



**TECHNIUM**  
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

[www.techniumscience.com](http://www.techniumscience.com)



**Vol. 75/2025**  
**A New Decade for Social Changes**

**PLUS**  
**COMMUNICATION P**



**International**  
Communication & PR

# **Professional Cultural Migration in the Digital Age: An Intercultural Communication Study of Digital Immigrant Lecturers in the Dynamics of Academic Workload Reporting (BKD) at Tanjungpura University, Pontianak**

**Julia Magdalena Wuysang<sup>1</sup>, Ira Patriani<sup>2</sup>, Dahniar Th. Musa<sup>3</sup>, Rahmawati<sup>4</sup>,  
Feibe Engeline Pijoh<sup>5</sup>**

<sup>1 2 3</sup>Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak, <sup>4</sup>Universitas Syiah Kuala Banda Aceh,  
<sup>5</sup>Universitas Negeri Manado

[julia.magdalena@fisip.untan.ac.id](mailto:julia.magdalena@fisip.untan.ac.id), [irapatriani@gmail.com](mailto:irapatriani@gmail.com),  
[dahniarmusa@fisip.untan.ac.id](mailto:dahniarmusa@fisip.untan.ac.id), [Rahmawati@fisip.untan.ac.id](mailto:Rahmawati@fisip.untan.ac.id),  
[feibepijoh@unima.ac.id](mailto:feibepijoh@unima.ac.id)

**Abstract.** In the digital era, the Academic Workload Reporting System (BKD) has evolved beyond its administrative function to become a site of cultural negotiation, particularly for lecturers from the digital immigrant generation. This study explores how senior academics—whose professional identities were shaped in the pre-digital era—undergo identity transformation when confronted with a reporting system rooted in efficiency, quantification, and technocratic logic. Employing a qualitative methodology and a critical digital ethnographic approach, the research investigates intercultural communication dynamics between senior lecturers and younger administrative staff, with digital systems conceptualized as symbolic actors within the higher education institution. Findings reveal three key insights: 1. The adaptation process of digital immigrant lecturers unfolds in three phases—identity dissonance, resistance or accommodation, and identity reconstruction; 2. Intergenerational differences in communication styles, shifting power relations within the organization, and evolving meanings of academic professionalism significantly affect the effectiveness of interactions within digital BKD reporting; 3. Lecturers respond through symbolic strategies, collaborative practices, and a redefinition of their roles as digital academics. A critical discovery highlights that three lecturers have persistently refused to participate in the digital BKD system as a form of boycott, while one has even opted for early retirement from the civil service. These cases underscore that digital transformation in academia is not merely a technological shift, but a cultural migration that demands a fundamental reconstruction of values and working relationships within the academic ecosystem.

**Keywords.** Cultural migration, digital immigrant lecturers, academic workload (BKD), digital transformation

## **Introduction**

The digital era has ushered in both structural and cultural transformations across various sectors, including higher education in Indonesia. Amid this wave of digital

transformation, university lecturers are not only expected to excel in their academic disciplines, but also to adapt to digitized performance reporting systems, such as the online-based Academic Workload Reporting (Beban Kerja Dosen – BKD). In this context, a compelling phenomenon emerges: the cultural tension experienced by lecturers who belong to the generation of *digital immigrants*—individuals who were born and socialized in the analog era, yet are now required to operate within digital environments (Boulton, 2010: 104–120). The shift from manual work cultures to digital reporting systems is not merely a technical transition, but constitutes a cultural migration that entails value reconfiguration, cognitive realignment, and transformed patterns of communication. Lecturers from the digital immigrant generation often encounter cultural dissonance when navigating systems designed with the logic and fluency of digital natives. This misalignment gives rise to resistance, confusion, and communication gaps that ultimately hinder the effectiveness of academic reporting and the integrity of performance accountability (Prensky, 2001). From the perspective of intercultural communication, this phenomenon may be understood as a form of internal *cultural migration*—where individuals cross cultural boundaries not geographically, but within the digital realm. This transition generates intercultural spaces characterized by divergent perceptions, symbolic interpretations of digital tools, and varying preferences in technology use. Within the BKD reporting context, such differences frequently result in communicative disorientation among the system, operators, and lecturers, thereby affecting both report quality and work satisfaction. This issue merits critical inquiry due to its direct implications on higher education governance, lecturer professionalism, and fairness in performance evaluation. Adopting an intercultural communication lens, this paper seeks to unpack how digital immigrant lecturers experience, negotiate, and adapt to a new cultural terrain shaped by the digitization of BKD reporting systems. Several key transformations within Indonesian higher education provide context for this study:

### **Digital Transformation in Higher Education**

The rapid development of information and communication technologies (ICT) has significantly reshaped the landscape of higher education in Indonesia. One major impact is the digitization of the BKD reporting system, transitioning from manual to online formats. This structural change compels lecturers—many of whom are unfamiliar with digital cultures—to engage with a system that feels alien.

### **Lecturers as Digital Immigrants**

The term *digital immigrant* refers to individuals born before the digital age, who must now adapt to emerging technologies. Lecturers in this category frequently encounter barriers in understanding and using digital systems such as BKD, creating a generational communication gap between themselves and the systems or actors designed for digital natives.

### **Intercultural Communication in the Digital Context**

In this setting, intercultural communication becomes a critical factor. Digital immigrant lecturers must navigate cultural differences in how information is communicated, interpreted, and managed in digital platforms. Misalignments between digital culture and traditional academic values often lead to misinterpretation and reporting inefficiencies.

The topic of “**Intercultural Communication and Digital Immigrant Lecturers in the Context of BKD Reporting**” opens a novel area of inquiry that intersects two crucial dimensions: cultural change driven by digitalization and its impact on professional communication practices in academic institutions. A review of current literature reveals that

while previous studies have separately addressed: Intercultural communication in digital contexts (e.g., *Technology and Intercultural Communication: Opportunities and Challenges in the Digital World*), and the experiences of digital immigrant lecturers in online teaching and virtual communication, there is limited to no research integrating these themes in relation to academic workload reporting systems like BKD. This gap presents an important opportunity for scholarly contribution, because:

It introduces a **fresh perspective** by combining intercultural frameworks with the digitization of administrative academic practices.

It provides **practical implications** for how institutions can support generationally diverse lecturers in performing digital reporting tasks.

It addresses a **highly relevant issue** as higher education systems globally accelerate toward digital transformation.

This study aims to uncover communication patterns and digital acculturation strategies that can serve as a foundation for developing more **inclusive, human-centered, and culturally responsive** academic reporting systems. **Based on this introduction, the study addresses the following research questions:** 1. How do digital immigrant lecturers negotiate their professional identity in response to the digital BKD reporting system as a form of academic cultural migration? 2. What patterns of intercultural communication emerge between digital immigrant lecturers and institutional actors (staff, operators, digital systems) in the execution of BKD reporting? 3. What communication and adaptation strategies are employed by digital immigrant lecturers to preserve academic integrity while navigating the technocratic demands of the digital BKD system?

