

The Individual and the Technocultural Problematics: A Sociological Reading of the Human–Technology Relationship

Dr. Zoubida Mechir

Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University- Tebessa (Algeria) Email

: zoubida.mechir@univ-tebessa.dz

Received : 24/10/2025 ; Accepted : 25/02/2026 ; Published : 09/03/2026

Abstract

This paper provides a sociological reading of the relationship between human beings and technology within the framework of the technocultural problematic. In their quest for identity, individuality, and selfrealization, individuals have oscillated between gain and loss. On the one hand, technological development has enabled unprecedented opportunities for selfexpression, autonomy, and empowerment. On the other hand, it has generated new forms of dependency and subordination, as modern technological systems increasingly shape individual behavior and social life.

The individual is no longer merely a user of technology; rather, technology has become an integral component of contemporary social and cultural structures. Consequently, the relationship between the individual, technology, and culture has evolved into a dynamic process of continuous interaction and mutual influence. Within this context, the technocultural problematic emerges as an

analytical framework for understanding the transformations affecting individual identity, social relations, and cultural practices in the digital age.

Keywords: Individual; Technology; Culture; Technocultural Problematics; Identity.

Introduction

The human individual constitutes the fundamental unit upon which all human sciences are built. Human needs, capacities, and actions ultimately form the basis of psychological, social, cultural, and even technological phenomena. Society itself is an organized collection of individuals, while culture, in its final analysis, consists of recurrent and structured responses produced by members of a given society. Accordingly, the individual represents the logical starting point for any investigation of broader collective entities such as society, culture, or technology.

The social conditions into which individuals are born and socialized undeniably leave a profound imprint on their behavior. However, this does not imply that human beings are devoid of individuality or free will. Although individuals may appear to be products of predefined social structures and expectations, their interactions with others play a crucial role in shaping personality, values, and patterns of behavior. The process of socialization itself originates in individual uniqueness and the experience of freedom, through which a sense of personal identity gradually develops.

Recent technological transformations, however, have profoundly altered the relationship between individuals and their social environment. The rise of digital technologies has fragmented identity between real and virtual selves, reshaping the individual's relationship to time, space, and knowledge. Digital culture has also fostered new value systems emphasizing speed, efficiency, and instant communication rather than depth, reflection, and critical engagement.

These developments call for a reconsideration of culture in light of technological change. Culture is not a static inheritance transmitted unchanged from one generation to another; rather, it is a historical construction shaped by evolving social relations. Consequently, the analysis of any

cultural system requires an examination of the social and historical conditions that produce and transform it.

Within this framework, technology occupies a central position. While technology has traditionally been viewed as a social instrument developed by human beings in their struggle against nature, it has progressively evolved into a powerful force shaping social relations and cultural dynamics. As numerous sociological perspectives suggest, technological development has become a determining factor in social transformation, particularly within modern capitalist societies, where tensions often emerge between technological progress and existing social structures.

Technology is therefore no longer merely a set of tools serving human purposes. It has become a social and cultural system that influences the ways individuals think, interact, and construct meaning. The technocultural problematic thus provides a valuable analytical framework for examining the dialectical relationship between individuals, technological development, and cultural transformation.

Accordingly, this study seeks to address the following questions:

1. Who is the individual, and what is the nature of their relationship with others?

2. How does technological development affect the individual?

3. How does cultural change, particularly in the context of cultural domination, shape individual identity and social experience?

Objectives of the Study

This paper aims to:

- Highlight the significance of the individual and their relationship with others.
- Examine the impact of technological development on the individual.
- Analyze the effects of cultural transformation and cultural domination on contemporary individuals.

Section One: The Individual and His Relationship with Others

The question of the individual occupies a central place in social thought and, more specifically, in sociological theory. Sociology has long been concerned with the individual as a being constantly seeking self-realization, freedom, and identity, while simultaneously existing as an inherently social being whose development depends upon interaction with others and participation in collective life.

