

Amerpass as a Non-State System of Transnational Professional Identification:

Conceptual, Institutional and Ethical-Legal Foundations

Igor Leonov

ORCID: 0009-0004-3645-6031

Independent Researcher

Founder of the Amerpass Project

United States

Peer Review Statement

This article underwent a **double-blind peer review process** in accordance with the editorial standards of the International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research.

The identities of the reviewers and the author were concealed throughout the review process.

The following scholars participated as independent reviewers:

- Alexandra Voronina — ORCID: 0009-0004-3155-9824
- Yurii Savchuk — ORCID: 0009-0005-3147-5425
- Oleh Tytarenko — ORCID: 0009-0008-9343-0427
- Khrystyna Nedeva — ORCID: 0009-0005-1135-9582

Abstract

In the context of increasing transnational professional mobility and growing institutional instability, traditional mechanisms of professional recognition demonstrate limited applicability. State and supranational systems primarily focus on administrative standardization and function within relatively stable legal regimes, whereas digital platforms of professional self-presentation provide visibility and network presence without institutional accountability or evidentiary verification. As a result, professional identity — particularly in journalism, academia, and creative industries — becomes fragmented and vulnerable in transnational settings.

This study introduces and conceptually analyzes **Amerpass** as an authorial model of non-state professional identification oriented toward reputational and evidentiary fixation of professional status beyond state sovereignty and commercial platform logic. Amerpass is conceptualized as a soft-institutional mechanism combining documentary form, multi-source verification, and distributed institutional responsibility while maintaining strict separation from legally binding status categories.

The research provides a comparative analysis of Amerpass alongside supranational standardization systems and commercial professional networking platforms, identifying their structural limitations under conditions of institutional rupture and transnational mobility. Particular attention is given to risks and constraints inherent in non-state models, including issues of trust, commercialization pressures, and limited scalability, which are interpreted not as deficiencies but as structural conditions of conceptual sustainability.

The empirical foundation of the study derives from the analytical reassessment of prior non-state professional identification initiatives within a national context and their transformation into a transnational conceptual model. Amerpass is positioned not as a finalized institution but as an evolving research framework contributing to the interdisciplinary discourse on new forms of professional legitimization in a transforming global order.

Keywords

professional identity; transnational mobility; non-state accreditation; digital reputation; Amerpass; Europass; LinkedIn; institutional rupture; soft institutionalism

1. Introduction

The accelerating globalization of professional activity reveals a fundamental contradiction within contemporary systems of identification and recognition. While professional communities — journalists, researchers, cultural actors, and creative industry professionals — increasingly operate within transnational environments, mechanisms for confirming professional status, competencies, and institutional belonging remain predominantly anchored to national, organizational, or bureaucratic frameworks.

Traditional forms of professional identification — diplomas, certificates, press credentials, membership cards — remain poorly adapted to conditions of cross-border mobility. They rarely possess universal verifiability, often require mediation by specific institutions, and may become politically or administratively vulnerable. Consequently, professional achievements recognized within one jurisdiction may lose legitimacy or become difficult to verify beyond its institutional boundaries.

Over recent decades, efforts have been made to develop transnational instruments for representing professional qualifications and experience. The most institutionalized example is the Europass framework within the European Union, designed to standardize educational and professional data presentation. Simultaneously, digital networking platforms — most prominently LinkedIn — have created global spaces for professional self-representation. However, despite their practical relevance, these systems focus either on administrative compatibility or algorithmic visibility. They do not address the problem of non-state,

reputational, and context-sensitive fixation of professional identity, particularly under conditions of institutional rupture, political pressure, or forced migration.

This fragmentation becomes particularly acute in crisis contexts. Professionals may retain qualifications, experience, and public relevance while losing access to formal institutional mechanisms of professional validation. The absence of a neutral, non-state, and transnational instrument for documenting professional status generates not only practical challenges but also ethical concerns related to professional dignity, self-representation, and freedom of professional activity.

This study introduces and conceptually analyzes the Amerpass project as a non-state system of professional identification and verification. Amerpass is proposed as an experimental framework for documenting professional activity and reputational capital beyond passport, migration, or licensing regimes. Unlike state-issued documents or digital self-presentation platforms, Amerpass does not claim functions of personal identification, employment authorization, or border crossing. Instead, it focuses on evidentiary documentation of professional reputation and contextualized career trajectories based on verifiable sources and distributed institutional responsibility.

