

SECTION: PSYCHOLOGY

DOI 10.70286/ISU-08.04.2026.012

PSYCHOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES OF PERSONALITY SUBJECTIVITY IN MEDIATED COMMUNICATION

Koshil Anton Igorovich

Postgraduate student

Lytovchenko Nina Fedorivna

Ph.D, Associate Professor

Department of General and Practical Psychology

Nizhyn State University named after Mykola Gogol, Ukraine

The psychological transformation of communication in the context of digital mediation calls for a nuanced reconsideration of the boundaries that shape personality subjectivity. Within the classical psychological paradigm, subjectivity is conceptualized as an individual's capacity for conscious self-organization, expressed through intentionality, autonomy, and the active transformation of reality. Yet, as communicative processes increasingly unfold within virtual environments, the "psychological boundary", understood as a functional membrane separating the internal "Self" from the external world, undergoes a qualitative reconfiguration. In mediated communication, this boundary is no longer a stable demarcation rooted in physical or immediate social contexts. Rather, it emerges as a fluid and continuously negotiated process, co-constructed by the human agent and the technological interface.

Digital interaction introduces a specific form of ontological displacement, generating a gap between the embodied self and its virtual representations. This condition may be described as a form of disembodied subjectivity, in which presence is no longer anchored in the immediacy of the "here and now." Instead, the subject becomes distributed across multiple digital environments, each demanding distinct modes of self-presentation [3, p. 379].

Such fragmentation places additional demands on the integrity of the personality, as the individual must coordinate various versions of the self-shaped by platform-specific affordances and algorithmic logics. In this sense, the digital interface transcends its instrumental role and becomes an active participant in the construction of communication, subtly regulating the scope of self-expression and the experience of agency.

Equally significant is the transformation of the "Self-Other" distinction, which constitutes a core function of psychological boundaries. The absence of embodied cues, combined with the perceived anonymity of online interaction, often facilitates the so-called online disinhibition effect, weakening internal mechanisms of self-regulation. As a result, psychological boundaries become more permeable, blurring the line

between private reflection and public expression. Within such conditions, the “Other” may no longer be encountered as an autonomous subject, but rather as a projection shaped by one’s own expectations and interpretative frameworks. This shift risks transforming dialogical interaction into a form of implicit monologue, where the expansion of the self-diminishes the presence and subjectivity of the interlocutor.

A crucial dimension of subjectivity lies in self-anticipatory activity, the capacity to project one’s actions into the future and regulate behavior in accordance with internally defined goals. However, the architecture of mediated environments often privileges reactivity over proactivity. Continuous streams of notifications, feedback signals, and algorithmically curated content draw the subject into cycles of immediate response, potentially undermining the experience of agency and contributing to what may be termed “algorithmic fragmentation.”

Under these conditions, the preservation of a coherent subjective boundary requires the development of digital reflexivity, a reflective stance that enables the individual to critically objectify the virtual environment, recognize its structuring influences, and consciously establish psychological limits that prevent the diffusion of the self [1, p. 404]. The psychological boundaries of subjectivity in mediated communication should be understood not as fixed lines of defense, but as dynamic loci of cognitive and affective negotiation. The shift from physical to virtual modes of interaction does not imply a loss of subjectivity, rather it signals the emergence of a mediated form of subjectivity that demands new regulatory capacities.

The preservation of personal integrity in the digital age depends on the individual’s ability to relocate the boundary of the self from the level of physical presence to the level of intentionality, reflexivity, and critical awareness. By actively engaging with and regulating the technological conditions of communication, the subject retains autonomy, transforming the digital environment into a space of meaningful self-realization rather than one of subjective dispersion.

Within virtual environments, the psychological boundary operates not simply as a barrier, but as a sensitive and selective filter, through which external digital incentives are either integrated into the subject’s inner world or held at a distance to preserve psychic coherence. Yet, this filtering function is increasingly challenged by the condition of “hyper-connectivity,” where the constant flow of information often bypasses or weakens traditional regulatory mechanisms [2, p. 891].

When the subject loses the capacity to modulate this flow, the boundary may become excessively permeable, giving rise to states of cognitive, emotional saturation. In such conditions, the line between one’s own intentions and desires and those subtly induced by the digital environment begins to blur. Maintaining subjectivity requires a form of active “boundary-work” that is not purely defensive, but reflective and transformative, enabling the individual to consciously shape and curate their digital experience rather than passively absorb it.

