INTI

eISSN 2830-795X

Technological Embodiment and the Fragmentation of Social Identity in the Era of Human Enhancement

Sirojuddin Abror, Rafadi Khan Khayru, Uswatun Chasanah, Fayola Issalillah

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Email: fayola.issalillah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT – This study explores how biohacking technologies, particularly those involving cognitive augmentation and bodily modification, reshape social identity and class structures through a post-humanist sociological perspective. By employing a literature-based approach, the research analyzes how technological interventions alter the construction of the self, redefine social hierarchies, and fragment traditional identity categories. The analysis reveals that biohacking introduces new symbolic economies wherein enhanced bodies become markers of social privilege. Access to enhancement tools remains uneven, further embedding socio-economic disparities. Technologically modified individuals often experience elevated status, while those without access face exclusion from evolving social norms. The concept of identity is transformed into a dynamic construct shaped by technological capability, leading to the emergence of techno-subjectivities. These shifts challenge the integrity of communal experiences and disrupt the formation of collective solidarity. The findings suggest that biohacking, while presented as a personal or liberatory choice, contributes to the reproduction of structural inequality when left unregulated. The study underscores the importance of critical inquiry into how identity and class are continually reconfigured in light of technological advancement, offering a sociological contribution that moves beyond celebration toward deeper reflection.

Keywords: Biohacking, post-humanism, social identity, class structure, technological embodiment, sociological transformation, human enhancement.

A. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the emergence of biohacking technologies has challenged conventional understandings of the human body and identity (Gaspar et al., 2019). As biomedical enhancements and cognitive augmentation tools become increasingly accessible, they are reshaping how individuals perceive their physical and mental boundaries (Darmawan, 2025). The sociological lens offers a powerful framework to examine how these technologies influence not only personal identity but also collective notions of humanity. What was once considered purely biological is now subject to technological intervention, raising significant philosophical and social questions (Tomašovičová, 2022).

Social theorists have long interrogated the relationship between the body and societal structures, but the arrival of post-humanism, fueled by biohacking, presents a novel trajectory. Technologies that modify bodily capacities or enhance cognitive functions push the boundaries of the 'natural' human. These developments lead to redefinitions of personhood, agency, and even moral responsibility. Post-humanism, as a sociological inquiry, thus compels a reevaluation of long-held assumptions about human limits, particularly when human faculties are technologically mediated (Ahn, 2023).

Beyond individual transformations, these technologies impact collective social arrangements (Arifin & Darmawan, 2021). Access to biohacking tools—such as neural implants, gene editing, or smart prosthetics—introduces new dimensions of inequality and privilege. Those with economic means or technological literacy may gain advantages that reshape class dynamics and reinforce structural disparities. This raises concerns over equity, autonomy, and the reconfiguration of social stratification in technologically mediated societies (Hobson & Roessing, 2022).

Further, the visibility of technologically modified bodies in public and digital spaces cultivates new aesthetic norms and pressures. These visible alterations become part of social identity construction, influencing how bodies are read, judged, and categorized. As biohacking blurs the line between enhancement and identity expression, it demands critical attention to its societal ramifications (McMillan, 2020).

The core issues that arise from this transformation are complex. One major issue is the regulation and governance of biohacking technologies (Lewis & Thomson, 2019). Despite their growing presence, policies surrounding their ethical application remain underdeveloped. Scholars such as Fukuyama (2002) have warned about the potential for technological enhancement to undermine democratic equality, yet enforcement mechanisms lag behind.

Another pressing concern is the epistemological uncertainty surrounding post-human identity. Haraway (1991) argues that traditional dichotomies of human versus machine are collapsing, but without clear frameworks, the social implications remain speculative. This ambiguity influences public discourse, legal categorization, and institutional practices, often leaving critical gaps in protection and recognition (Kadlecová, 2020).

A further issue involves the cultural and symbolic meanings attributed to technologically altered bodies. As argued by Balsamo (1996), the technologically mediated body becomes a site of power negotiation—both as object and subject. Such bodies are often situated within discourses of productivity, control, and desire, which complicate efforts to understand them merely as empowered entities (Rose, 2017).