1. Who Is the Individual?

1.1. The Concept of the Individual

Conceptually, the term *individual* refers to a single and distinct human being. The notion also conveys the idea of an indivisible whole that cannot be reduced into smaller constituent parts. The Latin term *individuum* is comparable to the Greek concept *atomos*, both of which denote something that is indivisible. In this sense, the individual represents a unique and irreducible entity.

Over time, the concept evolved to designate a person who maintains a distinct and independent existence. Unlike objects or artifacts, which may be referred to as examples or specimens, the notion of individuality applies specifically to human beings ⁽¹⁾.

From an etymological perspective, the individual signifies that which cannot be materially divided. Individual existence manifests itself through the dimensions of organic life, consciousness, and thought. These dimensions constitute the essential conditions of individuality, beyond which no truly individual existence can be conceived.

In psychology, the individual is generally understood as a natural person distinguished from others by a unique identity and a set of personal characteristics that differentiate him or her from members of the same species. In sociology, the individual is viewed as one of the basic units that compose society, much as the citizen constitutes a fundamental unit of the state⁽²⁾.

From an anthropological and sociological perspective, the individual is defined through his or her relationship with society and social groups. In this regard, the individual serves as the primary reference point both for self-understanding and for understanding social reality, continuously reproducing and reconstructing the self through social interaction.

The concept of the individual is closely associated with related notions such as individuation, individuality, the self, and subjectivity.

1.2. Individuation and Individuality

The concept of *individuation* was transmitted from classical Islamic philosophy, particularly through Avicenna (Ibn Sina), to medieval European thought. It refers to the process through which each being acquires a unique existence in time and space, thereby distinguishing itself from other members of the same species.

According to Jungian psychology, individuation represents a fundamental psychological process through which the individual achieves self-realization and personal fulfillment. Carl Jung describes individuation as the tendency of a human being to become authentically oneself by actualizing latent potentials and realizing the deepest dimensions of personal identity⁽³⁾.

By contrast, *individuality* refers to the set of physical, psychological, and moral characteristics that distinguish one person from another. While the individual designates a human entity, individuality refers to the unique attributes that define that entity and make it unlike any other.

Individuality is also linked to the concept of the self (*ego*). Unlike animals, which do not distinguish themselves from their vital activities, human beings possess self-awareness. The presence of the ego enables individuals to perceive themselves as distinct from others and to recognize themselves as conscious centers of experience and action.

The notion of the *self* should not, however, be confused with the individual or the person. Philosophically, the self is a broader category that may apply to both human and non-human entities. The person refers specifically to a conscious human being, whereas the self denotes the essence of a thing or that which exists in itself⁽⁴⁾.

2. The Emergence of the Idea of the Individual

The concept of the individual emerged gradually through a long historical process during which human beings sought freedom, autonomy, and self-definition. This evolution may be traced through several major historical stages.

2.1. The Ancient World

Anthropological studies suggest that human beings are born into pre-existing social structures such as families, clans, tribes, religious communities, and broader social formations. In tribal societies, social status largely determined individual freedom and identity. People defined themselves primarily through their familial, tribal, or religious affiliations rather than through personal aspirations or individual projects.

Individual identity was therefore subordinated to collective identity, and personal autonomy remained limited. The individual was understood principally as a member of a community rather than as an autonomous subject⁽⁵⁾.

2.2. The Middle Ages

Medieval societies were characterized by rigid and highly stratified social hierarchies. Individuals were generally confined to the social class into which they were born, with very limited opportunities for either social or geographical mobility.

Identity was therefore largely determined by one's social position, profession, or estate. Individuals derived their sense of self from the groups to which they belonged and within which they spent their entire lives. Consequently, collective belonging provided security and meaning, whereas individual freedom remained restricted.

As Erich Fromm observed, medieval society was marked by the absence of individual freedom. Social roles were largely predetermined, and individuals possessed little capacity to alter their social destinies. Similarly, Jacob Burckhardt argued that people of the medieval period perceived themselves primarily as members of broader collectivities rather than as autonomous individuals⁽⁶⁾.

2.3. The Renaissance and the Birth of Modern Individuality

The Renaissance constituted a decisive turning point in the history of individuality. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a new conception of human existence emerged in Europe, emphasizing personal capacities, creativity, and self-awareness.