The research approaches Amerpass as both a conceptual and applied model of transnational professional accreditation. The analysis is situated within an interdisciplinary framework intersecting digital identity studies, sociology of professions, media theory, and institutional analysis. The objective is to evaluate Amerpass as a soft-legitimation instrument under conditions of global institutional transformation and to identify its structural limitations, risks, and developmental trajectories.

2. Problem Statement and Research Context

2.1 Fragmentation of Professional Recognition in Transnational Environments

Contemporary professional activity is increasingly detached from a single national or institutional framework. Journalists, researchers, analysts, and creative professionals often operate simultaneously across multiple jurisdictions, publish internationally, participate in cross-border projects, and engage with distributed professional communities. However, systems for recognizing professional status and qualifications remain largely embedded within the logic of nation-states, specific institutions, or corporate structures.

This asynchrony between actual professional practice and formal mechanisms of recognition produces structural fragmentation. Professional status becomes distributed across various documents, platforms, and institutions, each capturing only a partial aspect of professional identity: education, employment history, membership, publication record, or digital visibility.

There is no unified mechanism capable of integrating these elements into a coherent, verifiable representation of professional legitimacy independent of a particular institutional context.

Under conditions of transnational mobility, this fragmentation becomes systemic. Documents that carry high legitimacy within one country or professional environment may lose their relevance in another. Recognition of professional status increasingly depends not on substantive expertise or accumulated experience, but on procedural conformity, jurisdictional frameworks, and institutional trust — elements that are rarely transferable across borders.

Efforts to address this gap have emerged at both supranational and platform levels. The Europass framework standardizes the presentation of educational and professional data within the European Union, facilitating administrative compatibility. Meanwhile, digital networking platforms, particularly LinkedIn, provide global spaces for self-presentation and network recognition. However, these tools primarily fix information or visibility; they do not assume institutional responsibility for reputational or contextual aspects of professional identity.

Consequently, professional recognition in transnational contexts becomes distributed among heterogeneous sources, each operating under its own logic without offering an integrated interpretation of professional status. A professional may possess substantial symbolic and professional capital yet lack a format in which this capital can be presented simultaneously as understandable, verifiable, and neutral in relation to state or corporate interests.

The core problem of transnational professional recognition, therefore, is not the absence of information about professional activity but the absence of a stable non-state mechanism capable of integrating dispersed data into a coherent model of professional identity. This structural gap between practice and recognition constitutes the analytical foundation of the present study.

2.2 Institutional and Digital Models: Structural Limitations

Existing approaches to transnational representation of professional experience can be broadly categorized into two groups: supranational institutional solutions and commercial digital platforms. Despite their differences in architecture and purpose, both exhibit structural limitations that prevent them from functioning as comprehensive mechanisms of professional legitimization under conditions of institutional rupture.

Institutional systems such as Europass focus on standardization and administrative interoperability. Their primary objective is to facilitate diploma recognition, qualification comparison, and labor mobility within a harmonized legal environment. In stable contexts, such systems effectively perform interface functions between educational and labor institutions.

However, these systems do not generate independent professional legitimacy. They presuppose the stability of underlying state institutions that validate primary data. In contexts of political

crisis, forced migration, or institutional breakdown, this presupposition collapses, significantly reducing the applicability of such tools outside stable jurisdictions.

Digital platforms introduce a different set of constraints. LinkedIn, as a global networking platform, enables professionals to construct dynamic profiles presenting career trajectories, skills, and publications. Yet this model is fundamentally based on self-declaration and algorithmically mediated visibility. Institutional verification mechanisms remain minimal, limited to recommendations or network signals.

Professional reputation within platform logic becomes influenced by engagement metrics, frequency of updates, and algorithmic prioritization rather than substantive contribution. Although profiles may be consulted even in institutional procedures — including migration or visa assessments — their role remains contextual rather than evidentiary. They function as supplementary signals rather than structured, institutionally accountable representations of professional status.

Thus, institutional systems ensure administrative compatibility but remain state-dependent, while platforms ensure visibility but lack structured verification and distributed responsibility. Neither model addresses the need for a neutral, non-state, reputationally accountable mechanism capable of functioning beyond stable institutional regimes.

