

5. Space and Identity Constructions Through Everyday-Cultural Practices

Christel Baltes-Löhr, Andrea Binsfeld, Elisabeth Boesen, Laure Caregari, Norbert Franz, Markus Hesse, Eva Klos, Rachel Reckinger, Gregor Schnuer, Benno Sönke Schulz, Heinz Sieburg, Gianna Thommes, Britta Weimann, Christian Wille, Julia Maria Zimmermann

5.1 SUBJECTIFICATIONS AND SUBJECTIVATIONS

The present chapter ties up with chapter 3 and completes the theoretical-conceptual perspective adopted there. While the latter primarily analyses technologies of domination, normalizations and attributions of meaning, we will here address the question of how such technologies and positings of subjects are lived and/or how they influence the individuals' self-conceptions. Both chapters are based on Foucault's approach of governmentality (see Foucault 2007) in order to shed light – each with a different focus – on the interplay of technologies of domination (see chapter 3) and subjectivation (see this chapter) and their inherent constructions of space and identity. For examining this interplay we distinguish, in the case studies presented here, between the aspect of subjectification, i.e. the addressing or 'interpellation' as subject (see Althusser 1971) and that of subjectivation, the understanding of self (see Bührmann/Schneider 2008); or in other words, between the processes of attribution and appropriation as well as their intermeshing in the course of everyday practices (see Reckinger/Schulz/Wille 2011). The following considerations focus on the subjectivations that can be observed empirically in the case studies.

At present, the concept of the subject is experiencing a certain revival in cultural studies. However, today's approaches have detached themselves significantly from the earlier abstract, philosophical discussion of the concept. The subject analysis in culture studies deals with the empirical subject and its different (historical) 'modes of subjectivation'. It is therefore based on a reversal of the classical relationship between the philosophical concept of subject and the empirical subject characteristic for the 18th and 19th centuries.

In the following, we will first show how the classical understanding of the subject has been questioned since the late 19th century and the distinction between transcendental and empirical subject dissolved. Subsequently we will present the theoretical foundation of subject analysis as encountered in the case studies and discuss the link between governmentality and subjectification/subjectivation. We will conclude by describing the operationalization of the developed conceptual framework in terms of research practice.

5.1.1 Development of the Concept of the Subject: A Synopsis

During the 18th century epistemology developed a specific understanding of the subject. This development can be traced back to René Descartes' dualism and leads to Immanuel Kant's transcendental philosophy (see Benedikter 2011: 767). Kant's subject is, in contrast to the object, an actively perceiving entity and exists *a priori* – it is not a result of sensory perceptions, but it is a “transcendental unity of self-consciousness” (see Kant 1999: 247). With this he describes a subject that is a given as a basis for sensory perceptions (see *ibid.*: 246f.) and can overcome subjective influences on itself through ‘understanding’ (*Verstand*). The subject here is centred, i.e. it perceives actively and the understanding of these perceptions is universally and objectively possible, since the mind and pure reason are given *a priori*.

In the 19th and in the early 20th century a series of concepts of the subject emerged that questioned the abstract, transcendental subject as a basis of the self. One can here point to Marx and Engels who maintain the subject-object dichotomy and transfer it onto the relationship of worker-product. Their concept of the subject describes the ‘self’ as the product of social agency (Marx/Engels 1970: 51). The works of Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche were ground-breaking for the development of the later, postmodern notion of the decentralization of the subject. The question of how self-awareness originates plays an important role in Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis. The instinctual ‘id’ and the value-oriented ‘super-ego’ are in conflict; this leads to the creation of the ‘ego’ or the self. There is therefore no transcendental subject in Kant's sense, but rather a balancing act that manifests itself in our consciousness as a clash of norms, urges and reflection. The influence of Freud's concept of the subject is very much in evidence in post-structuralist thinkers such as Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva and Judith Butler.

Of particular importance for the more recent discussion of the concept of the subject in cultural studies is Friedrich Nietzsche, for whom the notion of a transcendental subject, and the concept of freedom linked to it, is an illusion:

“Knowing, in an absolute and thus also relative sense, is likewise *a mere fiction!* So this also does away with the necessity to posit a something that ‘knows’, a subject for knowing,

some pure 'intelligence', an 'absolute spirit': – this mythology that even Kant has not entirely relinquished [...] has now had its day"¹ (Nietzsche 2009 [1885]: 38 [14]).