Individuals increasingly challenged traditional authorities and became conscious of their own agency. The affirmation of the word "I" symbolized a profound transformation in the center of social and cultural life. The focus shifted from transcendent authorities, such as God, the state, and the family to the individual as an autonomous subject⁽⁷⁾.

The intellectual and economic revolutions that accompanied the Renaissance paved the way for the development of modern individualism. This process reached its fullest sociological expression in the works of Émile Durkheim, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Georg Simmel.

Durkheim associated the growth of individuality with increasing social differentiation and the expansion of the division of labor. According to him, modern societies foster greater autonomy because individuals occupy increasingly specialized roles. This differentiation generates what he termed *organic solidarity*, a form of social cohesion based upon interdependence rather than similarity.

Likewise, Georg Simmel emphasized the role of monetary exchange in promoting individuality. Because money functions as a neutral and abstract medium, it contributes to more impersonal social relations while simultaneously increasing individual autonomy and differentiation.

2.4. The Contemporary Era

Contemporary individuals enjoy unprecedented opportunities to shape their own life trajectories and make personal choices. Nevertheless, the expansion of individual autonomy has been accompanied by new forms of alienation.

Twentieth-century ideological systems, whether liberal or socialist, often promised human emancipation but frequently produced opposite outcomes. Liberal societies transformed individuals into components of vast economic, technological, bureaucratic, and military systems, reducing their effective autonomy. Socialist systems, despite their critique of capitalist alienation, often

subordinated individual creativity to collective structures represented by the state and the ruling party⁽⁸⁾.

As a result, modern individuals increasingly experience feelings of isolation, social alienation, and existential uncertainty. Erich Fromm argued that many people failed to develop the positive dimensions of freedom and instead sought refuge from the responsibilities that genuine freedom entails.

By the late twentieth century, sociologists such as Alain Ehrenberg observed the emergence of a new social figure: the anxious and uncertain individual. The triumphant individual of modernity gradually gave way to an individual characterized by vulnerability, insecurity, and psychological distress.

2. The Individual and the Other: The Relationship between the Individual, the Person, the Group, and Society

Auguste Comte argued that if human beings are considered in isolation, positivist science can define them only as biological organisms whose primary objective is the preservation of their physical existence, much like other living creatures. However, if one seeks to understand the specifically human dimensions of existence, namely intelligence, sociality⁽⁹⁾, and collective life, it becomes necessary to transcend the isolated individual and consider humanity as a whole. Human beings are indebted to successive generations

for their intellectual, moral, and material development. Anyone who imagines himself entirely independent of others effectively negates his own existence, for even language, the primary medium of human expression is itself a social product and a creation of society.

2.1. From the Individual to the Person

The concept of the *individual* has traditionally been employed to emphasize the uniqueness and distinctiveness of each human being. It highlights the impossibility of reducing or fragmenting personality, which must instead be understood as an integrated and indivisible whole. Individual distinctiveness encourages cultural creativity by enabling people to invest their capacities in cultural production and to express the values, meanings, and symbolic resources embedded within culture. Such diversity prevents the imposition of uniformity and resists the emergence of a monolithic culture characterized by domination and intellectual conformity.

From a cultural perspective, the individual cannot be reduced to a purely biological entity whose significance ends with personal existence. Rather, the individual embodies a civilizational process that gradually develops through consciousness, experience, and social participation until it takes the form of a *person*. At this stage, the individual no longer acts solely in relation to personal needs or species membership but becomes capable of representing and

advancing the ideals of a civilization⁽¹⁰⁾.

The person, therefore, is not merely an individual who belongs to the human species. Rather, the person is a complex social being who simultaneously produces civilization and is produced by it. Human beings owe their ideas, values, and material achievements to the civilizational contexts in which they evolve. The concept of the person also implies a social function: participation in the construction and reproduction of civilization through engagement in collective life. Through this participation, individuals contribute to historical development and become active agents in shaping their societies.