2.3 Institutional Rupture, Migration, and the Loss of Professional Legitimacy

The limitations of existing systems become most pronounced under conditions of institutional rupture. Political crises, armed conflicts, state transformation, and forced migration disrupt the continuity of structures traditionally responsible for confirming professional status — universities, professional associations, editorial boards, certification bodies.

In such contexts, professionals may retain expertise and accumulated symbolic capital while losing institutional access to mechanisms of validation. Documents issued in one jurisdiction may become politically contested, inaccessible, or regarded with suspicion in another. Professional identity becomes detached from its institutional infrastructure.

Professions strongly embedded in public discourse — journalism, academic research, cultural and analytical work — are particularly vulnerable. Their value often rests not solely on formal qualifications but on reputation, corpus of work, peer recognition, and contextual engagement. When institutional channels collapse or become inaccessible, these elements disperse across fragmented archives and platforms, becoming difficult to present coherently.

Institutional rupture reveals a paradox: a professional with recognized contributions may become formally “invisible” beyond the original institutional context. This invisibility is not a result of diminished competence but of structural incompatibility between transnational professional practice and territorially anchored mechanisms of recognition.

The structural nature of this rupture generates demand for alternative models capable of operating independently of state sovereignty and commercial platform dependency. The emergence of such demand forms the analytical entry point for conceptualizing Amerpass.

2.4 Research Framework

The analysis above demonstrates that the challenge of transnational professional recognition is structural rather than technological. Information about professional activity exists in abundance; what is missing is an integrative, non-state mechanism capable of synthesizing this information into a coherent and verifiable representation of professional legitimacy.

The research framework of this study is constructed at the intersection of three factors:

1. Increasing transnational mobility of professionals.
2. Institutional rupture and instability of recognition mechanisms.
3. Structural limitations of both supranational standardization systems and commercial platforms.

These factors collectively justify the exploration of alternative forms of professional identification beyond traditional accreditation models. The subsequent section introduces Amerpass as a conceptual response to these structural constraints.

3. Amerpass as a Non-State System of Professional Identification

3.1 Amerpass as a Conceptual Model

The concept of Amerpass emerges as a response to the institutional rupture identified in the previous section — namely, the structural misalignment between transnational professional practice and territorially bounded mechanisms of recognition. Unlike state-issued credentials, supranational standardization systems, or commercial digital platforms, Amerpass is not proposed as a universal document or a digital networking service. Rather, it is conceptualized as a **non-state model of professional identification** centered on reputational and evidentiary verification in transnational contexts.

At the core of Amerpass lies a principled distinction between personal identification and professional identity. Professional identity, within this framework, is understood as a composite of verifiable characteristics including documented professional activity, corpus of work, institutional affiliations, editorial and expert confirmations, participation in professional communities, and peer recognition. Amerpass does not claim functions related to citizenship, legal status, or personal identity verification; it operates exclusively within the domain of professional legitimacy.

The non-state character of Amerpass constitutes its defining feature. The model is deliberately designed outside passport, migration, and labor law regimes, thereby reducing dependency on national sovereignty and political structures. However, non-state does not imply non-institutional. On the contrary, Amerpass presupposes transparent verification procedures, editorial and expert responsibility, and an archival evidentiary framework ensuring reproducibility and auditability of presented professional information.

Amerpass differs fundamentally from digital self-presentation platforms. Whereas profiles on networking platforms are shaped by self-declaration and algorithmic visibility, Amerpass emphasizes contextualized documentation and evidentiary substantiation. Professional reputation is not “displayed” but documented through verifiable sources and institutionally accountable interpretation.

Conceptually, Amerpass may be described as a **soft-institutional mechanism of professional legitimation**, situated at the intersection of professional communities, documentary forms, and distributed institutional responsibility. It does not replace existing recognition systems but complements them in areas where state-dependent and platform-based models prove insufficient or inapplicable. Amerpass thus occupies an intermediate layer, supporting coherence and reproducibility of professional identity under conditions of transnational mobility.

3.2 Principles and System Architecture

The architecture of Amerpass is structured around several foundational principles designed to ensure neutrality, sustainability, and reproducibility.

Functional Delimitation

Amerpass does not combine personal identification, legal status confirmation, or professional licensing. Its architecture explicitly excludes elements that could imitate state authority or regulate access to labor markets. This strict delimitation preserves conceptual clarity and reduces legal ambiguity.