Nietzsche understands the 'self' as plural, as unequal to itself, not centred and calls for 'self-overcoming' as a form of freedom. His philosophy and its notion of the subject are considered a prelude to postmodern theory and an escape from modernity (see Habermas 1990: 86). At the same time, in early sociology (Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Georg Simmel) the notion of the subject is understood in the sense of 'personality' or 'identity'. Until the second half of the 20th century, however, the conception of the individual in social sciences is based largely on the idea of an *a priori* given, self-aware 'self' that has a specific relationship to society to be explored.²

It is finally the late- and postmodern thinkers who once more radically question the subject as something given. Andreas Reckwitz (see 2008: 124) describes two concretizations of this perspective which are gaining increasing acceptance: 1) Michel Foucault's concept of the subject and the analysis of modes of subjectivation in cultural studies influenced by him and 2) the concept of a specifically postmodern 'self'. Foucault sees Kant's concept of the subject as a historical-contextual construction and rejects, like Nietzsche, the idea of a transcendental 'self'. In his view the subject is not a precondition that, under the influence of social structures, enables actions, but rather it is itself a result of actions which in turn are situated in a historical-cultural context. The second concretization consists in the formulation of new postmodern forms of the subject and is proposed by scholars such as Mike Featherstone (1995) or Zygmunt Bauman (2000) who deal with the dissolution of solid social structures in postmodernity hitherto considered natural. The classical differentiation between an abstract (transcendental) and an empirical (positivistically/deterministically prescribed) subject is now no longer a key element of subject analysis. What grounds these studies is the notion of the subject as one that is, on the one hand, socially constituted and, on the other, constitutes the social.

1 | Personal translation of: "Das Erkennen, das absolute und folglich auch das relative, ist ebenfalls *nur eine Fiktion!* Damit fällt denn auch die Nöthigung weg, ein Etwas das 'erkennt', ein Subjekt für das Erkennen anzusetzen, irgend eine reine 'Intelligenz', einen 'absoluten Geist': – diese noch von Kant nicht gänzlich aufgegeben Mythologie [...] hat nunmehr ihre Zeit gehabt."

2 | Here society is more than the sum of its individuals, in this sense becoming the actual subject of investigation – functionalism and structuralism do not deal with the relations between individuals but with those between the individual and society.

5.1.2 Theoretical Principles of Subject Analysis in Cultural Studies

The current subject analysis in cultural studies deals with the empirical subject, i.e. it is not concerned with the philosophical problem of determining a general concept of the subject. Nevertheless, the underlying theoretical understanding is widely shared: the subject is not an autonomous *a priori* given factor constituting the basis of knowledge and agency, but rather the result of certain modes of subjectivation and subjectification that need to be examined. The interest in cultural studies is therefore not directed towards the subject but the historically and culturally specific types of subject, more precisely, the processes of their formation. But more recent research has directed its attention expressly to the modes of subjectivation. The concern here is not an analysis of the relationship between the individual and society, where individualization is regarded as a liberation of the individual from social constraints, but rather “how this individual, in its physical or mental features, which supposedly ensure its autonomy, is made up of highly specific schemata” (Reckwitz 2008a: 15).³

Subject analysis in cultural studies therefore maintains a critical distance towards its subject: features are understood as only seemingly given and pre-cultural, and the object of enquiry are the “barely conscious or transparent processes of stabilization and destabilization” of these features – “of the societal subject categorizations in which the individual inserts herself in a more or less unproblematic fashion”⁴ (Reckwitz 2008a: 16f.).⁵ The interest in cultural modes of subjectivation and subjectification was stimulated by fundamental theoretical developments of poststructuralism; an important impulse came from the hypothesis of a postmodern transformation of the self, which forms the basis both of the revision of the bourgeois concept of the subject and the contemporary processes of subjectivation and subjectification processes.

In this chapter, subject analysis is primarily understood to mean an enquiry into social practices about the constitutions of subjects articulated in them, with subject constitution being understood as the dynamic relationship of subject formations and subject positionings or attributions (*subjectifications*) and forms of self-understanding and self-relationship or appropriations (*subjectivations*). In this process, implicit precepts are internalized, reproduced, shifted or also overcome in various ways. Subject constitutions are therefore contingent formations – as are the identities resulting from them, not devoid of contradictions and always

3 | Personal translation of: “[...] wie sich dieses ‘Individuum’ in [...] körperlichen oder psychischen Eigenschaften, die ihm vermeintlich Autonomie sichern, aus hochspezifischen Schemata zusammensetzt.”