## Literature Review

### Digitalization and the BKD Reporting Context

The Academic Workload Reporting System (*Beban Kerja Dosen* – BKD) in Indonesia has undergone a significant transformation, shifting from a paper-based administrative process to a fully digital, online application system. While the transition is often framed as a means to enhance **efficiency, transparency, and accountability**, it also implies a deeper shift: from a traditional documentation-oriented workflow to an **automated, system-centric digital culture**. This transformation is not merely technological; it also entails a **cultural reconfiguration** of how academic work is recorded, interpreted, and evaluated.

### Lecturers as Digital Immigrants

The term *digital immigrant*, popularized by Prensky (2001), refers to individuals who were not raised in the digital age but are now required to engage with digital technologies. In the Indonesian higher education context, a substantial portion of senior lecturers falls into this category. These lecturers typically:

Are accustomed to conventional, manual work systems and analog academic cultures;  
Experience cultural pressure from institutional demands for digital competency;

Encounter generational gaps with younger colleagues (digital natives), particularly in terms of work styles, technological vocabulary, and perceptions of what constitutes efficient practice.

The concept of digital immigrant is useful not only to understand **technological adaptation**, but also to frame the **intergenerational and intercultural tensions** within academic institutions undergoing digital transformation.

### **Intercultural Communication in Digital Spaces**

While intercultural communication is traditionally associated with ethnic, national, or geographical differences, it can also be extended to generational and digital literacy divides. As Gudykunst and Kim (2017) assert, intercultural communication is “the process of negotiating meaning between individuals from different cultural backgrounds.” Culture here encompasses **values, habits, and symbolic systems**, including digital technologies as a **new symbolic language**.

Within this framework, the interaction between digital immigrant lecturers and the BKD system can be analyzed as a **form of intercultural communication**, where:

The **digital reporting system** represents a new cultural logic, embedded with values of automation, standardization, and systematization;

The **senior lecturers** embody the analog academic culture that emphasizes reflection, tacit knowledge, and personalized documentation.

### **Tensions and Challenges in Communication**

In the implementation of digital BKD reporting, intercultural tensions emerge in several forms:

**Misinterpretation of digital symbols:** unfamiliarity with icons, interface navigation, or technical terminology can result in anxiety and reduced system engagement;

**Digital communication apprehension:** fear of making errors—such as incorrect data entry or system miscommunication—often leads to hesitation or complete avoidance;

**Intergenerational communication gaps:** difficulties arise in collaboration between senior lecturers and younger IT staff or administrative operators, who may overlook these struggles as **cultural barriers** rather than individual incompetencies.

These issues underscore that BKD reporting is **not merely an administrative task**, but rather a **convergent space** where two cultural paradigms—**analog and digital**—collide and interact. Lecturers positioned as digital immigrants are thus at the intersection of preserving traditional professional identities and confronting the institutional demand for digital acculturation.

### **Conclusion of the Review**

The BKD reporting process should be understood as more than a technological shift—it is a **site of cultural migration and professional identity transition**. Digital immigrant lecturers are not only learning a new system but also **navigating a new culture** within the digital university. As such, adopting an **intercultural communication perspective** becomes essential to ensure a more inclusive, humane, and effective adaptation process. It opens critical insights into how **professional identity, cultural belonging, and technological fluency** co-evolve in the digitized academic landscape.

### **Research Methodology**

#### **Research Design: Qualitative – Critical Digital Ethnography**

This study adopts a **qualitative approach** with the methodological orientation of **critical digital ethnography**, aimed at capturing the **meanings, experiences, and cultural practices** that emerge from lecturers' interactions with digital systems and intergenerational institutional actors.

Critical ethnography enables the researcher to:

Explore how **academic identities, values, and professional meanings** are negotiated within the digital transformation of higher education;

Unpack the dynamics of **power relations, symbolic resistance, and technological adaptation** as expressions of a broader process of **cultural migration** within academia.

**Research Setting and Participants**

**Site:** Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP), Universitas Tanjungpura – a faculty with a significant population of senior lecturers identified as digital immigrants.

**Participants:**

**Senior Lecturers** (born in the 1950s–1980s): Individuals shaped by analog academic cultures.

**System Operators/Administrative Staff** (born in the 1990s–2000s): Typically digital natives managing the BKD platform.

**BKD System Managers:** Includes vice deans, IT staff, and academic administrators involved in the governance and technical operation of BKD reporting.

**Object of Inquiry:** The observable practices, behaviors, and communicative patterns between digital immigrant lecturers, system operators, and institutional managers during the BKD reporting period.

**Data Collection Techniques**

Technique	Description
<b>In-depth Interviews</b>	Conducted with senior lecturers to explore their academic identity, values, and adaptive strategies.
<b>Participant Observation</b>	Direct observation of BKD reporting interactions, including training sessions, consultations, and system use.
<b>Digital Artefact Analysis</b>	Examination of BKD system interfaces, user manuals, and documentation as <b>symbolic actors</b> in shaping academic work culture.
<b>Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)</b>	Facilitated intergenerational discussions to uncover cross-role dynamics, perceptions, and communication challenges.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

Data were analyzed using **Thematic Analysis** (Braun & Clarke, 2006), a method suited for identifying recurring patterns of meaning within qualitative data. This approach enabled the researcher to surface key themes such as:

**Symbolic resistance** to digitalization,  
**Identity reconstruction** among digital immigrants,  
**Intergenerational communication disparities**, and  
The emergence of **adaptive cultural strategies** in response to digital transformation.

**Results**

**The Negotiation of Professional Identity Among Digital Immigrant Lecturers in the Context of BKD Online Reporting as a Form of Academic Cultural Migration**

The findings of this study reveal that **digital immigrant lecturers** undergo a complex and multidimensional process of **professional identity negotiation** when engaging with the online BKD (Beban Kerja Dosen) performance reporting system. This process reflects not

merely a technical adaptation, but a **deep cultural migration**, marked by the shifting terrain of academic values, digital competencies, and institutional expectations.

**Institutional Context: Generational Composition and Technological Landscape**

At the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura (FISIP Untan), the generational distribution is as follows:

**Senior Lecturers (1960s–1980s cohorts):** 80 individuals

**Young Lecturers (2000–2025 cohorts):** 30 individuals

**BKD System Operator (1990s cohort):** Only 1 staff member, aged 35

**BKD Assessors:** 6 individuals – 5 from the Baby Boomer generation, and 1 from Generation X (early adopters of digital technologies).

**Tabel 1**

*Demographic Distribution of Faculty Members by Age Group and Technological Exposure Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura (Untan), Pontianak – August 2025*

No	Age group	Number of lectures
1	65 – 50	20
2	59 – 55	26
3	54 – 50	13
4	49 – 45	10
5	44 – 35	11
6	34 – 24	29
7	23 – 20	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>

**Source:** Author’s field data (September 2025).

More than 70% of the lecturers at FISIP Untan belong to **pre-digital generations**, shaped by analog educational and professional environments. Their encounters with digital systems like BKD are often marked by initial **shock**, **technological anxiety**, and **identity dissonance**. In contrast, younger lecturers—though fewer in number—are projected to lead the faculty's transition toward a digital campus aligned with Indonesia's **Golden Vision 2045**.