At the same time, the very nature of the “Other” within mediated interaction undergoes a significant transformation, shifting the boundary from an interpersonal to a techno-social dimension. In direct, face-to-face communication, the embodied presence of the Other naturally limits the expansion of the self, anchoring interaction

in reciprocity and mutual recognition [4, p. 275]. In contrast, within virtual space, the interlocutor is often reduced to symbolic representations, such as texts, images, or avatars that can be selectively engaged with, reinterpreted, or even ignored. This reduction challenges the subject's capacity for empathy and for recognizing the Other as an autonomous center of experience. As a result, the psychological boundary risks turning into a "mirror" rather than a "bridge," reflecting the subject's own expectations and projections instead of enabling genuine dialogue. To counteract this tendency toward subjective closure, the individual must engage in a deliberate process of de-centering, acknowledging the complexity and partial opacity of the mediated Other and actively sustaining a boundary that supports authentic dialogic exchange despite the constraints of the medium.

Equally important is the transformation of temporal and spatial conditions in digital communication, which reshapes the rhythmic organization of subjective activity. Traditionally, subjectivity unfolds within a relatively continuous temporal horizon, where past experiences, present awareness, and future intentions are integrated through anticipatory regulation. However, the immediacy and "instantaneity" of virtual environments disrupt this continuity, privileging rapid response over reflective pause. This often results in a fragmented temporality, where the subject's agency becomes dispersed across a sequence of isolated "now-moments," lacking deeper integration. This often results in a fragmented temporality, in which the subject's agency becomes dispersed across a sequence of discrete present instances, lacking deeper integration.

In order to restore a coherent sense of self, the individual must actively reconstruct their own temporal boundaries, regulating the pace of interaction, resisting the pressure of constant responsiveness, and creating spaces for sustained reflection within the digital flow. Such temporal autonomy becomes a necessary condition for the realization of higher-order subjective capacities, including long-term intentionality and ethical responsibility [2, p. 897].

The stability of psychological boundaries is increasingly tested by the persistent presence of the "digital shadow", such as the accumulated traces of data, histories, and metadata that accompany the individual across digital environments. This shadow often precedes the subject in interaction, presenting a pre-configured profile through which others and algorithmic systems engage with the individual even before direct self-expression occurs. The central psychological challenge lies in maintaining a meaningful distinction between this externalized digital representation and the subject's evolving inner self.

When identification with the digital profile becomes too rigid or uncritical, the boundary risks collapsing, and subjectivity may be reduced to a fixed, commodified identity. Preserving the integrity of personality subjectivity therefore entails an ongoing process of de-identification from one's digital traces, allowing the core of the self to remain open, dynamic, and not fully determined by the structures of the virtual environment.

Ultimately, the stability of individual subjectivity in mediated communication depends on the individual's capacity to continuously renegotiate and stabilize

psychological boundaries under conditions of digital fluidity. This involves not only defensive regulation, but also the development of a reflective and critically aware stance toward the structuring influences of technological environments. In this sense, mediated communication does not eliminate subjectivity, but redefines it as an ongoing project of self-construction, grounded in autonomy, reflexivity, and intentional engagement with the digital world.

References

1. Akın A. (2012). The relationships between Internet addiction, subjective vitality, and subjective happiness. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15, P. 404-410.
2. Gosling S. D., Mason W. (2015). Internet research in psychology. *Annual review of psychology*, 66, P. 877-902.
3. Gough B., Madill A. (2012). Subjectivity in psychological science: from problem to prospect. *Psychological methods*, 17, P. 374-384.
4. Levitt-Frank M., Avihu S. (2023). Subjectivity and individual psychology. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 79, P. 275-290.

ПОКАЗНИКИ СТРЕСУ, ТРИВОЖНОСТІ Й ДЕПРЕСІЇ У СТУДЕНТСЬКОЇ МОЛОДІ В СУЧАСНИХ УМОВАХ

Негоруї Вікторія

здобувачка вищої освіти бакалаврського рівня

Кафедра психології та педагогіки

Хмельницький національний університет, Україна

Гаврилькевич В'ячеслав

кандидат психологічних наук, доцент

Повномасштабна збройна агресія росії проти України спричинила значне зростання психічного навантаження на населення, що проявляється у підвищенні рівня тривожності, депресії та стресу. За даними сучасних досліджень, значна частина українців демонструє симптоми психічного дистресу, а молодь віком 18-29 років є найбільш уразливою категорією [1; 2].

Студентська молодь перебуває у специфічних умовах, поєднуючи навчальну діяльність із впливом воєнних стресорів, що зумовлює необхідність дослідження її психічного стану та визначення шляхів психологічної підтримки.

Мета дослідження – визначення показників стресу, тривожності й депресії у студентської молоді в сучасних умовах та окреслення необхідних заходів для збереження психічного здоров'я студентів.

Психічне здоров'я розглядається як стан психологічного благополуччя, що забезпечує здатність особистості ефективно функціонувати, протистояти