Evidentiary Orientation

Unlike self-declarative systems, Amerpass relies on verifiable sources: published materials, archival records, editorial confirmations, expert references, institutional affiliations, and documented project participation. The system prioritizes the formation of a coherent evidentiary corpus over the accumulation of disconnected claims.

Contextualization

Professional identity is conceptualized as a dynamic trajectory rather than a static collection of attributes. The architecture allows for representation of career development, disciplinary shifts,

geographic mobility, and evolving professional networks. This distinguishes Amerpass from certification models or résumé-based formats that reduce professional life to fixed categories.

Distributed Institutional Responsibility

Amerpass operates through non-state editorial, expert, or curatorial structures that assume procedural and reputational responsibility. These bodies do not possess normative authority but provide interpretative and verification functions, creating an intermediate layer of institutionalization without reliance on state enforcement.

Multi-Level Structure

The system architecture can be conceptualized across three interconnected levels:

1. **Documentary Level** — a material or symbolic documentary representation of professional identity.
2. **Digital Level** — access to expanded evidentiary archives and source verification.
3. **Institutional Level** — procedures for expert review, validation, and periodic reassessment.

A modular design allows adaptation to specific professional fields, particularly journalism, academic research, analytical practice, and creative industries. This modularity ensures flexibility while maintaining conceptual coherence.

3.3 Verification Mechanisms and Institutional Responsibility

The distinguishing feature of Amerpass lies in its structured verification mechanisms combined with distributed institutional accountability.

Verification is conceived not as a one-time confirmation but as an ongoing process. Professional identity is supported through **multi-source validation**, reducing dependence on single institutions. Evidence may include publications, editorial letters, public records, citations, project documentation, and institutional confirmations.

Importantly, verification within Amerpass is **graduated rather than binary**. Professional status is not reduced to “verified” or “unverified” but may reflect varying degrees of substantiation depending on available documentation and contextual evidence. This allows accommodation of nonlinear and interdisciplinary career paths.

Institutional responsibility is distributed across non-state editorial and expert bodies that provide interpretative oversight. These actors do not confer legal status but enhance reputational credibility by ensuring procedural transparency and reproducibility. Trust arises from documented methodology rather than coercive authority.

Transparency is central. Verification criteria and procedures must remain explicit and reproducible, enabling independent assessment. Periodic reassessment ensures that professional identity remains dynamic and responsive to change.

Amerpass does not replace professional communities but interacts with them. Recognition by professional peers remains primary; Amerpass functions as an integrative mechanism that aggregates and contextualizes such recognition in transnational settings.

3.4 Legal Boundaries

A critical dimension of Amerpass is its precise positioning within legal boundaries.

Amerpass is neither a passport, identity card, travel document, nor proof of citizenship. It contains no migration-related data and does not intersect with border control or visa regimes. It does not function as a professional license or regulatory accreditation and does not grant rights to practice regulated professions.

Legally, Amerpass may be situated within the domain of non-state reputational documentation operating under principles of freedom of association, expression, and academic freedom. It documents professional identity without generating legal rights or obligations.

To minimize risks of misinterpretation, the system must avoid terminology, symbols, and visual forms associated with state authority. Documentary form serves informational and reputational functions only.

This principle of minimal sufficiency ensures legal sustainability across jurisdictions.

3.5 Amerpass as an Instrument of Professional Mobility

Professional mobility involves not only geographic relocation but also transitions across institutional regimes, employment forms, and disciplinary domains. Amerpass supports continuity of professional identity across such transitions.

In cases of relocation accompanied by loss of institutional affiliation, Amerpass provides a coherent narrative supported by verifiable evidence independent of territorial constraints.

For interdisciplinary mobility, it aggregates professional capital accumulated across diverse sectors, enabling interpretation within a unified evidentiary framework.

For project-based transnational work lacking stable institutional anchoring, Amerpass functions as an aggregator and contextual interpreter of dispersed professional contributions.

In all scenarios, Amerpass does not replace formal recognition procedures but facilitates preliminary evaluation, reduces informational asymmetry, and enhances transparency in professional interactions.

Its significance lies in demonstrating the feasibility of non-state approaches to supporting professional mobility without reliance on sovereign authority or commercial platform dependency.