These problems signal the necessity of sociological investigation. The transformation of the human body through technology is not simply a technical matter; it has social repercussions that demand rigorous analysis (Bednar & Welch, 2020). The shifting definition of identity, coupled with emerging class formations based on technological access, necessitates scholarly attention. As such, analyzing biohacking within a post-humanist sociological perspective is essential to grasp the trajectory of human development in the digital age (Sands, 2022).

This issue warrants focused attention because it reshapes our understanding of identity, community, and societal expectations. The increasing normalization of body enhancement challenges traditional frameworks of personhood and raises critical questions regarding authenticity and agency. Furthermore, these shifts are not occurring in isolation—they are intertwined with larger institutional and cultural systems that influence how these bodies are accepted or marginalized.

This study aims to explore how biohacking technologies are reshaping contemporary understandings of the human body and identity within the sociological framework of post-humanism. By examining how technological modification intersects with social categorization and inequality, this analysis seeks to illuminate the changing dynamics of identity formation and class distinction. The findings of this study contribute to the growing discourse on the sociotechnical construction of identity, offering insights into how technology mediates human existence in evolving social orders.

B. METHOD

This research adopts a qualitative literature review method, emphasizing a normative-sociological analysis. It draws upon primary and secondary academic sources to explore the impact of biohacking within the framework of post-humanist sociology. According to Neuman (2006), literature-based research is suitable for examining theoretical constructs and understanding how concepts evolve in response to social changes. This approach allows the study to identify connections between technological developments and their sociological implications without relying on empirical fieldwork. The data used include books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and relevant legal or institutional frameworks regarding body modification and technological enhancement.

The data collection technique is based on structured reading and critical interpretation of selected texts. This aligns with Blaikie's (2000) description of qualitative research strategies that emphasize meaning, subjectivity, and interpretation over quantification. Sources are chosen based on their relevance to themes of identity, technology, and social stratification. The analysis technique is inductive and interpretive, seeking patterns of argumentation that reveal how biohacking influences contemporary perceptions of social identity and class. The trustworthiness of the data is supported through triangulation by comparing different scholarly perspectives on the same topic and ensuring alignment with established sociological theories.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In recent decades, the convergence of biology and technology has brought forth a reimagining of the human form (Xu et al., 2019). Advancements once confined to the realm of medical restoration now enter territories of enhancement and voluntary transformation. Individuals are no longer

limited to passive interactions with their bodies; instead, they actively reengineer themselves in pursuit of elevated states of being (Courpasson & Monties, 2017). This phenomenon signals a cultural shift that challenges long-standing assumptions about the body as a static biological entity.

At the heart of this transformation lies the emergence of biohacking—an array of practices that integrate digital tools, genetic interventions, and mechanical augmentations into the human body (Lupton, 2015). These interventions transcend therapeutic intent and redefine the very purpose of embodiment. No longer directed solely by survival or recovery, bodily modification becomes an instrument of self-determined evolution (Harwood et al., 2023). The resulting figures embody aspirations, anxieties, and philosophical reorientations surrounding the nature of existence in technologically saturated environments.

Traditional sociological frameworks, while invaluable in interpreting collective behavior and social patterns, often fall short in explaining the ontological upheavals triggered by such innovations (Bour, 2019). It is here that post-humanist theory proves instrumental. By decentering the human subject and embracing a fluid interplay between organisms and machines, this lens opens new pathways for understanding how emerging technologies reshape identity. The body, once viewed as a vessel of social inscription, is now an open interface subject to design, iteration, and experimentation (Haddow et al., 2023).

These shifts are not merely superficial; they penetrate the deepest layers of selfhood and interpersonal dynamics. The individual becomes a site of convergence for cultural codes, technological capacities, and biological potentialities (Drozdova & Vlasova, 2019). As such, identity construction becomes a process mediated by circuits, implants, and data, complicating traditional markers of gender, race, and ability. In this emergent order, human agency is recalibrated to accommodate the material influence of innovation (Suchman, 2020).

By acknowledging this transformation, sociology finds itself compelled to expand its analytical vocabulary (Bakirov, 2021). The post-humanist orientation encourages a departure from anthropocentric paradigms and moves toward a relational understanding of subjectivity (Homewood, 2018). In this view, biohacking is neither anomaly nor fringe experiment—it is a central development that demands critical attention. Through this lens, society is not just reacting to technological progress; it is actively being reconstructed by it.