Social interaction fosters self-awareness and enables individuals to recognize their significance within the broader social environment. Consequently, personal identity develops through participation in networks of social relations that connect individuals to the cultural and historical realities of their societies.

In this regard, social transformation begins with the transition from the *individual* (*individu*) to the *person* (*personne*). This transformation occurs when biological and instinctive tendencies are complemented by social dispositions that bind individuals to their communities. As individuals become engaged in the concerns of society, they move beyond the narrow sphere of personal and familial interests and enter the wider social arena.

Through participation in institutions such as schools, factories, trade unions, theaters, and other social organizations, individuals contribute to collective development and become active participants in social progress⁽¹¹⁾.

2.2. From the Individual to the Group

Human beings do not live as isolated entities detached from the groups to which they belong. From birth, individuals are embedded within networks of social relationships and dependencies, including family, kinship, ethnicity, social class, and other forms of collective affiliation. These social structures significantly influence individual destinies, opportunities, and identities.

A social group may be defined as a social system composed of individuals who interact with one another and participate in shared activities. Every group possesses a distinct identity that contributes to the individual's selfconcept. Social identity emerges from awareness of group membership and from the emotional and value-laden meanings attached to that membership⁽¹²⁾.

Consequently, groups function as important reference frameworks in the formation of personality. As Comte suggested, the individual's reality derives from the group, which provides both social legitimacy and meaning. Through group membership, individuals acquire norms, values, and

behavioral orientations that shape their interactions with the world.

Several forms of reference groups may be distinguished:

- **Primary reference groups**, such as families and close social networks, characterized by direct face-to-face interaction.

- **Institutional reference groups**, including workplaces and political organizations, which impose specific responsibilities and expectations.

- **Categorical reference groups**, based on age, gender, or cultural affiliation.

- **Aspirational reference groups**, which individuals seek to join and identify with.

- **Negative reference groups**, from which individuals consciously distance themselves while still defining themselves in relation to them.

Reference groups exert a significant influence on individuals by shaping aspirations, establishing standards of behavior, and defining socially desirable and undesirable forms of conduct. Through social interaction, groups facilitate friendship formation, social comparison, self-evaluation, selfimprovement, self-enhancement, altruism, and the development of social bonds. They also provide

members with frameworks for understanding social realities and internalizing collective values.

The principal function of reference groups is therefore the construction of social identity and the reinforcement of social cohesion among their members.

2.3. From the Individual to Society

The relationship between the individual and society is both profound and inseparable. Neither can exist meaningfully without the other. Society is not merely an aggregate of individuals but a specifically organized form of human association governed by structured systems of interaction and regulation.

Society may be defined as a group of individuals sharing common characteristics, inhabiting a particular territory over an extended period, and connected through social bonds that generate a collective sense of belonging and a shared culture⁽¹³⁾.

The concept of society encompasses two complementary dimensions. First, it refers to the collective body of individuals organized into a social formation shaped by historical processes. Second, it denotes the network of structures, relationships, and institutions through which individuals become integrated into collective life. These two dimensions are inseparable, for society consists simultaneously of people and the social forms that organize their interactions.

The boundaries of society are not always clearly defined. Depending on the analytical perspective adopted, one may speak of Algerian society, Arab society, or even global society. What remains essential, however, is the network of interactions that unites individuals in the pursuit of common objectives and facilitates collective action.

Social relationships generate systems of norms, rules, and institutions—including customs, traditions, legal systems, and moral values—that regulate interactions among members of society. Through processes of socialization, individuals learn distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable behavior, thereby internalizing the normative foundations of social life.

These shared norms and meanings collectively constitute culture. Culture emerges from the continuity of social relations and serves as the foundation of collective identity. It reflects the moral, symbolic, and often religious frameworks through which communities interpret their existence and organize social life.

Culture cannot be produced by isolated individuals, regardless of their talents or achievements. As anthropologist Maurice Godelier emphasizes, human beings do not merely live in society; they actively produce society in order to live within it. Consequently, any attempt to understand individuals

independently of their social relationships remains fundamentally incomplete.