4. Comparative Analysis of Professional Identification Models

Comparative analysis is essential for situating Amerpass within the broader ecosystem of professional recognition mechanisms. Rather than presenting Amerpass in isolation, this section evaluates it alongside two dominant approaches to transnational representation of professional experience:

1. Supranational standardization systems (e.g., Europass);
2. Commercial digital networking platforms (e.g., LinkedIn).

The comparison is structured according to the following analytical criteria:

- Institutional foundation
- Type of professional information recorded
- Verification mechanisms
- Institutional accountability
- Dependence on state structures
- Dependence on commercial platform logic
- Functionality under institutional rupture
- Legal status
- Functional role in professional mobility

4.1 Europass as a Supranational Standardization Framework

Europass represents one of the most institutionalized efforts to facilitate cross-border professional mobility. Developed within the European Union, it provides standardized templates

for presenting educational and professional qualifications, enabling administrative comparability across member states.

Its strength lies in administrative interoperability. By aligning with European qualification frameworks, Europass reduces bureaucratic barriers within stable legal environments. It functions as an interface between national education systems and labor markets.

However, Europass does not generate independent professional legitimacy. It relies entirely on the authority and stability of underlying national institutions. Its function is descriptive rather than interpretative; it standardizes information but does not contextualize reputational capital.

Outside stable institutional contexts, especially under conditions of political disruption or forced migration, Europass loses much of its practical effectiveness. It documents qualifications but does not preserve or reinterpret professional legitimacy when institutional recognition collapses.

Thus, Europass may be characterized as a supranational administrative format effective within coordinated legal regimes but limited in transnational crisis contexts.

4.2 LinkedIn as a Platform-Based Model of Professional Visibility

LinkedIn represents a fundamentally different approach grounded in digital network logic. It enables professionals to construct publicly visible profiles documenting education, employment, skills, publications, and connections.

Its global reach has made LinkedIn a de facto reference point for preliminary professional assessment. Even governmental authorities, including U.S. immigration bodies, may consult LinkedIn profiles as contextual background during visa evaluations. However, such consultation remains supplementary rather than evidentiary.

The platform is built on self-declaration and algorithmic visibility. Institutional verification mechanisms are minimal and indirect. Reputation is influenced by engagement metrics, update frequency, and network reach rather than structured evidence.

Commercial dependency further complicates neutrality. Visibility and influence may be affected by paid services, algorithmic adjustments, and corporate governance decisions. Consequently, LinkedIn cannot function as a neutral, institutionally accountable mechanism of professional legitimization.

It excels at generating visibility and connectivity but does not provide reproducible, structured reputational validation.

4.3 Amerpass in Comparative Perspective

Amerpass occupies a distinct analytical position between administrative standardization and digital visibility.

Unlike supranational systems, it does not depend on stable state institutions. Unlike platforms, it does not rely on self-declaration or algorithmic ranking. Its core differentiator lies in:

- Multi-source evidentiary verification
- Contextual interpretation of professional trajectories
- Distributed non-state institutional responsibility
- Deliberate independence from both sovereign and commercial authority

Amerpass conceptualizes professional status not as administrative qualification nor as network presence but as a reputational construct formed over time through documented contributions and community recognition.

Its particular relevance emerges under conditions of institutional rupture — when traditional recognition channels become inaccessible or unreliable.

4.4 Comparative Matrix

Below is a structured comparison of the three models:

Criterion	Europass (Supranational System)	LinkedIn (Platform Model)	Amerpass (Non-State Model)
Institutional Foundation	Supranational & national institutions	Commercial corporation	Non-state professional structures
Type of Information	Standardized qualifications and experience	Self-declared profiles, networks	Documented professional trajectory & reputation
Verification Mechanism	Reliance on state institutions	Indirect (recommendations, signals)	Multi-source, graduated verification
Institutional Accountability	High, but state-dependent	Minimal, platform-based	Distributed non-state responsibility
Dependence on State	High	None	None
Dependence on Commercial Logic	None	High	None

Criterion	Europass (Supranational System)	LinkedIn (Platform Model)	Amerpass (Non-State Model)
Function under Institutional Rupture	Limited	Partial	Targeted and adaptive
Legal Status	Administrative data format	Private platform	Non-state reputational document
Primary Function	Administrative compatibility	Visibility & networking	Coherence & reproducibility of professional identity
Role in Migration/Visa Contexts	Indirect	Contextual background	Reputational-evidentiary (non-legal)

Analytical Conclusions

Each model serves a distinct function:

- Europass enhances administrative compatibility within stable institutional systems.
- LinkedIn enhances visibility and connectivity within digital networks.
- Amerpass seeks to provide structured, reproducible, non-state reputational legitimacy under transnational and unstable conditions.