**Tabel 2**  
**Asesor BKD Fisip Untan Pontianak**

No	Usia	Jumlah
1	65	1
2	64	1
3	61	1

4	60	1
5	65	1
6	49	1

**Source: Author's field data (September 2025).**

While most BKD assessors are of advanced age, they differ from the general lecturer population due to consistent participation in training and synchronization workshops, organized by DIKTI (Directorate General of Higher Education). This institutional support enhances their **assessment reliability** despite their analog origins.

### **Identity Dissonance: Tensions Between Analog Culture and Digital Demands**

The shift from analog to digital systems introduces **identity dissonance**—a psychological and cultural gap between long-held professional values and the emergent expectations of the digital academic environment. Drawing from Erikson's **Psychosocial Development Theory** (1968), identity is formed and reshaped in response to **changing social contexts**. A crisis emerges when there is a misalignment between internalized identities and new external realities. Similarly, **Mezirow's Transformative Learning Theory** (1991) argues that such dissonance—often triggered by a "disorienting dilemma"—can catalyze **critical reflection** and identity transformation. In the case of digital immigrant lecturers, this dissonance manifests in the confrontation between **analog mindsets** and **digital imperatives** such as automation, multitasking, and algorithmic accountability.

#### **Conceptual Analysis: Dimensions of Identity Dissonance**

<b>Identity Aspect</b>	<b>Analog Cultural Traits</b>	<b>Digital Cultural Demands</b>	<b>Form of Dissonance</b>
<b>Professional</b>	Stable, tenure-based, experience-driven	Agile, competence-based, digitally fluent	Feelings of obsolescence and professional insecurity
<b>Communicative</b>	Linear, face-to-face, hierarchical	Instantaneous, multitasking, participatory	Confusion over social cues, etiquette, and communication channels
<b>Cognitive</b>	Deep, reflective, structured	Fast, responsive, multitasking-oriented	Anxiety about superficiality and loss of depth in academic practice
<b>Social Identity</b>	Shaped by physical networks and institutional rank	Shaped by online presence, metrics, and digital influence	Tension between offline identity and online academic persona

**Source: Author's Analysis (July 2025)**

#### **Theoretical Synthesis**

**Erikson (1968)** underscores that identity is a **dynamic psychosocial process**, not a fixed trait. In moments of profound cultural change—such as digital transformation—individuals

experience **identity crises** when their previously stable values and competencies become misaligned with emerging norms and tools.

**Mezirow (1991)** goes further, positioning dissonance not only as a threat but as an **opportunity for growth**. His theory of **transformative learning** emphasizes the potential of disorienting dilemmas (like digital disruption) to stimulate **reflective reassessment of professional roles, beliefs, and identities**. With adequate support, these crises can yield **new adaptive identities** for the digital age.

#### Conclusion of Section 4.1

The digitalization of BKD reporting acts as a **cultural disruptor**, compelling analog-native lecturers to confront and renegotiate their academic identities. The process is neither linear nor uniform. Instead, it unfolds through cycles of disorientation, resistance or accommodation, and eventual **reconstruction of professional selfhood**—a journey that reflects both institutional transformation and personal adaptation.

#### 4.1.2 Resistance or Accommodation: Identity Responses to Digital Culture

##### Core Issue: Negotiating Identity in the Digital Era

At the second stage of digital transformation within higher education, academics often find themselves at a crossroads between two identity orientations:

**Resistance** — the defense of traditional values and professional practices shaped by an analog cultural framework.

**Accommodation** — the adjustment to new administrative demands embedded within digital systems, including e-learning platforms, computerized data management, and performance reporting via institutional dashboards.

This phenomenon is not merely a technical transition; it signifies a deeper **transformation of professional identity**, wherein long-held norms and values are confronted by emerging digital structures and expectations. The dynamics of faculty attitudes and behaviors toward the implementation of the **BKD digital reporting system** reveal diverse forms of identity negotiation in response to these structural shifts.

**Table 4.1.2: Dynamics of Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors Toward the Digital BKD Reporting System**

Dimension	Senior Lecturers (Digital Immigrants)	Younger Lecturers (Digital Natives)	Administrative Staff / System Operators
Acceptance of the System	Ambivalent: formally compliant, yet often exhibiting symbolic resistance	Adaptive and generally positive; perceive the system as part of professional accountability	Fully accepting; view the system as a central tool for workflow and control
Attitude Toward Digitalization	Skeptical of system efficiency; concerned that academic value is being reduced	Optimistic; see opportunities for transparency and academic self-branding	Pragmatic and technical; focus on system stability and procedural effectiveness
Adaptation Style	Rely on staff or students for	Independent, exploratory, and	Proactive, systematic, and

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Senior Lecturers (Digital Immigrants)</b>	<b>Younger Lecturers (Digital Natives)</b>	<b>Administrative Staff / System Operators</b>
<b>Power Relations in Reporting</b>	assistance, symbolic strategies, or delegation  Experiencing a shift: from dominance → dependency on digital operators	often share digital knowledge with peers  More egalitarian; cultivate horizontal relationships with administrative staff	supportive— especially in technical aspects  Gaining functional authority through mastery of digital systems
<b>Understanding of Professionalism</b>	Anchored in academic reputation and non-digital scholarly contributions	Open to data-driven assessments and digital documentation	Regard successful reporting as a mark of administrative professionalism
<b>Identity Adjustment Strategy</b>	Emphasize reflective narratives, historical recognition, and classical academic roles	Integrate academic identity with a digitally mediated public image	Function as technical facilitators and quality gatekeepers in reporting processes
<b>Common Challenges</b>	Mild technophobia, cultural resistance, limited time and precision	High multitasking demands and additional administrative workload	Technical and emotional burden of managing diverse faculty attitudes
<b>Digital Communication Behavior</b>	Formal, vertical, and occasionally passive	Responsive, fluid, and collaborative	Cooperative and communicative, yet assertive within technical and regulatory boundaries

**Source:** Author's Field Data, Augustus 2025.

**Analytical Notes**

**Senior lecturers** tend to prioritize symbolic and cultural values, often perceiving that their academic identity is being eroded by increasingly technocratic systems. Their resistance is less about incompetence and more about the perceived loss of epistemic authority.

**Younger lecturers** demonstrate greater flexibility and interpret the reporting system as part of their academic digital branding strategy, seamlessly integrating technological literacy into their professional identity.

**Administrative staff** serve as crucial **technical gatekeepers** and procedural enforcers within the BKD reporting ecosystem. However, despite their pivotal role, they often remain under-recognized in symbolic and institutional hierarchies.

### Theoretical Framework

#### Cultural Lag Theory – William F. Ogburn (1922)

Ogburn posits that cultural values (non-material culture) tend to lag behind technological advancements (material culture). This discrepancy, termed **cultural lag**, reflects the misalignment between emergent digital infrastructures and pre-existing institutional norms or professional identities.