The sociological lens of post-humanism offers an insightful framework for examining how biohacking technologies—ranging from cognitive enhancements to bodily modifications—restructure the way individuals perceive themselves and are positioned within society (Aznar & Burguete, 2020). Unlike traditional biomedical interventions, biohacking introduces deliberate technological intrusions into the body that extend beyond medical necessity, reflecting desires for performance optimization, aesthetic redefinition, and ontological experimentation. According to Braidotti (2006), post-humanist thought detaches the human condition from its species-bound limitations and repositions it within a network of technological assemblages. Within this framework, biohacking is not merely a tool but a mechanism for constructing new identities that blur the line between organic and synthetic, human and machine (Petersén, 2023).

The implications of these alterations are most visible in the way social identities are constructed and validated (Loewenthal, 2017). Traditional identity categories—such as gender, age, and ability—are destabilized as technological augmentation introduces a layer of fluidity and choice. As Haraway (2003) argued in her work on the cyborg metaphor, hybrid identities born out of technological integration challenge the coherence of essentialist identity markers. Biohackers who opt for neural implants, subdermal chips, or prosthetic enhancements embody new forms of self-expression that reflect autonomy and resistance to normative bodily standards, which often place them at odds with dominant cultural narratives (Barfield & Williams, 2017).

However, this transformation is not experienced uniformly across all social strata. The capacity to engage in biohacking practices is often restricted by access to knowledge, financial resources, and technological infrastructure. Rose (2007) observed that the governance of biotechnological access reproduces socio-economic boundaries, thereby generating new hierarchies of embodiment. Those who can afford sophisticated enhancements acquire advantages not only biologically, but also socially, as augmented

capabilities begin to serve as status markers. This phenomenon reinforces a stratification system where technologically altered bodies symbolize elite membership, while unmodified bodies are seen as lagging behind (Zanc & Lupu, 2013).

Moreover, the normalization of enhanced bodies shifts societal expectations regarding performance, productivity, and aesthetics (Vogiatzaki & Krukowski, 2016). As Hogle (2005) noted, biomedical technologies tend to redefine the "normal" body in alignment with idealized capacities, placing pressure on individuals to conform or risk marginalization. In such a landscape, identity becomes increasingly performative and technological, tied to one's ability to keep up with rapid enhancements (Siegel et al., 2017). This redefinition of bodily worth translates into new forms of symbolic capital within class structures.

Biohacking, therefore, reconfigures not just the individual's self-concept but the broader social order (Jansen & Wehrle, 2018). The emergence of augmented elites, defined by their access to enhancement technologies, reveals a techno-elitism that reshapes class boundaries (Nabben, 2021). According to Sadowski (2010) and Tyfield et al. (2017), the political economy of biohacking is inseparable from neoliberal ideologies that promote personal optimization as both moral imperative and market commodity. In this view, enhancement is no longer a personal choice but a socioeconomic demand, leading to the commodification of identity.

Social cohesion is also disrupted as biohacked individuals create communities with shared technological ideologies, often disconnected from conventional identity groupings (Barceló & Lemkow, 2016). These enclaves may foster solidarity among the bio-enhanced, but they can alienate those outside the augmentation discourse. As Wolfe (2010) observed, post-humanism problematizes the notion of a unified "human" identity, replacing it with a multiplicity of techno-subjectivities that are hierarchically organized by access and capability. This transformation exacerbates feelings of exclusion among unaugmented populations (Gomel, 2011).

Education, employment, and even interpersonal relationships begin to reflect these new divisions (Gangwar, 2020). Individuals with cognitive enhancements, such as nootropic implants or neurostimulators, may outperform others in competitive settings, creating pressure on institutions to adjust their standards. As Franklin (2007) and Mulligan et al. (2019) emphasized, the integration of technology into identity construction forces social institutions to redefine merit, fairness, and inclusion in an age where enhancement can skew baselines of comparison.

Legal and ethical systems struggle to keep pace with these sociotechnical shifts (Pasmore et al., 2019). The absence of clear regulatory boundaries around elective human enhancement allows disparities to proliferate. As Coeckelbergh (2009) noted, the unequal distribution of enhancement technologies raises questions about justice, autonomy, and democratic access. While biohacking offers opportunities for self-reinvention, it also risks entrenching privilege in more subtle and biologically coded forms.