4 | Personal translation of: “[...] kaum bewussten oder transparenten kulturellen Prozessen der Stabilisierung und Destabilisierung”[dieser Eigenschaften] – “de[r]n gesellschaftlichen Subjektordnungen, in die der Einzelne mehr oder weniger unproblematisch einrückt.”

5 | Partly inspired by the American Culture and Personality School.

temporary. Subject constitution is a ubiquitous, continuous process that permeates social practice.

The 'subject' focused on here should not be equated to an individual. Rather, these are historically changeable subject forms that allow the individual to be addressed as a subject, *to be subjectivated*, and to perceive him/herself as a subject, *to subjectivate him/herself*. Subjectifications comprise attributed cultural typings, catalogues of requirements or patterns of what should be attained. Subjectivations by contrast stand for self-designs of the individual that are guided by subjectifications, which also includes the possibility that the individual might fail in meeting the challenge of becoming a subject in his or her attempt to fulfill the subjectifications. The theoretical approach that focuses on this empirically open and partly conflictual tension between subjectification and subjectivation is described by Reckwitz as follows:

"The most important feature of the poststructuralist perspective on the subject consists in the fact that the subject categorizations are not analysed as results of homogenous and clear-cut codes but as cultural entities in which a contradiction-free and stable subjectivity is continuously defeated and subverted: for instance by different discourse categories overlapping each other in unpredictable ways, by attributions of signifiers to signified identities turning out to be ambivalent or subject cultures emerging as spaces of permanent conflicts of definition"⁶ (Reckwitz 2008b: 80).

Drawing on Foucault's notion of governmentality, the case studies in this chapter shed light on processes of subject constitution by focusing on certain practices and discourses of spatial and identity construction in border regions. They thus examine contexts where particularly ambiguous, contradictory and fragile subject constitutions may be presumed. In the following, we will argue how the conceptual tools used here are linked to Foucault's concept of governmentality and subject analysis that plays a crucial role in this volume.

5.1.3 Governmental Approach to Subject Constitutions

The governmentality approach has shown itself to be a particularly useful tool for subsuming the examination of subject constitutions emerging from processes

⁶ | Personal translation of: "Das wichtigste Merkmal der poststrukturalistischen Perspektive auf das Subjekt besteht [...] darin, dass sie [...] Subjektordnungen nicht als Resultate homogener und eindeutiger Codes analysiert, sondern als kulturelle Gebilde, in denen eine widerspruchsfreie und stabile Subjektivität immer wieder scheitert und torpediert wird: etwa dadurch, dass sich unterschiedliche Diskursordnungen unberechenbar überlagern, dass Zuordnungen von Signifikanten zu Identitätssignifikanten sich als mehrdeutig erweisen oder Subjektkulturen sich als Räume permanenter Definitionskonflikte herausstellen."

of subjectification and subjectivation under one single analytical bracket, thus providing a common basis for the different research interests of the authors of this chapter. This is an integrative concept which focuses on the interaction between technologies of domination and of self by “generally addressing the mutual constitution of forms of power, practices of knowledge and forms of subjectivation”⁷ (Bühmann/Schneider 2008: 70). Put differently: governmentality points to “the different forms of agency and fields of practice that in manifold ways aim at the guidance, or the conduct of individuals and collectives”⁸ (Lemke 2008: 260). This can refer to the conduct of *others* (e.g. on the macrosocial level of a national administration or on the microsocial level of self-help literature) as well as the conduct of the *self* (on the microsocial level of ethical self-disciplining).

The approach gives particular attention to the *interconnection of technologies of domination and of self*, the latter of which are the focus of the present chapter, as already indicated above. Governmentality “not only integrates numerous inter-, sub-, and transnational actors, but also points in particular to the numerous intersections of power relations where concrete actions, particular dispositions and subjectivities are created in the first place”⁹ (Gertenbach 2012: 112). On the microanalytical level favoured in this chapter, the governmental form of government “finds its specific expression in the influence on the subjects’ sphere of agency and in the shaping and forming of certain kinds of subjectivity”¹⁰ which are analysed in the case studies with regard to constructions of space and identity in everyday-cultural practices.