*“The adaptive culture lags behind the material culture, creating disorganization and maladjustment.”*— Ogburn, 1922:200

In the context of BKD digital reporting, this theory explains the heterogeneous responses of academic staff:

Some senior lecturers attempt to engage in **learning new technologies** and adapt to digital routines.

Others exhibit **indifference or disengagement**, treating digital requirements as burdensome intrusions.

A few have gone as far as **voluntarily resigning or requesting early retirement** from their status as civil servants (ASN), highlighting the depth of resistance when identity conflict becomes untenable.

These dynamics are further illustrated in Table 4.1.3 (presented subsequently), which categorizes faculty responses to digital transformation within the reporting system.

**Table 4.1.3**

#### Senior Lecturers’ Attitudes and Extreme Resistance Towards Digital BKD Reporting

Resistance Category	Field Description	Practice	Symbolic Psychosocial Motivation	Theoretical Framework & Scholarly References
<b>Passive Resistance</b>	Ignoring BKD system notifications, delaying data entry until deadlines, or delegating reporting tasks to others.		A silent expression of dissent towards a system perceived as “alien” or infringing on academic autonomy.	Bourdieu (1990): Mismatch between established habitus and digital field; resistance as a means to preserve symbolic capital.
<b>Total Delegation</b>	Completely outsourcing input to students, or operators without involvement.	BKD staff, operators direct	Maintaining identity as a pure scholar by distancing from “bureaucratic labor.”	Goffman (1959): Impression management by minimizing bureaucratic “front stage”; Bourdieu: symbolic practices to protect cultural capital.

Resistance Category	Field Description	Practice	Symbolic Psychosocial Motivation	Theoretical Framework & Scholarly References
<b>Verbal Discontent</b>	Criticizing the system in formal/informal forums, claiming digital BKD reduces lecturers to mere data entry clerks.		Affirming that intellectual value cannot be captured by administrative or digital metrics.	Goffman (1959): Identity dramaturgy— language as a form of resistance; Becher & Trowler (2001): differing values among “academic tribes.”
<b>Symbolic Boycott</b>	Complete refusal to fill BKD reports as a silent protest or critique of digitalized performance evaluation.		Political statement: “I will not submit to a system that disregards scholarly values.”	Bourdieu (1990): Symbolic action to protect cultural and symbolic capital from systemic deconstruction.
<b>Analog Advocacy</b>	Demanding the continued availability of manual/face-to-face reporting systems; asserting technology is unsuitable for all generations.		Effort to preserve historical legitimacy and experiential superiority within academia.	Eraut (2004): Rejection of formal technical learning; Wenger (1998): failure to create inclusive cross-generational communities of practice.
<b>Identity Withdrawal</b>	Withdrawing from training sessions, digital groups, or BKD system discussions entirely.		Professional identity threatened; a strategy to shield the “academic self” from value disruption.	Giddens (1991): Self-identity crisis in reflective modernity; Brown & Duguid (2001): rejection of integration into digital social practices.

**Source:** Author’s Data (July 2025).

**Theoretical Framework: Cultural Migration & Digital Literacy in the Academic Context Cultural Migration: The Transition from Analog to Digital Culture**

The concept of cultural migration refers to the process of transferring values, practices, and individual identities from one cultural form to another. Within the academic sphere, this transition involves a shift from an analog work culture—characterized by face-to-face interactions, physical documentation, and direct engagement—to a digital work culture defined by platformization, data-centric processes, and automation. Jenkins et al. (2006) emphasize that cultural migration extends beyond mere technological change; it encompasses the

reconstruction of professional identity, habitus, and the meaning of work within the context of new media. As digital immigrants (Prensky, 2001), academics experience cultural dislocation as technology introduces new logics that reshape how they are evaluated, communicate, and establish academic legitimacy.

“Digital technologies do not simply offer new tools; they transform the culture of practice itself” (Jenkins et al., 2006, *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture*).

This cultural migration is asynchronous across generations: senior faculty typically carry analog symbolic capital, whereas younger staff or digital natives operate within an epistemically and symbolically distinct digital field (Bourdieu, 1990).

### **Digital Literacy: Transformative Capacity Beyond Technical Skills**

Digital literacy in academia transcends mere operational proficiency with digital tools. It broadly refers to the ability to comprehend, critically evaluate, and reflect upon the use of technology in the production and representation of academic knowledge (Belshaw, 2012). Martin and Grudziecki (2006) further delineate digital literacy into three interrelated dimensions:

**Digital competence:** technical skills (e.g., BKD data entry),

**Digital usage:** application of skills within professional contexts,

**Digital transformation:** reflective capacity to leverage technology for reconfiguring identity and work practices.

For academics, digital BKD reporting represents more than an administrative obligation; it signifies reflective digital literacy that reveals how they adjust their epistemic practices within the digital ecosystem.

“*Digital literacy is not about tools, but about using those tools to think, reflect, and construct meaning in digital cultures*” (Belshaw, 2012; Martin & Grudziecki, 2006).

### **Integration of Theories in the Digital Academic Context**

The confluence of cultural migration and digital literacy theories elucidates that transitioning to digital BKD systems demands more than technical training. It requires:

Adaptation of professional values and meanings (Giddens, 1991),

Reconstruction of digital academic identity (Selwyn, 2016),

And the cultivation of cross-generational communities of practice (Wenger, 1998).

Academics who successfully navigate cultural migration with reflective digital literacy not only maintain their professional relevance but also lead in redefining the digital academic ethos.

### **Habitus and Field – Bourdieu (1990)**

Bourdieu conceptualizes professional identity as an expression of habitus, a system of durable dispositions shaped within specific social fields. When the field undergoes transformation—such as through digitalization—habitus may respond through:

**Resistance**, where existing dispositions misalign with new structures,

**Accommodation**, where habitus gradually adapts by adopting new practices.

“*Habitus is a product of history... but it is also the principle of the structuring of new practices*” (Bourdieu, 1990:54).

**Table 4.1.4**  
**Analysis of Resistance versus Accommodation in Professional Identity**

Aspect	Characteristics of Old Habitus	Challenges of the New (Digital) Field	Reaction: Resistance	Reaction: Accommodation
<b>Professional Identity</b>	Rooted in analog experience, class sovereignty, and oral teaching	Demands for efficiency, digital reporting, and system management	Feeling that the lecturer's role is diminished to that of a "system operator"	Redesigning the role as a digital academic equipped with new competencies
<b>Work Style</b>	Slow rhythm, reflective, manual documentation	Integration of LMS systems, systemic deadlines, data-driven work	Experiencing fatigue and alienation	Developing digital work routines based on adaptive strategies
<b>Social Status</b>	Respected for experience and seniority	Disrupted by younger lecturers more proficient in technology	Feeling a loss of authority	Cross-generational collaboration embraced as a new asset
<b>Academic Communication</b>	Face-to-face, direct interaction	Platform-based communication, Zoom, mass email	Feeling a loss of intimacy and quality in discussions	Seeking more meaningful forms of digital interaction
<b>Meaning of Work</b>	Teaching as mentoring, face-to-face discussion	Instruction based on digital instruments and asynchronous content	Feeling a loss of educational essence	Finding new value in blended learning and co-creation of knowledge

**Source:** Author's Data (July 2025).

### **In-Depth Analytical Exposition**

◆ **Resistance as a Reflection of Habitus**  
Lecturers exhibiting resistance to digital systems are not merely "technologically inept," but are actively defending a form of habitus shaped within the pre-digital academic social field. This habitus is grounded in values such as pedagogical autonomy, rich interpersonal

relationships, and professional prestige cultivated through analog processes. *"When the field changes, habitus does not transform instantaneously. During this interim, resistance emerges as a manifestation of dissonance between the old structure and the new"* (Bourdieu, 1990: 58).