Cultural narratives around the "post-human" reinforce these disparities (Zettler et al., 2019). Popular media often depict enhanced individuals as superior, desirable, or even more evolved, creating aspirational models that amplify class tension (Chithra, 2021). This symbolic construction feeds into consumer behaviors, where body enhancement is marketed as empowerment but primarily benefits those with purchasing power. As Hayles (2008) described, the post-human subject becomes a product shaped by both desire and market logic.

The destabilization of traditional social markers gives rise to identity crises and alienation among individuals who cannot or choose not to participate in biohacking (Henry, 2014). This divergence creates rifts within communities and families, as value systems diverge based on technological affinity. The sociological outcome is a bifurcation of identity pathways—one oriented toward techno-progress, the other toward organic resistance (Cohen et al., 2016). This tension mirrors larger cultural debates over authenticity, belonging, and what it means to be human.

These developments challenge the foundations of collective solidarity. When identity becomes technologically modulated, shared experiences are fragmented by differing levels of enhancement (Bologan & Seo, 2017). The notion of common struggle, essential to social movements and cohesion, weakens as individuals become isolated within personalized technological trajectories. Sloterdijk (2009) noted that such fragmentation risks turning society into an archipelago of individuals, each shaped by their own bio-technological profile.

Nevertheless, resistance emerges from critical sociological voices and grassroots movements (Ourahmoune, 2017). Scholars and activists warn against the uncritical adoption of enhancement technologies without interrogating their implications for equity and social justice. As Ihde (2002) argued, technological embodiment should not obscure the social and political conditions that shape access. The reframing of identity through biohacking must be read not as liberation, but as participation in a complex system of power and exclusion.

The convergence of human ambition and technological capacity has given rise to a form of embodiment that exceeds conventional understanding (Gladden, 2019). No longer defined solely by organic composition or inherited traits, the body has become a dynamic platform for reconfiguration. This shift compels scholars to reevaluate long-standing assumptions about subjectivity, agency, and social classification, particularly as enhancement becomes both a personal aspiration and a commodified ideal (Welsh, 2020).

While the pursuit of transformation is often framed as empowerment, it simultaneously introduces modes of exclusion that mirror, and sometimes intensify, preexisting social divides. Technological access, proficiency, and literacy determine who may participate in the redefinition of selfhood (Masur, 2020). These disparities embed themselves not only in the body, but in educational systems, labor markets, and institutional structures that reward technologically mediated performance.

What emerges is a new architecture of social meaning, one in which difference is engineered and hierarchy recalibrated through tools of augmentation. As individuals navigate this landscape, the lines separating choice from necessity, identity from aspiration, and liberation from conformity begin to blur (Rabb, 2023). The implications of this ambiguity stretch beyond aesthetics or ability—they challenge the very foundations of ethical social engagement.

It becomes increasingly clear that biohacking cannot be understood solely through scientific, medical, or technological discourses. It must be addressed as a profoundly sociological phenomenon, with ramifications that shape how people understand worth, value, and place in a stratified world. The reconstructed body is not apolitical—it carries inscriptions of privilege, regulation, and ideology.

Therefore, the discourse must shift from fascination to critical vigilance. The future of bodily enhancement demands frameworks that account for power, equity, and responsibility. Only by confronting the social architectures that surround biohacking can we avoid reinscribing the very forms of inequality that innovation seeks to transcend.

D. CONCLUSION

The transformation of the human body and self-conception through biohacking technologies reflects more than mere personal choice; it reshapes the foundational dimensions of social identity and class relations. This study has demonstrated that the integration of enhancement technologies within the post-humanist sociological framework results in new hierarchies of embodiment, fragmented notions of collective identity, and a shift in symbolic capital. Technological modifications have generated fluid, hybrid subjectivities that challenge traditional social categories, yet simultaneously reinforce inequality through uneven access and market-driven logic.