Through participation in cultural life, individuals overcome isolation and contribute to the production of meanings, symbols, and collective representations. Ideas and material objects acquire cultural significance only when integrated into broader systems of social meaning. In the absence of such integration, both individuals and groups risk cultural stagnation and social disengagement. By contrast, dynamic societies continuously generate new cultural syntheses that enable them to adapt, innovate, and participate effectively in historical development⁽¹⁴⁾.

Section Two: Technological Development and Its Impact on the Individual

2.1. The Positive Impact of Technological Development

From a sociological perspective, technological development has profoundly transformed the position of the individual within society. Contemporary technologies have provided unprecedented opportunities for communication, self-expression, knowledge production, and social participation. In this regard, Marshall McLuhan argued that technological media constitute extensions of human senses, becoming integral components of human perception and behavior.

Technology is therefore no longer external to human existence; rather, it has become a constitutive element of modern identity.

Material technological advancement has been accompanied by significant transformations in social, cultural, economic, and demographic structures. Technology should consequently be understood not merely as an industrial phenomenon but also as a socio-cultural one. Many sociological perspectives regard technology as a primary driver of social, economic, and cultural change, considering it an independent variable capable of generating profound transformations within social systems and cultural frameworks.

In this sense, technology represents a major human achievement whose benefits depend largely on the manner in which it is utilized. The Japanese experience offers a notable example of successful technological adaptation, as Japan managed to assimilate the material achievements of the Western model while preserving the essential foundations of its national culture and social values.

Technological innovation has progressed at an unprecedented pace, particularly during recent decades. New technologies have acquired characteristics and capabilities unmatched in previous historical periods. Their widespread adoption by individuals and institutions has facilitated the fulfillment of social needs and contributed significantly to economic development. Technological

advancement has also generated new employment opportunities, especially for highly skilled professionals and knowledge workers.

As a result of its extensive penetration into everyday life, technology has acquired a distinctly social character. No society aspiring to development can remain disconnected from technological innovation. Technology has become an indispensable component of daily activities and professional practices, enabling individuals to accomplish tasks that were previously difficult, time-consuming, or even impossible.

Consequently, the relationship between individuals and technology has become increasingly intimate and reciprocal. Social needs stimulate technological innovation, while technological innovation, in turn, reshapes social behavior, patterns of interaction, and individual lifestyles⁽¹⁵⁾.

2.2. The Negative Impact of Technological Development

Despite its numerous benefits, technological development has also generated significant challenges for contemporary individuals. In industrial capitalist societies, machinery and highly organized systems of production have undoubtedly increased workers' efficiency, productivity, and precision. However, as Thorstein Veblen observed, the problem arises when

technological systems begin to dominate the worker rather than serve human purposes.

Within modern industrial production, workers increasingly become components of mechanized processes whose rhythms and requirements dictate their actions. Rather than controlling machines, individuals often find themselves adapting to the logic of technological systems. Consequently, labor becomes standardized and routinized, limiting opportunities for creativity and personal initiative.

This phenomenon reflects a broader crisis experienced by individuals in technologically advanced societies. Modern factories and mechanized forms of work frequently discourage creative expression and reduce workers to executors of predetermined tasks. The increasing automation of production contributes to the standardization of mental life and reinforces conformity to technical and organizational imperatives.

The individualism produced by industrial capitalism thus contains an inherent contradiction. While modern societies have granted individuals greater personal autonomy and expanded opportunities for leisure, reflection, and self-development compared to traditional societies, working conditions have often remained profoundly dehumanizing. The transition toward large-scale industrial production and global economic integration has generated individuals who frequently

experience anxiety, insecurity, social dislocation, addiction, and what Erich Fromm famously described as the “escape from freedom.”⁽¹⁶⁾

According to Fromm, the economic transformations associated with modern capitalism dismantled traditional structures of social stability and security. Individuals became increasingly responsible for their own destinies, no longer protected by fixed social positions or inherited statuses. While this development expanded personal freedom, it also exposed individuals to uncertainty, competition, and existential vulnerability.