◆ **Accommodation as Habitus Transposition**

Conversely, lecturers who successfully accommodate digital systems do more than merely master technological tools; they engage in a reconstruction of professional values and work practices. Habitus undergoes a process of transposition—adapting to the new field while carrying traces of previous dispositions. Such adaptation often requires structural support, including reflective training, horizontal forums for discussion, and safe spaces to experiment with new practices free from stigma.

◆ **Cultural Lag as a Macro-Theoretical Framework**

The concept of cultural lag provides a macro-level framework to understand that this transition is not solely an individual-level phenomenon but a structural symptom of symbolic value delay in responding to digitally embedded systemic changes.

**Subchapter 3: Identity Reconstruction – Self-Integration within the Digital Academic Culture**

**Core Discussion**

The third phase in the professional identity transformation process of lecturers is reconstruction, where individuals move beyond merely responding to or resisting digital systems and actively integrate themselves within these systems. At this juncture, lecturers do not simply adapt but become transformational agents within the digital academic culture. The professional identity, previously rooted in analog culture, is now expanded, renegotiated, and articulated through ongoing interactions with technology, digital discourse, and new pedagogical practices. This process entails deep reflection on their roles as educators, how they aspire to position themselves within digital academic spaces, and how they attribute meaning to these changes.

**Table 4.1.5:**  
**Analysis of Characteristics in Lecturers' Digital Identity Reconstruction**

<b>Identity Dimension</b>	<b>Pre-Reconstruction</b>	<b>Post-Reconstruction</b>	<b>Theoretical Explanation</b>
<b>Professional Role</b>	Passive system user	Agent of digital transformation	Reflexive Project (Giddens, 1991)
<b>Meaning of Work</b>	Entrapped by digital administrative burden	Views technology as a tool for pedagogical enhancement	Discursive Identity (Hall, 1996)
<b>Self-Control</b>	Feels monitored by the system	Designs personalized digital strategies	Digital Agency (Bandura, 2001)
<b>Technological Competence</b>	Low confidence in digital usage	Capable of developing content, learning systems, and digital reflection	Technological Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 2001)

<b>Identity Dimension</b>	<b>Pre-Reconstruction</b>	<b>Post-Reconstruction</b>	<b>Theoretical Explanation</b>
<b>Academic Interaction</b>	Reactive to the system	Proactively creates digital academic communities	Identity formed through new relations and practices

Source: Author's Data (July 2025)

### **From Static Identity to Reflexive Narratives**

The process of identity reconstruction within the digital academic culture marks a significant shift from traditionally grounded professional identities toward identities driven by reflexivity and narrative consciousness. Lecturers begin to question and reorganize their self-conception in the context of digital teaching: Are they merely content providers, or authentic facilitators of digital learning?

According to Giddens (1991), this emerging narrative is not a replacement of the former identity but a reflexive project—an ongoing and open process of identity work. In this framework, technology becomes a space for narrative intervention rather than merely a technical instrument.

### **Identity as Discursive Production**

Following Hall (1996), identity is not a fixed inheritance but a product of ongoing discourse. As digital technologies become part of the regime of truth within the academic realm, professional identity is shaped through lecturers' participation in digital discourses: academic blogs, online publications, scholarly social media, and learning management system (LMS) design. Thus, successful identity reconstruction is characterized by lecturers' capacity to engage with and shape the digital academic discourse, rather than merely conforming to system protocols.

### **Agency and Self-Efficacy as Resources for Reconstruction**

Bandura (2001) highlights self-efficacy as a fundamental prerequisite for agency. In the digital identity reconstruction process, lecturers' success is strongly influenced by:

- Confidence in using technology
- Ability to develop digital solutions
- Willingness to experiment and share knowledge

This digital agency distinguishes transformative lecturers from merely adaptive ones. Such agents do not simply comply with existing systems but actively shape, critique, and enrich them through reflective and collaborative identities.

### **Patterns of Intercultural Communication Formed Between Digital Immigrant Lecturers and Institutional Actors (Staff, Operators, Systems) in the Implementation of Digital BKD Reporting**

#### **Subsection 4.2.1: Intergenerational Communication Style Differences and Technology as a "Cultural Mediator"**

This analysis employs Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory (2001) alongside Daft and Lengel's Media Richness Theory (1986), presented through a scientific narrative and

thematic analytical tables to elucidate the dynamics of intergenerational communication within the digital academic context.

**Core Discussion**

Within the digitized higher education environment, collaboration between Generation X/Baby Boomer lecturers (digital immigrants) and younger Generation Y/Z staff (digital natives) frequently encounters tensions. A primary source of such tension lies in differing communication styles, encompassing social norms, expectations for message clarity, and preferences for digital media usage. While technology initially serves as a facilitative tool, in this context, it often becomes a source of cultural dissonance in communication. Nevertheless, with an appropriate approach, technology can function as a cultural mediator bridging divergent values, expectations, and work languages across generations.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions (2001) – Micro-Organizational Application**

Hofstede posits that cultural values operate not only across nations but also intergenerationally within organizations. At the micro level—such as within a university or work unit—differences manifest in dimensions including:

**Power Distance:** seniority versus egalitarianism

**Uncertainty Avoidance:** preference for system clarity versus flexibility

**Individualism versus Collectivism:** formal communication versus spontaneous collaboration

These cultural values underpin communication expectations and significantly influence how lecturers and staff interpret, transmit, and receive messages within digital systems. *"Cultural values fundamentally shape communication expectations, even within small organizations"* (Hofstede, 2001: 231).

**Media Richness Theory – Daft & Lengel (1986)**

This theory asserts that each communication channel varies in “media richness,” determined by its capacity to convey nuance, emotion, and immediate feedback.

Generation X and Baby Boomers tend to prefer richer media (face-to-face meetings, telephone) for critical discussions.

Generations Y and Z show greater comfort with leaner media such as WhatsApp, email, or digital reporting applications. *"Mismatches in media choice may result in miscommunication and organizational frustration"* (Daft & Langel, 1986: 560).