Importantly, Amerpass does not seek to replace existing systems but to complement them where structural gaps appear. Its niche lies in areas where standardized data prove insufficient and algorithmic visibility becomes unreliable or contextually distorted.

The need for such alternative mechanisms is not technological but structural, arising from increased professional mobility and institutional volatility in the global order.

5. Risks, Constraints, and Structural Limitations of the Amerpass Model

Any non-state initiative operating within the sensitive domain of identification inevitably encounters structural risks. The sustainability of Amerpass depends not only on its conceptual coherence but also on its ability to acknowledge and delimit its own constraints. This section examines the principal categories of risk inherent in the model.

5.1 Risk of Symbolic Imitation of State Authority

One of the most significant risks associated with documentary-based non-state systems is symbolic confusion with state-issued instruments. The use of documentary formats, structured verification procedures, or institutional language may create the false perception that Amerpass possesses legal authority or normative status.

Such misinterpretation would contradict the foundational principle of Amerpass: strict separation between professional identification and juridical status. Any blending of reputational documentation with passport, migration, or licensing functions would not only undermine conceptual clarity but also generate legal and ethical complications.

This risk requires deliberate mitigation through:

- Clear terminological delimitation;
- Avoidance of state-associated symbols or design elements;
- Explicit disclaimers clarifying non-legal status;
- Transparent articulation of functional boundaries.

The documentary form must remain symbolic and informational rather than normative. Maintaining this boundary is not a secondary detail but a structural precondition for legitimacy.

5.2 Trust Deficit and Institutional Legitimacy

Unlike state institutions whose legitimacy derives from legal authority, non-state systems must cultivate trust through procedural transparency, reputational capital, and professional recognition.

Amerpass cannot assume legitimacy a priori. Trust must emerge gradually through demonstrated methodological consistency and responsible verification practices. During early implementation phases, reception will likely vary across professional and cultural contexts.

Several structural constraints arise:

- Absence of coercive authority;
- Variability in cultural perceptions of non-state credentials;
- Dependence on recognition by professional communities;
- Possibility of selective acceptance by external evaluators.

Importantly, Amerpass does not and cannot guarantee recognition. Reputational legitimacy differs fundamentally from legal entitlement. Attempts to prematurely universalize or overstate its authority would undermine credibility.

Therefore, gradual institutionalization and methodological transparency are not optional but essential developmental conditions.

5.3 Commercialization and Platform Drift

A further structural risk lies in potential commercialization and gradual transformation into a digital platform. Historical precedents demonstrate that non-state documentation initiatives may shift toward monetization to ensure financial sustainability.

Commercialization becomes problematic when it reorients priorities from evidentiary rigor toward scale, automation, and revenue optimization. Algorithmic ranking, paid visibility tiers, or gamification of reputation would fundamentally alter the system's logic.

Platform drift would blur the distinction between structured reputational documentation and digital self-presentation. Professional identity would become contingent on digital activity rather than substantive contribution.

To mitigate this risk, Amerpass must:

- Avoid universal expansion strategies;
- Prioritize quality over scale;
- Resist algorithmic reputational scoring;
- Preserve expert-mediated verification processes.

Limited scalability is not a weakness but a structural safeguard against dilution of methodological integrity.

5.4 Constraints of Scalability and Universalization

Unlike administrative templates or commercial networks designed for mass adoption, Amerpass is intentionally selective and context-sensitive.

Scalability in the conventional technological sense requires automation and standardization. However, Amerpass relies on interpretative, expert-based assessment, which inherently limits mass expansion.

Moreover, applicability varies across professions. Fields grounded in reputational capital and public contribution — journalism, academia, analytical and creative industries — align more closely with the model's architecture. Highly regulated professions requiring statutory licensing fall outside its appropriate scope.