The examination of biohacking through a sociological and post-humanist lens brings to light implications that affect not just individuals but the broader structure of society. As technological intervention becomes embedded in the formation of social status and identity, questions of fairness, inclusion, and institutional responsibility become unavoidable. The findings suggest a pressing need for scholars, educators, and policymakers to address how identity is increasingly mediated by technologies not governed equitably. Ignoring these developments could lead to deeper divisions and erosion of shared social narratives that sustain cohesion in human communities.

This paper recommends sustained academic attention and empirical research to monitor how technological self-modification influences emerging social patterns. Although biohacking presents an image of individual empowerment, it necessitates vigilant scrutiny to ensure it does not intensify marginalization under the guise of progress. Future sociological inquiry should continue to interrogate these transformations with intellectual precision and ethical commitment, ensuring that the technological future remains critically engaged rather than blindly celebrated.

REFERENCES

Ahn, S. 2023. Humanism Contra Post-Humanism. Historical Materialism, 31(1), 63-92. https://doi.org/10.1163/1569206x-20232009

Arifin, S., & D. Darmawan. 2021. Technology Access and Digital Skills: Bridging the Gaps in Education and Employment Opportunities in the Age of Technology 4.0, Journal of Social Science Studies, 1(1), 163 – 168.

Aznar Lucea, J., & E. Burguete Miguel. 2020. From Australopithecus to Ciborgs. Are We Facing the End of Human Evolution?. Acta Bioethica, 26(2), 165-177.

Bakirov, V. 2021. Transformation of Sociology: Necessity and Perspectives. Ukrainian Sociological Journal, (26), 9-15.

Balsamo, A. 1996. Technologies of the Gendered Body: Reading Cyborg Women. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Barceló, M. & L. Lemkow. 2016. New Options and Identities: Body Enhancement in Science Fiction Narrative. Technoscience and Citizenship: Ethics and Governance in the Digital Society, 17(5), 63-79.

Barfield, W. & A. Williams. 2017. Cyborgs and Enhancement Technology. Philosophies, 2(1), 1-18.

Bednar, P. M., & C. Welch. 2020. Socio-Technical Perspectives on Smart Working: Creating Meaningful and Sustainable Systems. Information Systems Frontiers, 22(2), 281-298.

Blaikie, N. 2000. Designing Social Research. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bologan, A. & J. H. Seo. 2017. What Is the Human? Imagining the Self as Post-Human. In Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGCHI Conference on Creativity and Cognition (pp. 450-452). Association for Computing Machinery, New York.

Bour, S. 2019. Transhumanisme: Entre Augmentation, Esthétique et Éthique. Philosophical Readings-Online Journal of Philosophy–ISSN 2036-4989, 11(1), 6-16.

Braidotti, R. 2006. Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Chasanah, U. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2023. Optimizing Employee Performance: The Role of Human Resource Management, Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia, 3(1), 1-12.

Chithra, J. L. 2021. The Paradox of Being Human and More Than Human: Exploring the Class Struggle in Nancy Kress' Beggars in Spain. Psychology and Education Journal, 58(1), 4485-44487.

Coeckelbergh, M. 2009. Distributive Justice and Human Enhancement. Science and Engineering Ethics, 15(2), 173–181.

Cohen, T., C. Colebrook, & J. Miller Hillis. 2016. Twilight of the Anthropocene Idols. Open Humanities Press, London.

Courpasson, D., & V. Monties. 2017. "I Am My Body". Physical Selves of Police Officers in a Changing Institution. Journal of Management Studies, 54(1), 32-57.

Darmawan, D. 2025. Human Capital Development in Knowledge-Based Organizations for Innovation and Continuous Learning, International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology, 7(1), 1–4.

da Silva, B. dos S., D. Darmawan, & B. Gardi. 2022. A Systematic Approach to Risk Management to Enhance Information Technology Project Success in a Dynamic Business Environment, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 213 – 218.

Drozdova, A. V., & E. V. Vlasova. 2019. The Transformation of the Body in Today's Media Culture. Wellbeing and Security in the Face of Social Transformations, 9(1), 272-279.

Fariz, F. A. B. M., & F. Issalillah. 2021. Narrowing the Economic Gap: The Impact of Technological Innovation on Access and Welfare of the Poor, Journal of Social Science Studies, 1(1), 111 – 116.

Franklin, S. 2007. Dolly Mixtures: The Remaking of Genealogy. Durham, Duke University Press, North Carolina, USA.