**Table 4.2.1**  
**Analysis of Intergenerational Communication Styles and the Role of Technology as a Cultural Mediator**

Communication Aspect	Generation X/Boomer Lecturers (Digital Immigrants)	Generation Y/Z Staff (Digital Natives)	Potential Tensions	Technology as a Solution
Language Style	Formal, lengthy, cautious	Concise, symbolic, informal	Lecturers perceive staff as impolite;	Hybrid message templates:

Communication Aspect	Generation X/Boomer Lecturers (Digital Immigrants)	Generation Y/Z Staff (Digital Natives)	Potential Tensions	Technology as a Solution
Preferred Media	Face-to-face, formal letters, telephone	WhatsApp, email, Trello, Google Docs	staff view lecturers as rigid Lecturers feel undervalued ; staff find face-to-face meetings burdensome	polite yet efficient Integrated unified communication systems with cross-generational tutorials
Response Expectations	Detailed responses with explanations	Quick replies, often emojis or “okay”	Lecturers consider staff unserious	Joint education on digital etiquette and response expectations
Communication Structure	Hierarchical, one-way	Egalitarian, dialogic	Lecturers feel loss of authority; staff feel pressured	Design of digital workspaces supporting equal collaboration (e.g., Notion, Teams)
System Usage	Follows procedures linearly	Quick, improvisational navigation	Lecturers confused by system flow; staff frustrated by repeated explanations	Development of interactive SOPs and video tutorials by younger staff for senior lecturers

**Source: Author’s Data (July 2025)**

**Analytical Commentary: The Role of Technology as a Cultural Mediator  
Tensions as Manifestations of a Micro Cultural Gap**

Tensions in interactions between senior lecturers and younger staff transcend personal differences, reflecting a micro-level cultural gap within digital organizations. Communication styles are not neutral; they carry generational values, expectations, and identities.

### **Technology as a Bridge, Not Merely a Tool**

When thoughtfully applied, technology serves as a *cultural mediator* rather than a mere system. This is realized when:

- Digital systems are designed to be not only functional but also adaptive to intergenerational communication styles.
- Joint training sessions foster cross-generational awareness.
- Digital communication is recognized as a field for negotiating values rather than unidirectional instruction.

### **Positive Outcomes of Intergenerational Communication Reconciliation**

When mutual understanding in technology use is achieved:

- Lecturers no longer feel coerced into using the system but rather empowered by it.
- Younger staff feel valued for their technological contributions beyond mere execution roles.
- Collaboration becomes more dialogical and innovative.

## **4.2.2 Subsection 2: Power Relations in Organizational Communication and the Reversal of Competency Roles**

### **Core Discussion:**

The transformation of the Lecturer Workload Reporting system (BKD) into a digital platform not only alters administrative governance but also disrupts power relations within the organization. Senior lecturers (typically Generation X or Boomers), who have traditionally held symbolic and epistemic dominance within the institution, now find themselves dependent on younger staff/operators who possess greater mastery of digital systems. This condition produces an asymmetry of digital knowledge that impacts communication dynamics—manifesting as friction, a sense of lost control, and shifts in roles within the social structure of the organization.

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Foucault (1980) – Knowledge/Power**

Foucault posits that knowledge is not merely a cognitive tool but a form of power. Within organizations, those who control systems or technical knowledge wield functional power, even if they hold lower hierarchical status. *"Power and knowledge directly imply one another... there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge"* (Foucault, 1980: 27). In this context, younger staff exert tacit power over senior lecturers concerning digital reporting.

#### **Organizational Role Theory – Katz & Kahn (1978)**

Katz and Kahn argue that within organizations, individuals enact institutional roles with specific social expectations. When systemic changes occur (e.g., digitalization), role expectations are reconstructed accordingly.

*"Organizational roles are not fixed; they are constructed and reconstructed in response to structural and environmental changes"* (Katz & Kahn, 1978: 189). Such role transformations provoke identity tensions and communication challenges, as lecturers no longer remain the primary source of technical competence.

**Table 4.2.2**  
**Analysis of Power Relations and Competency Role Shifts in the Digital BKD System**

Dimension	Senior Lecturers (Gen X/Boomers)	Younger Staff (Gen Y/Z)	New Power Relations	Communication Impact
Technical Knowledge	Limited operational proficiency with digital BKD system	Mastery of reporting system and troubleshooting	Staff become gatekeepers of digital knowledge	Lecturer dependency leads to reversal of dependency
Formal Status	Higher hierarchical and symbolic status	Functional administrative roles	Mismatch between formal status and technical power	Emergence of feelings of threat and resistance
Role Perception	View themselves as academic leaders and supervisors	Previously considered technical implementers	Staff hold control over digital workflow	Lecturers experience professional identity crisis
Communication Direction	Top-down, one-way, formal	Egalitarian, responsive, technical	Communication shifts to horizontal or even bottom-up	Lecturers feel loss of communicative authority
System Ownership	Perceive system as imposed	Feel ownership and technical trust	Power shifts from seniority to competency	Potential for miscommunication if not transformed into collaboration

**Source:** Author's Data (July 2025).

**Scholarly Commentary and Critical Analysis**

◆ **Digitalization as a New Arena for the Reproduction of Power (Foucault)**

The digital BKD system indirectly creates a new power arena grounded in digital knowledge. Younger staff who master the system wield technical authority, influencing workflow rhythm, procedural compliance, and even lecturer performance evaluation. Lecturers' dependency on staff for data entry, validation, and interpretation shifts power relations: digital knowledge becomes a mechanism of control, supplanting traditional academic authority.

◆ **Role-Status Incongruence (Katz & Kahn, 1978)**

Systemic changes compel institutional role reconstruction, but not all actors adapt

synchronously. Senior lecturers, who internalize their role as thought leaders, feel “demoted” when relying on younger staff for technical tasks. Conversely, younger staff experience role inflation—they not only execute technical duties but also educate, validate, and make functional decisions that influence lecturer performance reporting.

♦ **Implications: Tension, Resistance, or Transformation?**

<b>Intervention Focus</b>	<b>Constructive Strategies</b>
Hierarchical Relations	Reposition younger staff as digital co-facilitators rather than mere technicians
Competency Enhancement	Digital training for lecturers utilizing peer mentoring or reverse mentoring approaches
Institutional Policy	Redefine job descriptions for lecturers and staff within digital systems emphasizing collaboration
Communication Ethics	Establish digital communication codes of ethics across roles to prevent status-role dissonance.

4.2.3. The Shift in the Meaning of Professionalism and Redefinition of Identity in the Digital Space

**Core Discussion**

Within the context of digital BKD (Beban Kerja Dosen) reporting, the notion of professionalism has undergone a significant transformation. It has shifted from a process-oriented, relational, and pedagogically grounded form of academic performance to one that is administrative, document-centric, and data-driven. This transformation redefines how lecturers and institutional actors construct professional legitimacy and negotiate their identities within institutional communication structures.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Giddens (1991)** – *The Reflexive Project of the Self*: Professional identity is no longer static or inherited but constantly renegotiated in relation to systems, structures, and evolving narratives in late modernity.

**Symbolic Interactionism (Blumer, 1969)** – Professionalism is not an objective status but emerges through interpretive processes in social interaction, including engagement with digital platforms that hold divergent symbolic meanings for different actors.

**Post-Bureaucratic Communication (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994)** – The shift from formal hierarchy to flexible, collaborative, and agile organizational communication necessitates a new mode of professionalism that is adaptive, dialogic, and digitally literate.

