.V.* Industry digitalization in the Republic of Kazakhstan // Bulletin of Karaganda University. 2022. Vol. 1. No. 105. P. 54–67. DOI: 10.31489/2022ec1/54-67 EDN: NYHUEI
[24] *Yermekbaeva D., Rakhmatullina A.* The Importance of Implementing Digitalization in Kazakhstan // Eurasian Journal of Economic and Business Studies. 2020. Vol 57. No. 3. P. 40–55. DOI: 10.47703/ejebs.v3i57.19 EDN: KEXCSK
[25] *Ellul J.* Technological Society. New York : Random House, 1967.
[26] *Foucault M.* Discipline and Punish. The Birth of Prison / transl. from French by A. Sheridan. New York : Vintage Books, 1999.

[27] *Weber M.* Economy and Society / transl. by K. Tribe. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 2019.
[28] *Kant I.* Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals / transl. by M. Gregor. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511809590
[29] *Lavazza A., Farina M.* Infosphere, Datafication, and Decision-Making Processes in the AI Era // Topoi. 2023. Vol. 42. P. 843–856. DOI: 10.1007/s11245-023-09919-0 EDN: JPKSUU
[30] *Hegel G.W.F.* Elements of the Philosophy of Right / transl. by H.B. Nisbet, edited by A.W. Wood. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1991. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511808012
[31] *Локк Дж.* Два трактата о правлении. Режим доступа: https://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Lokk_Traktaty_1.pdf (дата обращения: 11.12.2024).

About the authors:

Karipbayev Baizhol I. – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Faculty of Philosophy and Psychology, Karaganda Buketov University, 28 Universitetskaya St., Karaganda, 100026, Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0000-0002-3787-1307. SPIN-code: 1964-5083. E-mail: karipbaev@mail.ru

Zhakin Samat M. – Master of Humanities, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Faculty of Philosophy and Psychology, Karaganda Buketov University, 28 Universitetskaya St., Karaganda, 100026, Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0009-0000-4644-3788. E-mail: samatsky7@gmail.com

Seifullina Galiya R. – Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Faculty of Philosophy and Psychology, Karaganda Buketov University, 28 Universitetskaya St., Karaganda, 100026, Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0000-0003-3220-6233. SPIN-code: 4646-2828. E-mail: Galiya-magavina@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах:

Карипбаев Байжол Искакович – доктор философских наук, профессор, профессор кафедры философии и теории культуры, факультет философии и психологии, Карагандинский университет имени академика Е.А. Букетова, Казахстан, 100026, Караганда, ул. Университетская, д. 28. ORCID: 0000-0002-3787-1307. SPIN-код: 1964-5083. E-mail: karipbaev@mail.ru

Жакин Самат Манатович – магистр гуманитарных наук, старший преподаватель кафедры философии и теории культуры, факультет философии и психологии, Карагандинский университет имени академика Е.А. Букетова, Казахстан, 100026, Караганда, ул. Университетская, д. 28. ORCID: 0009-0000-4644-3788. E-mail: samatsky7@gmail.com

Сейфуллина Галия Рустембековна – кандидат философских наук, доцент, доцент кафедры философии и теории культуры, факультет философии и психологии, Карагандинский университет имени академика Е.А. Букетова, Казахстан, 100026, Караганда, ул. Университетская, д. 28. ORCID: 0000-0003-3220-6233. SPIN-код: 4646-2828. E-mail: Galiya-magavina@mail.ru