Fukuyama, F. 2002. Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.

Gangwar, N. 2020. Education Divide at Work. In Management Practices for Engaging a Diverse Workforce (pp. 107-130). Apple Academic Press, Florida.

Gani, A. 2022. Technology, Social Fragmentation and Polarization in Building Inclusive and Effective Social Networks in Communities, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 21

Gaspar, R., P. Rohde, & J. C. Giger. 2019. Unconventional Settings and Uses of Human Enhancement Technologies: A Non-Systematic Review of Public and Experts' Views on Self-Enhancement and DIY Biology/Biohacking Risks. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 1(4), 295-305.

Gladden, M. E. 2019. Who Will Be the Members of Society 5.0? Towards an Anthropology of Technologically Posthumanized Future Societies. Social Sciences, 8(5), 1-39.

Gomel, E. 2011. Science (Fiction) and Posthuman Ethics: Redefining the Human. The European Legacy, 16(3), 339-354.

Haddow, G., C. Åsberg, & F. Timeto. 2023. Cyborg Figurations: Exploring the Intersections of Technology, Embodiment, Identity, and Ecology. Tecnoscienza, 14(1), 123-154.

Halizah, S. N. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. Accommodating Social Change in Sustainability Policy: Solutions for a Just and Relevant Society, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 299 – 304.

Haraway, D. 1991. Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature. Routledge, New York.

Haraway, D. J. 2003. The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness. Prickly Paradigm Press, Chicago.

Hariani, M., R. Mardikaningsih, & N. E. Essa. 2022. HR and Environmental Policy Management Strategies to Create a Sustainable Organization that Improves Company Performance, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 249 – 254.

Harwood, M., G. Hizi, M. Jackson, M. Kavesh, G. Orsini, N. Rapport, & J. Timmer. 2023. Self-Alteration: How People Change Themselves Across Cultures. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Hayles, N. K. 2008. How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Henry, B. 2014. Human Enhancement and the Post-Human; The Converging and Diverging Pathways of Human, Hybrid and Artificial Anthropoids. HUMANA. MENTE Journal of Philosophical Studies, 7(26), 59-77.

Hobson, T. & A. Roessing. 2022. Questioning the Politics of Human Enhancement Technologies. In Bioethics and the Posthumanities (pp. 53-66). Routledge, London.

Hogle, L. F. 2005. Enhancement Technologies and the Body. Annu. Rev. Anthropol, 34(1), 695-716.

Homewood, S. 2018. Designing for the Changing Body: A Feminist Exploration of Self-Tracking Technologies. In Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-4). ACM, Canada.

Ihde, D. 2002. Bodies in Technology. University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.

Irfan, M. & M. Hariani. 2023. Implementation of Human Resource Audit on Recruitment System. Journal of Science, Technology and Society, 4(1), 1-8.

Jansen, J. & M. Wehrle. 2018. The Normal Body: Female Bodies in Changing Contexts of Normalization and Optimization. In New Feminist Perspectives on Embodiment (pp. 37-55). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Kadlecová, J. 2020. Body-Hacking: On the Relationship Between People and Material Entities in the Practice of Technological Body Modifications. Historická Sociologie, 12(1), 49-63.

Lewis, S. & M. Thomson. 2019. Social Bodies and Social Justice. International Journal of Law in Context, 15(3), 344-361.

Loewenthal, D. 2017. Post Humanism, 'E' and Other Psychological Therapies. European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling, 19(4), 339-342.

Lupton, D. 2015. Fabricated Data Bodies: Reflections on 3D Printed Digital Body Objects in Medical and Health Domains. Social Theory & Health, 13(1), 99-115.

Mardikaningsih, R. 2024. Organizational Effectiveness and Green Human Resources Management, Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(1), 6-13.

Mardikaningsih, R. & D. T. W. Wardoyo. 2024. The Role of Technology in Human Resource Development for Sustainability: A Literature Review on Digital Innovation, Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(3), 20-26.

Masur, P. K. 2020. How Online Privacy Literacy Supports Self-Data Protection and Self-Determination in the Age of Information. Media and Communication, 8(2), 258-269.