**Table 4.2.3.**

**Shifting Professionalism and Identity in the Digital System**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Traditional (Analog) Professionalism</b>	<b>Digital Professionalism (BKD System)</b>	<b>Impact on Identity &amp; Legitimacy</b>
<b>Basis of Legitimacy</b>	Face-to-face performance, direct engagement, dedication	Administrative accuracy, data integrity, digital compliance	Legitimacy shifts from enacted action to documented output

Dimension	Traditional (Analog) Professionalism	Digital Professionalism (BKD System)	Impact on Identity & Legitimacy
Professional Interaction	Formal, in-person, relational	Platform-based, asynchronous, impersonal	Identity is narrated through system-generated digital traces
Meaning of Work	Educator, mentor, relational facilitator	System operator, data curator, performance manager	Professionalism redefined as digital efficiency
Identity Narratives	Rooted in collegial reputation and peer acknowledgment	Constructed through system profiles, digital portfolios	Identity shaped by digital metrics and platform outputs
Communication & Networks	Bureaucratic, top-down, formal	Collaborative, multitasking, digitally agile	Professional value reflected in team-based digital communication

Source: Author's Field Data (July 2025)

### In-Depth Theoretical Analysis

◆ **Giddens (1991): Professionalism as a Reflexive Project**

In reflexive modernity, professional identity is no longer an inherited title but a conscious project of self-narration. Lecturers must actively engage with digital platforms, not only to comply administratively, but to construct and project their evolving academic identities. The digital BKD system thus becomes a space of narrative intervention, where identity is negotiated, redefined, and performed in real time.

◆ **Blumer (1969): The Interpretive Construction of Meaning in Digital Interactions**

Symbolic interactionism suggests that professional meaning emerges through shared interpretation. For lecturers, the BKD system may symbolize surveillance and control; for staff, it may represent efficiency and modernization. These diverging symbolisms influence how professionalism is perceived, performed, and legitimized across institutional roles.

◆ **Heckscher & Donnellon (1994): The Shift to Post-Bureaucratic Communication**

The digital environment encourages a move from rigid bureaucratic procedures to flexible, responsive, and collaborative professional communication. Professional legitimacy is no longer based solely on procedural compliance, but also on the ability to engage meaningfully in digital networks—through real-time responsiveness, reflexivity, and co-constructed digital narratives.

### Strategic and Academic Implications

Domain	Recommended Interventions
Institutional Policy	Develop digital professionalism indicators that value documentation, innovation, and reflective practices

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Recommended Interventions</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>	Facilitate reflexive identity workshops: mentoring, e-portfolio writing, digital storytelling
<b>Platform Design</b>	Incorporate reflective tools into BKD systems (e.g., comment sections, process logs, evidence uploads)
<b>Performance Evaluation</b>	Combine data-driven assessments with qualitative self-narratives as components of professional identity

**Source:** Author’s Field Data (July 2025)

#### 4.3.1. Digital Immigrant Lecturers Employ Symbolic Strategies to Sustain Academic Legitimacy in the Digital BKD Reporting System

##### **Core Discussion**

The transition of the *Beban Kerja Dosen* (BKD) reporting system into a fully digital format has generated an identity challenge for digital immigrant lecturers—predominantly from Generation X or the Baby Boomer cohort. These academics are compelled to translate a long-standing professional ethos—built upon symbolic recognition, scholarly reputation, and relational authority—into standardized digital formats, performance indicators, and technical documentation.

Rather than merely adapting technically, these lecturers employ **symbolic strategies** to retain their professional legitimacy. Such strategies serve as cultural acts of resistance, reframing the meaning of academic contribution within a system they perceive as reducing the essential, non-quantifiable aspects of their scholarly work.

##### **Theoretical Framework**

**Pierre Bourdieu (1990) – *The Logic of Practice***

The concepts of *habitus*, *symbolic capital*, and *field* explain how actors sustain their position within a changing academic field. Digital immigrant lecturers leverage existing cultural capital (e.g., scholarly reputation, print publications) as symbolic markers to remain relevant within the digitalized academic terrain.

**Erving Goffman (1959) – *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life***

Professional identity is a dramaturgical performance. In digital spaces, lecturers engage in “front stage” behavior (e.g., public forums, reflective reports) to reaffirm their academic role and deflect potential diminishment of their symbolic authority.

**Becher & Trowler (2001) – *Academic Tribes and Territories***

Academic disciplines differ in epistemological values and work cultures. For instance, scholars in the humanities often emphasize interpretive, reflective, and dialogical approaches—contrasting with the quantification logic embedded in administrative systems.

**Table 4.3.1**  
**Symbolic Strategies Employed by Digital Immigrant Lecturers in Navigating the Digital BKD System**

Type of Symbolic Strategy	Description	Social Function	Theoretical Basis
<b>Reactivation of Scholarly Legacy</b>	Emphasizing print publications, authorship, book and	Asserting historical value and long-term	Bourdieu – <i>Symbolic Capital</i>

Type of Symbolic Strategy	Description	Social Function	Theoretical Basis
	community involvement	scholarly contributions	
Reflective Narratives in Academic Forums	Voicing critique or reflections on digitalization in public scholarly settings	Building symbolic solidarity, resisting value subordination	Goffman – <i>Academic Dramaturgy</i>
Claiming Academic Autonomy	Rejecting rigid reporting metrics and standardized indicators	Upholding professionalism as an autonomous intellectual domain	Becher & Trowler – <i>Disciplinary Ethos</i>
Technical Delegation to Staff or Students	Avoiding direct system use while focusing on substantive academic tasks	Signaling the primacy of substance over technical compliance	Bourdieu – <i>Field Practice in New Conditions</i>
Staging Traditional Academic Identity	Reclaiming the identity of “public intellectual” or “scholar-thinker”	Reinforcing the role of academic as a cultural actor, not a data clerk	Goffman – <i>Identity Performativity</i>

Source: Author’s Field Data (July 2025)

### Analytical Insight

◆ **Digital Systems as a Symbolic Field**

The digital BKD platform functions not merely as a technical tool but as a symbolic field where legitimacy is redefined. For digital immigrant lecturers, the shift imposes a new currency of legitimacy—one grounded in data and system conformity rather than relational authority or scholarly legacy.

◆ **Symbolic Resistance as Cultural Adaptation**

Drawing from Bourdieu, these lecturers do not passively surrender to new power configurations. Instead, they engage in **symbolic resistance**—reinscribing their *symbolic capital* into strategic performances that preserve their identity within the transformed academic field.

◆ **Dramaturgical Assertion of Professional Identity**

Goffman’s dramaturgy highlights how digital immigrant lecturers curate specific academic “scenes” to perform professionalism. Through deliberate narrative acts—reflective seminars, public critiques—they maintain cultural legitimacy even when the formal system may marginalize their contributions.

◆ **Disciplinary Culture as a Lens for Resistance**

Becher & Trowler remind us that disciplinary identities are not fully translatable into administrative logic. Lecturers from interpretive traditions may perceive digital

quantification as epistemologically misaligned—prompting resistance not from incompetence, but from *value dissonance*.