Similarly, Karl Marx argued that technological development and the increasing division of labor intensify forms of alienation among workers. Numerous studies examining the relationship between technology and alienation have reached comparable conclusions, suggesting that rapid technological change often generates perceptions that machines threaten cultural values, occupational identities, and human autonomy.

In the contemporary digital era, these concerns have acquired new dimensions. Digital openness and global connectivity have produced novel forms of cultural domination. Algorithms, digital platforms, and data-driven systems increasingly influence individual preferences, consumption patterns, and modes of thought. In this context, technology no

longer merely mediates human activity; it actively shapes the conditions under which social life is experienced.

From the perspective of contemporary critical theory, particularly the intellectual legacy of the Frankfurt School, these developments may be interpreted as forms of *digital alienation*. Individuals appear formally free while simultaneously becoming subject to subtle mechanisms of technological control embedded within digital infrastructures. Consequently, the digital environment contributes to the reproduction of new forms of dependence, manipulation, and symbolic domination, raising important questions regarding autonomy, identity, and human agency in the technological age.

Section Three: The Individual in the Context of Cultural Change and Cultural Hegemony

The question of cultural domination has occupied a central position within sociological thought. Both Karl Marx and Max Weber argued that the culture of the dominant social class tends to become the dominant culture within society. Such dominance does not stem from the intrinsic superiority of a particular culture but rather from the relative social power of the groups that support and disseminate it. Consequently, discussions of “dominant” and “dominated” cultures are, strictly speaking, metaphorical, since what actually exists are

social groups connected through relations of power, dependence, and subordination.

However, Claude Grignon and JeanClaude Passeron caution against interpreting cultural domination in exactly the same manner as social domination. Symbolic systems do not operate according to the same logic as social relations between individuals and groups. The effects of cultural domination often differ from those of economic or political domination. A dominant culture can never impose itself upon a subordinate culture in the same direct way that a powerful group may dominate a weaker one. Cultural hegemony is neither absolute nor definitive, and subjection to cultural influence does not necessarily imply complete submission or passive acceptance.

Erich Fromm observed that modern society initially aspired to create a new culture capable of satisfying fundamental human needs. Its ideal was to reconcile individual aspirations with social requirements and to overcome the tension between human nature and social organization. This project rested upon two major assumptions. First, technological and industrial development would generate sufficient productive capacity to satisfy the needs of all individuals. Second, a rational and objective understanding of human nature would enable the construction of a society in which individuals could develop intellectual objectivity and perceive themselves, others, and nature without

ideological distortion. Yet, according to Fromm, modern societies have largely failed to achieve these objectives.

This failure is closely linked to the emergence of new forms of alienation affecting both individuals and social groups. Popular classes, in particular, have experienced a growing loss of autonomy as ideas themselves increasingly become subject to market forces. Mass communication systems, which constitute the primary channels for the dissemination of information and ideas in contemporary societies, have further intensified this process. More importantly, various forms of cultural imperialism have emerged as powerful mechanisms for influencing consciousness and shaping collective perceptions.

In 1980, the French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss warned that cultural globalization could lead humanity toward cultural uniformity. Such a process would reduce cultural diversity and promote a standardized global culture. In contemporary conditions, this dominant culture is largely associated with Western civilization and, more specifically, with American cultural influence. Language provides a particularly significant illustration of this phenomenon, as it functions as one of the principal vehicles through which culture is transmitted and reproduced.

The British writer H. G. Wells anticipated the emergence of a dominant global language

resulting from increasing communication, travel, and intercultural interaction. He suggested that societies would eventually be compelled to adopt a common language for international communication while preserving local languages for internal use. Given the predominance of the American model in contemporary globalization, English has emerged as the most likely candidate for this global communicative role⁽¹⁷⁾.

These developments have generated considerable concern, particularly among developing countries, which increasingly perceive themselves as vulnerable to forms of cultural dependency. In response, several countries, especially within the framework of the Non-Aligned Movement, called for the establishment of a new international order for information and communication designed to counter cultural domination and protect cultural autonomy. Nevertheless, such initiatives have achieved limited success in the face of rapid technological expansion and the growing influence of global communication networks.