Recent publications on the concept of governmentality frequently emphasize its function as a hinge between power, knowledge and subjectivity. This refers to the fact that the interplay of power and knowledge in each case produces or ‘suggests’ different forms of subjectivity (see *ibid.*: 114). Knowledge is understood by Foucault extremely heterogeneously as an umbrella term for scientific findings, legitimate ‘high culture’, various official ‘canons’; but it also includes everyday-cultural evidences, non-discursive inventories of experience etc. This knowledge is not only never neutral, but it also regulates what appears as ‘true’ in the various social fields or periods. Within this scope, individuals have a certain latitude for

7 | Personal translation of: [indem es] “allgemein die wechselseitige Konstituierung von Machtformen, Wissenspraktiken und Subjektivierungsformen adressiert.”

8 | Personal translation of: “[...] auf unterschiedliche Handlungsformen und Praxisfelder, die in vielfältiger Weise auf die Lenkung und Leitung von Individuen und Kollektiven zielen.”

9 | Personal translation of: “[...] integriert nicht nur zahlreiche zwischen-, sub- und transstaatliche Akteure, sondern verweist v.a. auf vielfältige Kreuzungspunkte von Machtverhältnissen, in denen überhaupt erst konkrete Handlungsweisen, bestimmte Dispositionen und Subjektivitäten erzeugt werden.”

10 | Personal translation of: [ihren] “spezifischen Ausdruck [...] im Einwirken auf den Handlungsbereich der Subjekte und in der Formung und Gestaltung bestimmter Formen von Subjektivität.”

agency with extremely numerous – but not arbitrary – choices (see Baltes-Löhr/Prüm/Reckinger/Wille 2011).

The following case studies focus on the governmental positioning of self-relationships in connection with spatial aspects of identity construction. In this field of research one can find a considerable number of terms that are partly used synonymously: in the context of subjectification, we come across processes of subject formation, subject positioning, governmental practices, disciplining practices etc., while in the context of subjectivation we encounter self-practices, technologies of self, self-government, self-conduct etc. (see Bührmann/Schneider 2008). These different terms each point to aspects of the following basic context: “Technologies of government aim at certain practices of self-care, conduct individuals to self-responsible and rational behaviour”¹¹ (Gertenbach 2012: 117). This kind of conduct in which “individuals – without being forced to – adapt, frequently unresistingly and via internalized norms or values, to the fabric of power relationships”¹² (Füller/Marquardt 2009: 89) shows the inherent ambivalence of the term ‘conduct’: “To ‘conduct’ is at the same time to ‘lead’ others (according to mechanisms of coercion that are, to varying degrees, strict) and a way of behaving within a more or less open field of possibilities” (Foucault 2000 [1982]: 341). This ‘conduct’ of subjects based on internalized knowledge and the examination of its adaptation in specific contextual-normative frameworks constitute the common subject matter of the eight case studies. These plural, relational, reflexive and ambivalent identifications and self-disciplinings concern everyday life choices and positionings – in short ‘identity work’ (see Keupp *et al.* 2006) – that are made on the basis of unequally distributed resources. Despite this inequality, “choices follow discursive structures that are oriented towards a specific risk scenario and make certain choices more or less likely”¹³ (Füller/Marquardt 2009: 90). These probabilities are not the same for everybody, but their principle obtains to everybody. Paying particular attention to processes of agency, we therefore understand the *relational* subject in the case studies of this chapter neither as

“something transcendental with features that it possesses a priori, i.e. prior to any experience, nor can it be rendered, in its mental structure, independently from the cultural context into an object of empirical research. [...] The subject does not simply emancipate

11 | Personal translation of: “Regierungstechnologien zielen [...] auf bestimmte Praktiken der Selbstsorge hin, leiten Individuen zu selbstverantwortlichem und rationalem Verhalten an.”

12 | Personal translation of: [in der sich] “Individuen – ohne dazu ‘gezwungen’ zu werden – durch verinnerlichte Normen oder Wertvorstellungen häufig widerstandslos in das Gefüge der Kräfteverhältnisse einpassen.”

13 | Personal translation of: “[...] Entscheidungen diskursiven Strukturen, die an einem spezifischen Risikoszenario ausgerichtet sind und bestimmte Entscheidungen wahrscheinlicher oder unwahrscheinlicher machen.”

itself from all cultural forms, but is a correlate of changing modes of subjectivation. [...] Instead of presupposing the reflexive subject, it then emerges as a product of highly specific cultural modes of subjectivation”¹⁴ (Reckwitz 2008a: 13 and 16).