Rapid expansion could produce:

- Divergence of standards;
- Inconsistent verification practices;
- Fragmentation of institutional responsibility;
- Erosion of trust.

Thus, selective application and moderated growth function as structural safeguards rather than operational deficiencies.

6. Empirical Foundations and Conceptual Development

6.1 National-Level Experience and Analytical Lessons

The conceptualization of Amerpass is grounded in prior empirical experience involving non-state professional identification initiatives within a national framework. The earlier project, Rupass, functioned as a non-state system aimed at documenting professional activity and reputational standing within a single jurisdiction.

Rupass demonstrated practical demand for non-state professional documentation, particularly under conditions of limited trust in formal institutions. However, it also revealed structural vulnerabilities tied to national embeddedness.

Dependence on local institutional recognition constrained cross-border applicability. Political and institutional shifts exposed the fragility of reputational systems confined to a single jurisdictional context.

This empirical experience highlighted a crucial distinction between formal non-state status and structurally resilient non-state architecture. The latter requires independence not only from state authority but also from national contextual dependency.

6.2 Conceptual Reframing Toward a Transnational Model

The transition from Rupass to Amerpass involved fundamental conceptual reframing.

Key lessons included:

- Transnational professional identity cannot be produced by exporting national models;
- Reputational reproducibility must replace institutional origin as the core legitimacy source;
- Documentary form must be separated from normative implication;
- Universal ambition must be replaced by selective contextual adaptation.

Amerpass was therefore designed as a qualitatively distinct system rather than a scaled iteration of a national initiative. Its architecture prioritizes interpretative transparency and evidentiary coherence over institutional origin.

6.3 Practical Application Scenarios

Amerpass demonstrates relevance in several typical transnational scenarios:

Professional Relocation

When professionals lose institutional affiliation due to migration or political conditions, Amerpass provides a coherent evidentiary narrative independent of territorial constraints.

Interdisciplinary Mobility

Transitions between academia, media, analytical practice, and creative industries often disrupt conventional recognition mechanisms. Amerpass aggregates reputational capital across sectors.

Project-Based Transnational Work

Professionals engaged in distributed international projects may lack stable institutional anchoring. Amerpass consolidates dispersed contributions into a verifiable framework.

In all scenarios, Amerpass does not substitute for legal recognition but facilitates preliminary evaluation and reduces informational asymmetry.

7. Conclusion

This study has examined the structural transformation of professional identification under conditions of transnational mobility and institutional instability.

The analysis demonstrates that neither supranational standardization systems nor commercial digital platforms provide reproducible, institutionally accountable mechanisms for professional legitimacy in crisis or rupture contexts.

Amerpass has been introduced as a non-state, soft-institutional model oriented toward evidentiary and reputational fixation of professional identity beyond sovereign and commercial dependencies.

Its distinctiveness lies in:

- Multi-source verification;
- Contextualized documentation;
- Distributed institutional responsibility;

- Explicit legal delimitation;
- Controlled scalability.

Amerpass is not presented as a finalized institution but as an evolving conceptual framework contributing to interdisciplinary discourse on professional identity and non-state institutional innovation.

Future research should focus on empirical implementation analysis, comparative study of alternative non-state recognition mechanisms, and interaction between reputational systems and formal migration or academic evaluation procedures.

Additional Mandatory Sections

Author Contributions

The author is solely responsible for the conceptualization, methodology, analysis, and writing of this study.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement

No datasets were generated or analyzed beyond publicly available conceptual and theoretical sources.

Ethical Statement

The study does not involve human subjects research and complies with academic ethical standards.

References

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226189666.001.0001>
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press. (*No universally registered DOI available — classic monograph*).

- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Brubaker, R. (2015). *Grounds for difference*. Harvard University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- European Commission. (2020). *Europass: Supporting learning and career development in Europe*. European Commission.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Stanford University Press.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 764–791. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667055>
- Kitchin, R. (2014). *The data revolution: Big data, open data, data infrastructures and their consequences*. Sage.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Sennett, R. (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. Yale University Press.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- USCIS. (2022). *Policy manual: Extraordinary ability and outstanding professor or researcher*. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. <https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual>
- van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*. University of California Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.
(There is no single DOI for the book itself, but review articles and critiques exist in academic journals; see Hongladarom's article with DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-01100-0> for context on interpretation).