Anthony Giddens characterizes the globalization of communication and media as the geographical expansion of similar forms of content across diverse regions of the world, creating conditions conducive to cultural expansion and influence. The objective of this expansion extends beyond the simple transmission of information; it also involves

shaping perceptions, preferences, values, and patterns of consumption.

Every individual possesses a multifaceted identity that varies according to the social groups with which he or she identifies. Identity is continuously constructed through membership in various social categories, including gender, age, social class, ethnicity, and cultural affiliation. Yet the globalization process that became increasingly dominant at the end of the twentieth century introduced a new social reality characterized by the circulation of information, the recognition of cultural plurality, and the growing interconnectedness of societies.

In principle, globalization encourages openness, intercultural dialogue, freedom of information, and democratic participation. Technological development has facilitated access to knowledge, expanded opportunities for individual freedom, and enabled people to compare information from multiple sources when forming opinions and making decisions.

However, the practical reality often differs from these normative ideals. Several powerful states, particularly the United States, have utilized the mechanisms of globalization to promote cultural penetration and influence. Through media industries, communication technologies, and global cultural products, dominant societies have acquired unprecedented capacities to shape perceptions

and influence cultural orientations beyond their national borders.

This process of cultural penetration has frequently transmitted social and cultural models that do not necessarily correspond to the values, traditions, and historical experiences of recipient societies. As a result, many individuals find themselves caught between local cultural frameworks and globally disseminated cultural patterns. This tension creates a state of cultural imbalance and contributes to what Émile Durkheim described as *anomie*—a condition characterized by the weakening of normative structures and the erosion of shared social values⁽¹⁸⁾.

The consequences of this phenomenon become particularly visible when traditional institutions of socialization, such as the family, the school, and other community structures, experience declining influence. Under such circumstances, individuals may encounter increasing difficulties in maintaining coherent identities and stable systems of meaning within rapidly changing cultural environments. Thus, the contemporary individual is confronted with the challenge of negotiating between local cultural belonging and the pressures of global cultural integration, a challenge that lies at the heart of current debates on identity, globalization, and cultural hegemony.

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that the individual's quest for self-realization unfolds within a complex interplay between technological development and cultural transformation. Within this context, the technocultural problematic emerges as a critical framework for understanding the evolving relationship between human beings and technology and its implications for identity formation, social interaction, and cultural belonging.

From a sociological perspective, two major approaches can be identified. The first, represented by the interactionist tradition, views individuals as active agents who continuously reproduce and reshape culture through everyday interactions mediated by technological tools. This perspective, associated with thinkers such as George Herbert Mead, emphasizes the individual's capacity to construct meaning and participate actively in the production of social reality. The second, represented by critical social theory, highlights the ways in which technology may function as an instrument of economic domination and cultural hegemony. Thinkers such as Max Horkheimer argue that technological systems are not neutral but can serve to reproduce relations of power, dependency, and social control.

The findings of this study suggest that technological progress cannot be understood

solely in terms of its technical or economic dimensions. Rather, it must also be examined through its cultural and social consequences, particularly its impact on individual autonomy, identity, and social integration. While technology offers unprecedented opportunities for communication, creativity, and access to knowledge, it may simultaneously generate new forms of alienation, cultural dependency, and symbolic domination.

Accordingly, the challenge facing contemporary societies is not whether technology should be embraced or rejected, but how it can be integrated into social life in ways that enhance human freedom and cultural diversity. This objective requires the development of a critical sociology of technology capable of revealing the cultural assumptions embedded within technological systems and assessing their effects on social relations.

Ultimately, the individual must reclaim an active role within the technocultural sphere, not merely as a passive consumer of digital content and technological applications, but as a conscious social actor capable of shaping technology in accordance with human values, cultural plurality, and the pursuit of collective emancipation.