Precisely here is the starting point for our empirical analysis: from the perspective of different microanalytical modes of subjectivation we at the same time focus on the aspects of subjectification linked to them. In the sense of governmentality, we mix aspects of subjectification, i.e. the way how individuals are addressed, with aspects of subjectivation, i.e. the way individuals see themselves with regard to the discourses *implicitly* addressed to them and the, in each case different, individually produced internalizations. In summary we can say:

“The relationship between the two analytical dimensions of subjectification/subjectivation is thus one that needs to be examined empirically according to the identity precepts found in each case and their – however seamlessly or refractedly – ascertainable appropriations as empirically reconstructable identity patterns”¹⁵ (Bühmann/Schneider 2008: 71f.).

5.1.4 Operationalization of the Theoretical-Conceptual Framework

Regarding the operationalization of the research approach, we have modelled our work, among others, on the praxeological heuristics as suggested by Reckwitz (2008a: 135ff.) and on the corresponding analytical categories. This heuristics seems particularly suited for research in the context of the border, since it is attuned to the investigation of ‘processual realities’, so that it is possible to observe contingent processes and examine space and identity constructions both as preconditions as well as results of practices of *Doing Space* or *Doing Identity*. The concept of practices occupies a crucial place within this analytical framework. It allows the examination of subject constitutions that ‘cut across national borders’, when we can assume in particular for border regions that “meanings, identities and practices do not occur either in one or the other culture”, but that the world is “a cultural melange in the sense of a mutual cultural penetration of global

14 | Personal translation of: “[...] eine Transzendentalie mit Eigenschaften, die ihm *a priori*, d.h. vor aller Erfahrung, zukommen, noch lässt es sich in seiner mentalen Struktur unabhängig vom kulturellen Kontext zum Objekt empirischer Forschung machen. [...] Das Subjekt emanzipiert sich nicht kurzerhand aus sämtlichen kulturellen Formen, sondern ist ein Korrelat wechselnder Subjektivierungsweisen. [...] Statt das reflexive Subjekt vorauszusetzen, wird es dann als Produkt hochspezifischer kultureller Subjektivierungsweisen sichtbar.”

15 | Personal translation of: “Das Verhältnis zwischen den beiden analytischen Dimensionen von Subjektivation/Subjektivierung ist somit ein empirisch zu klärendes gemäß den jeweils vorfindbaren Identitätsvorgaben und deren – wie nahtlos oder gebrochen auch immer – nachweisbaren Aneignungen als empirisch rekonstruierbare Identitätsmuster.”

and local references of meaning that are mobilized and reproduced in everyday practices”¹⁶ (Reuter 2008: 270).

The following studies build from this concept of practices to do justice to the creative-eventful potential of subject constitutions, but also to the increased complexity and contingency of cultural forms that can be presumed to be particularly marked in border regions. The concept of practices ties in with the understanding of the subject developed above, since “praxeological subjects are not subjects of cognition but empirical projects that are described within the respective practice”¹⁷ (Berger 2013: 315). This view implies that subjects only exist within the performance of practices, which is why an investigation into subject constitutions or identities can only be dealt with as an investigation into the social practices with the corresponding sub-aspects of subjectivation and subjectification.

The concept of practices contrasts with the concept of action in so far as social agency in the ‘classical sense’ is understood as a social phenomenon that is generated and guided by a mental centre of action residing in the actors themselves. This internal centre represents a place of non-visible motives, values, norms etc. that guide the externally visible action. This dualism of the guiding internal apparatus and the externally perceivable physical agency is overcome with the concept of practices (see Schmidt 2012: 56). Here it is assumed that

“[...] ‘actions’ do not occur as discrete, punctual and individual exemplars but that they are embedded, under normal social conditions, in a more comprehensive, socially divided practice held together by an implicit, methodological and interpretative knowledge as a typified, routinized and socially ‘understandable’ bundle of activities. The social should here not be sought in the ‘intersubjectivity’ and not in the ‘guidedness by norms’, but rather in the collectivity of behaviours that are held together by a specific ‘practical competence’: practices thus form an emergent level of the social which however is not present in the ‘environment’ of its physical-mental carriers”¹⁸ (Reckwitz 2003: 289).