McMillan, C. T. 2020. Altered Bodies, Changing Identities, Shifting Power: Trans/Posthumanism and the Reproduction of Humanity in Film and Video Game Fandom. Doctoral dissertation. University of Leicester.

Mulligan, D. K., J. A. Kroll, N. Kohli, & R. Y. Wong. 2019. This Thing Called Fairness: Disciplinary Confusion Realizing a Value in Technology. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 3(CSCW), 1-36.

Nabben, K. 2021. Imagining Human-Machine Futures: Blockchain-Based 'Decentralized Autonomous Organizations'. Philosophies, 2(4), 1-18.

Neuman, W. L. 2006. Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Oluwatoyin, F. 2021. The Dynamics of Social Interaction in the Digital Age: Technological Implications for Interpersonal Relationships and Psychosocial Well-Being, Journal of Social Science Studies, 1(2), 137 – 142.

Oluwatoyin, F. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2024. Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainability of Human Resource Development in Industry 4.0, Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(2), 9-16.

Ourahmoune, N. 2017. Embodied Transformations and Food Restrictions: The Case of Medicalized Obesity. Journal of Business Research, 75(2016), 192-201.

Pasmore, W., S. Winby, S. A. Mohrman, & R. Vanasse. 2019. Reflections: Sociotechnical Systems Design and Organization Change. Journal of Change Management, 19(2), 67-85.

Petersén, M. 2023. Body Descriptions in Biohacking and Their Overlaps and Origins. DigitCult-Scientific Journal on Digital Cultures, 8(1), 7-24.

Rabb, C. 2023. Navigating Identity, Belonging, and Purpose in a Society in Flux. Pace L. Rev., 44(1), 1-22.

Radjawane, L. E. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. Building Ethical and Fair Technology: Approaches to Responsible Technology Development and Application, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(1), 189 – 194.

Ramle, N. L. B., & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. Inclusivity in Technology-Based Services: Access and Skills Challenges, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 225 – 230.

Rojak, J. A. 2024. Government Policy in Improving Human Resource Competencies Based on Digital Technology, Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(2), 1-8.

Rose, G. 2017. Posthuman Agency in the Digitally Mediated City: Exteriorization, Individuation, Reinvention. Annals of the American Association of Geographers, 107(4), 779-793.

Rose, N. 2007. The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, USA.

Sadowski, J. 2010. The Political Economy of Human Enhancement. Technology in Society, 32(3), 236–243.

Sands, D. 2022. Bioethics and the Posthumanities (pp. 1-11). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, England.

Siegel, J. E., D. C. Erb, & S. E. Sarma. 2017. A Survey of the Connected Vehicle Landscape—Architectures, Enabling Technologies, Applications, and Development Areas. IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 19(8), 2391-2406.

Sloterdijk, P. 2009. You Must Change Your Life. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Suchman, L. 2020. Agencies in Technology Design: Feminist Reconfigurations. In Machine Ethics and Robot Ethics (pp. 361-375). Routledge, UK.

Tomašovičová, J. 2022. From Therapy to Technological Enhancement: A Socio-Ethical Perspective. Social Communication, 23(1), 92-103.

Tyfield, D., R. Lave, S. Randalls, & C. Thorpe. 2017. The Routledge Handbook of the Political Economy of Science (pp. 21-31). Routledge, London.

Vogiatzaki, E. & A. Krukowski. 2016. The Significance of a Body in Contemporary Arts. EAI Endorsed Transactions on Creative Technologies, 3(6), 1-6.

Welsh, J. 2020. Subjectivising Academics: The Ranking Apparatus, Social Transformation, and a 'Crisis of Subjectivity'. Subjectivity, 13(3), 153-178.

Wolfe, C. 2010. What Is Posthumanism?. University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.

Xu, W., P. C. Su, & S. C. S. Cheung. 2019. Human Body Reshaping and Its Application Using Multiple RGB-D Sensors. Signal Processing: Image Communication, 79(2019), 71-81.

Zanc, I., & I. Lupu. 2007. Posthumanism and Bioethics. Revista Romana de Bioetica, 5(1).

Zettler, P. J., C. J. Guerrini, & J. S. Sherkow. 2019. Regulating Genetic Biohacking. Science (New York, N.Y.), 365(6448), 34–36.