References

I. Books

1. Al-Jawhari, Mohammed Mahmoud. *Introduction to Sociology*. Vol. 1. Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Masirah for Printing and Publishing, 2010.
2. Al-Kahlani, Hassan. *Individualism in Philosophical Thought*. Cairo: Madbouly Library, 2004.
3. Al-Sayyid, Abd al-Ati Al-Sayyid. *Society, Culture, and Personality: Studies in Cultural Sociology*. Egypt: Dar Al-Ma'rifa Al-Jami'iyya, 2003.
4. Boudon, Raymond, and François Bourricaud. *Critical Dictionary of Sociology*. Algiers: University Publications Office, n.d.
5. Dliou, Fodil, et al. *Contemporary Challenges: Globalization, the Internet, Poverty, and Language*. Constantine, Algeria: Sociology of Communication Laboratory, 2002.
6. Gharbi, Ali, and Yamina Nizar. *Imported Technology and the Development of Workers' Culture in Industrial Institutions*. Constantine, Algeria: Sociology of Communication Laboratory, Mentouri University, 2002.
7. Kadhim, Alaa Jawad. *The Individual and Destiny: A Study in Cultural Anthropology*. Beirut: Al-Tanweer Printing and Publishing, 2011.

8. Shroukh, Salah Eddine. *Social Psychology and Islam*. Annaba, Algeria: Dar Al-Olum for Publishing and Distribution, 2010.

II. University Teaching Materials

1. Othman, Mariam. *Pedagogical Course Material for the Individual and Culture*

Module. El Tarf, Algeria: University of El Tarf, 2017.

2. Rabah, Waked. *The Individual and Culture: Lectures for First-Year Common Core Social Sciences Students*. Algiers: University of Algiers 1, n.d.

¹ - Kadhim, Alaa Jawad. *The Individual and Destiny: A Study in Cultural Anthropology*. Beirut: Al-Tanweer Printing and Publishing, 2011, p 36 .

² - Boudon, R., and F. Bourricaud. *Critical Dictionary of Sociology*. Algeria: University Publications Office, n.d , p 105/

³ - Shroukh, Salah Eddine. *Social Psychology and Islam*. Annaba, Algeria: Dar Al-Olum for Publishing and Distribution, 2010, p 78.

⁴ - Al-Kahlani, Hassan. *Individualism in Philosophical Thought*. Cairo: Madbouly Library, 2004.

⁵ - Kadhim, Alaa Jawad. *The Individual and Destiny: A Study in Cultural Anthropology*. Beirut: Al-Tanweer Printing and Publishing, 2011 , p 48.

⁶ - Boudon, R., and F. Bourricaud, p 29 .

⁷ - Gharbi, Ali, and Yamina Nizar. *Imported Technology and the Development of Workers' Culture in Industrial Institutions*. Constantine, Algeria: Sociology of Communication Laboratory, Mentouri University, 2002, p 203.

⁸ - Othman, Mariam. *Pedagogical Course Material for the Individual and Culture Module*. El Tarf, Algeria: University of El Tarf, 2017, p 81.

⁹ - Rabah, Waked. *The Individual and Culture: Lectures for First-Year Common Core Social Sciences Students*. Algiers: University of Algiers 1, n.d, p 156.

¹⁰ - Dliou, Fodil, et al. *Contemporary Challenges: Globalization, the Internet, Poverty, and Language*. Constantine, Algeria: Sociology of Communication Laboratory, 2002 , p 39.

¹¹ -ibid. p 41.

¹² - Al-Sayyid, Abd al-Ati Al-Sayyid. *Society, Culture, and Personality: Studies in Cultural Sociology*. Egypt: Dar Al-Ma'rifa Al-Jami'iyya, 2003, p 230.

¹³ - Al-Jawhari, Mohammed Mahmoud. *Introduction to Sociology*. Vol. 1. Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Masirah for Printing and Publishing, 2010 , p 93.

¹⁴ - ibid , p 93.

¹⁵ - Rabah, Waked. *P 154*.

¹⁶ - Dliou, Fodil, et al, p 76.

¹⁷ - Kadhim, Alaa Jawad. *The Individual and Destiny: A Study in Cultural Anthropology*.
Beirut:

Al-Tanweer Printing and Publishing, 2011, p 70.

¹⁸ - Rabah, Waked. *P 159*.