16 | Personal translation of: “[...] Bedeutungen, Identitäten und Praktiken [...] nicht entweder in der einen oder der anderen Kultur [liegen]”, [sondern die Welt] “vielmehr einer Kulturmelange im Sinne einer wechselseitigen kulturellen Durchdringung globaler und lokaler Sinnbezüge [gleich], die in den alltäglichen Praktiken mobilisiert und reproduziert werden.”

17 | Personal translation of: [insofern] “es sich bei den praxeologischen Subjekten nicht um Erkenntnissubjekte [handelt], sondern [um] empirische Projekte, die innerhalb der jeweiligen Praktik beschrieben werden.”

18 | Personal translation of: “[...] ‘Handlungen’ nicht als diskrete, punktuelle und individuelle Exemplare vorkommen, sondern [dass] sie im sozialen Normalfall eingebettet sind in eine umfassendere, sozial geteilte und durch ein implizites, methodisches und interpretatives Wissen zusammengehaltene Praktik als ein typisiertes, routinisiertes und sozial ‘verstehbares’ Bündel von Aktivitäten. Das Soziale ist hier nicht in der ‘Intersubjektivität’ und nicht in der ‘Normgeleitetheit’ [...] zu suchen, sondern in der

In the following, we will lay out in more detail individual facets of this concept under analytical-empirical aspects, as used in the following case studies.

Collectivity and Enactment: The concept of practices emphasizes the collective character of human activities, with symbolic categories and cultural codes not regarded as ‘being outside of practice’, but as inherent in social practices and produced by these. It is only through social practices that interpretative patterns or symbolic power relations develop their existence and effect (see Moebius 2008: 60). Robert Schmidt (2012: 57) emphasizes in this context that the concept of practices by no means ignores “concepts and capabilities such as intentionality, consciousness and reflexivity” but “reformulates these praxeologically”¹⁹. This means that the analytical focus should be directed to the observable doing and the capabilities and structures of meaning that become manifest in it. These features of the concept of practices allow the case studies to approach questions of spatial and identity construction largely unencumbered by presuppositions. In the reconstruction of (cross-border) linguistic spaces, for example, interviewees are asked about their language choice in order to establish the actual linguistic practices in the border region independently of pre-defined linguistic spaces. Another study examines the interviewees’ empirically observable dietary practices and values in order to determine which concepts of sustainability are actually practiced. Also practices of remembering and the interpretations of meaning connected to them are examined in their direct enactment – initially regardless of national or regional normalizations.

Routinization and Unpredictability: The concept of practices also emphasizes the routinized as well as the creative and unpredictable character of human action. This allows both the repetitiveness of practices as well as their situative and contextual adaptability to become the subject of analysis (see Reckwitz 2009: 174). In terms of research practice, this makes it possible to focus on the “combinational logic – in detail decipherable, impure – of various cultural elements in the practices, discourses, subjectifications and systems of practice and artefacts”²⁰ (Reckwitz 2010: 195). The reproductive-routinized character of practices, as emphasized particularly by Bourdieu, and their creative-processual character, as highlighted notably by Derrida or Butler, are two sides of one coin (see Reckwitz 2009: 174). This perspective centers on the contingency of social logics and with that on cultural change – a particularly crucial aspect when examining border regions.

Kollektivität von Verhaltensweisen, die durch ein spezifisches ‘praktisches Können’ zusammengehalten werden: Praktiken bilden somit eine emergente Ebene des Sozialen, die sich jedoch nicht in der ‘Umwelt’ ihrer körperlich-mental-träger befindet.”

19 | Personal translation of: “[...] Konzepte und Vermögen wie Intentionalität, Bewusstheit und Reflexivität” keinesfalls ausblende, sondern diese “praxeologisch reformuliert.”

20 | Personal translation of: [die] “im Detail dechiffrierbare[n], unreine[n] Kombinationslogik diverser kultureller Elemente in den Praktiken, Diskursen, Subjektivierungen und Praxis-/Artefaktesystemen.”

This is reflected in the case studies when they, for example, show how practices of remembering develop contrary to established discourses, how routinization and reflexivity mix in the context of dietary practices or which strategies are employed in order to deal with linguistic unpredictability.

Materiality and Spaces: Practices are, in addition, not only observable through physical performance, which also includes language and other symbolic forms, but they also manifest themselves as well *in* and *with* artefacts. The material dimension of bodies and artefacts can, for instance, comprise technologies, architectures or spatial structurizations and at the same time be understood as part of a discourse. Discourses are then not understood as speaking about certain issues, but rather as elements that produce cultural representations and form objects by speaking about them. Thus discourses themselves are, in turn, practices: “Practices of representation” (*Praktiken der Repräsentation*, Reckwitz 2006: 43) or ‘discursive practices’ (*pratiques discursives*, Foucault 2002 [1969]) which – like all practices – have a material anchoring (e.g. grave stones, newspaper articles, paintings) and, as “social places that produce orders of knowledge”²¹ (Reckwitz 2010: 191), bring forth discourses with their inherent subjectifications or subjectivations. Artefacts are to be understood as “quasi-objects” (Latour 1993) and thus as elements of practices that are examined as to how their use and treatment influence practices, and how they enable or limit practices (see Reckwitz 2010: 193). This focus on modes of appropriation or use of artefacts enables a tie-in with considerations of spatial theory: “The fact that all social practices can be regarded as spatializing and organize space and its artefacts in a certain way, creates a further wide-ranging field of subject analysis”²² (Reckwitz 2008b: 91). This refers to constellations of artefacts and/or space-generating interpretations of meaning that are here subsumed under the term of spatial construction. The space to be thus examined “is not a container, but a processual, relational space of practices and relationships between embodied participants, artefacts, places and environments”²³ (Schmidt 2012: 240). The following case studies take up this way of considering materiality and space; they discuss for instance the significance of spatial categories in dietary practices, the representations of (cross-border) spaces, workers’ estates as a spatial nexus of social practices or the distribution of linguistic practices. They examine how the artefacts involved in the respective spatial constructions influence the practices of representation, for instance in connection with family identities or practices of remembering.

21 | Personal translation of: “Gesellschaftliche Produktionsorte von Wissensordnungen.”

22 | Personal translation of: “Dadurch, dass sämtliche soziale Praktiken [...] sich als *spatializing* betrachten lassen und den Raum und dessen Artefakte auf bestimmte Weise organisieren, ist [...] ein weiteres umfangreiches Feld der Subjektanalyse gewonnen.”

23 | Personal translation of: “Raum ist kein Behälter, sondern ein prozessualer, relationaler Raum der Praktiken und Beziehungen zwischen verkörperten Teilnehmerinnen, Artfakten, Orten und Umgebungen.”

Practical Knowledge: Another area of analysis of subject constitutions connected to the hitherto discussed aspects is practical knowledge. This is the term for various kinds of knowledge that form a basis of meaning for social practices; practical knowledge flows into practices while at the same time being produced by them (see Reckwitz 2004: 320). Knowledge is therefore not understood as a given capability for action, rather it can only be reconstructed in its processuality, i.e. in connection with practices. Knowledge of this kind is “structured via differentiations which also provide the context for how specific things should be interpreted in a practice and dealt with practically”²⁴ (Reckwitz 2010: 193). These differentiations thus give orientation for what is ‘correct’ or ‘discrediting’ (see *ibid.*: 194). They represent codes that are often constructed in a binary fashion, but can also be more complex and comprise entire systems of differentiations. For the examination of subject constitutions, it is necessary to reveal the codes inherent in practical knowledge that determine what the subject ‘is’ and should be. This also includes pursuing the question in how far different codes that shape culturally desirable or also rejected subject models overlap in subject constitutions or compete with each other.

These processes that shed light on the dynamics of identity constructions direct the attention to the interplay of processes of subjectification and subjectivation, which in each case articulates itself empirically in different ways. This will be illustrated in the following case studies using examples of practices of language choice, diet, remembering and commemorating as well as gender-specific spatial representations.

5.2 SUSTAINABLE EVERYDAY EATING PRACTICES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SPATIAL IDENTIFICATIONS

Rachel Reckinger

Food plays an important role in everyday-cultural practices due to the fact that it constitutes a daily necessity, that it is recurrent and that it is subject to choice – even though that importance is reflected unevenly by individuals. Furthermore, it is assumed that as much as 50 % of environmental effects are due to the consumption patterns of individual households (see EEA 2012); a major part of this is food (see EEA 2005), particularly because of its means of production (agricultural manufacturing processes), its distribution (global transport routes and commercial outlets), as well as the demand and the preferences for specific foods on the part of the consumers (orientation of product processing, choice and marketing). This case study deals with

24 | Personal translation of: [ist über] “Unterscheidungen strukturiert, die auch den Rahmen dafür bieten, wie konkrete Dinge in einer Praktik zu interpretieren und wie sie praktisch zu handhaben sind.”