### Conclusion

Digital immigrant lecturers are not merely passive recipients of technological change. Through symbolic strategies, they reassert their academic identity and navigate the structural constraints of digitalization with cultural intelligence. These strategies offer not only resistance, but also **alternative frameworks** of professional legitimacy within a system increasingly dominated by quantification and automation.

Scholarly Review and In-Depth Analysis

#### ◆ 1. **Habitus vs. the Digital Field (Bourdieu, 1990)**

Digital immigrant lecturers are actors whose *habitus* was formed within the traditional academic field, shaped by norms of analog scholarship, interpersonal authority, and symbolic recognition. As the structure of the field shifts through digitalization, a dissonance emerges between the ingrained dispositions and the new digital environment. In response, these lecturers deploy their accumulated **symbolic capital**—including scholarly recognition, seniority, and epistemic depth—as a means of sustaining their position within the transformed field.

“Symbols are not only instruments of recognition, but tools of defense in the struggle for position within the social structure.”  
(Bourdieu, 1990, *The Logic of Practice*)

#### ◆ 2. **Academic Identity as Dramaturgical Performance (Goffman, 1959)**

In the digital BKD reporting system, the traditional enactments of academic identity—such as face-to-face lecturing or scholarly forums—are increasingly displaced. In response, lecturers stage new forms of **academic dramaturgy**, such as reflective narratives in webinars, contributions to institutional discussions, or publishing opinion pieces, to reframe a professional identity that is “not quantifiable by the system.”

“What we present is not simply reality, but a reality constructed for a particular audience.”  
(Goffman, 1959, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*)

#### ◆ 3. **Symbolic Resistance Across Disciplinary Cultures (Becher & Trowler, 2001)**

Academics from disciplines with high cultural capital—such as philosophy, literature, or sociology—tend to resist administrative reporting more strongly than those in fields like engineering or economics. This resistance stems from differing epistemic values: in the humanities, professional merit is assessed by depth of meaning and critical reflection, not by quantifiable outputs.

“Academics are members of intellectual tribes, each with distinct rituals, languages, and systems of legitimacy.” (Becher & Trowler, 2001, *Academic Tribes and Territories*)

4.3.2. Forms of Informal and Cross-Generational Collaboration to Support Digital Immigrant Lecturers’ Adaptation to the Digital Reporting System

### Core Discussion

In navigating the complexities of the digital workload reporting system (*Beban Kerja Dosen*, BKD), digital immigrant lecturers—mostly from Generation X or baby boomer cohorts—who are accustomed to analog systems, engage in various forms of **informal, cross-generational collaboration** with younger staff, students, and digital native colleagues (Generations Y/Z). These collaborations are not merely technical assistance

mechanisms, but serve as **sites of social learning** and gradual **reconstruction of professional identity**.

This phenomenon aligns with the following theoretical foundations:

**Communities of Practice** (Wenger, 1998): Learning occurs through active social participation within communities.

**Informal Learning Theory** (Eraut, 2004): Competence is built not only through formal training but also through day-to-day work experiences.

**Organizational Knowledge as Social Practice** (Brown & Duguid, 2001): Knowledge is embedded in social context and collaborative practice, not simply stored in individuals.

**Table 4.3.2**

**Forms of Informal Cross-Generational Collaboration in Digital Adaptation of Senior Lecturers**

<b>Form of Collaboration</b>	<b>Main Actors</b>	<b>Description of Practice</b>	<b>Benefits for Senior Lecturers</b>	<b>Supporting Theories</b>
<b>Digital Shadowing</b>	Senior lecturer → junior staff/student	Lecturers observe and mimic younger peers' technical operations in BKD input	Enables low-pressure, experiential learning through direct observation	Wenger (1998); Eraut (2004)
<b>Reciprocal Mentoring</b>	Senior lecturer ↔ junior operator/staff	Mutual exchange: senior shares academic insights; junior provides technical guidance	Builds reciprocal respect and strengthens dual expertise	Brown & Duguid (2001); Wenger (1998)
<b>Tactical Networking</b>	Senior lecturer ↔ BKD operator	Establishing relational rapport to ease input and data validation processes	Facilitates adaptation through social negotiation rather than skill alone	Eraut (2004); Wenger (1998)
<b>Peer Digital Teaching</b>	Senior lecturer → other senior peers	After learning from younger peers, senior lecturers disseminate knowledge to colleagues	Increases confidence and fosters agency within the system	Wenger (1998)
<b>Digital Co-Presence</b>	Senior lecturer + junior staff	Lecturer is not isolated but works	Reduces pressure and fosters a sense	Brown & Duguid (2001)

Form of Collaboration	Main Actors	Description of Practice	Benefits for Senior Lecturers	Supporting Theories
		alongside junior staff during digital input	of shared ownership of the system	

Source: Author's Field Data (July 2025)

**Scholarly Narrative and Critical Analysis**

◆ **1. Collaboration as a Mechanism for Social Adaptation (Wenger, 1998)**

Wenger emphasizes that learning occurs not through isolated instruction, but through active engagement in social communities. On university campuses, **informal intergenerational networks** serve as powerful spaces for senior lecturers to develop not only technical skills but also **recalibrate their professional identity** within the digital regime—while maintaining the values of their academic traditions.

“Learning is not just acquiring information, but becoming a certain kind of person in a community of practice.”(Wenger, 1998: 215)

◆ **2. Informal Learning through Everyday Practice (Eraut, 2004)**

According to Eraut, informal learning is embedded in routine activities, interpersonal interactions, and unstructured collaboration. Mechanisms such as *digital shadowing* or *tactical networking* are not components of formal training, yet they have proven effective in cultivating **digital competencies among senior lecturers**.

“Much of workplace learning is informal, unstructured, and embedded in activities and relationships.”(Eraut, 2004)

◆ **3. Knowledge as a Social Practice (Brown & Duguid, 2001)**

Knowledge within organizations is not merely located in individuals or documents, but arises from **social practices**. When senior lecturers and younger staff work together, they integrate generational perspectives and co-construct new meanings of professionalism and digital systems as part of shared academic work.

“Organizations that ignore the social context of knowledge risk losing the richness of learning embedded in informal communities.”(Brown & Duguid, 2001).

**4.3.3. Redefining the Role of the 'Digital Academic': Strategies for Sustaining Professional Identity and Academic Integrity**

**Core Argument**

The redefinition of the lecturer's role as a *digital academic* is not merely a reactive adjustment to the administrative demands of digital BKD (Workload Reporting for Lecturers), but rather a strategic reintegration of a dynamic professional identity. This conceptual shift draws on Giddens' (1991) notion of identity as a reflexive project, continually reshaped within the context of modernity. By embracing this redefined role, digital immigrant lecturers not only endure digital transformation but assertively reaffirm their academic integrity and professional relevance in digital academic ecosystems.

**Table 4.3.3.**

**Dimensions of Role Redefinition: The Digital Academic**

<b>Dimension of Redefinition</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Impact on Professional Identity</b>	<b>Theoretical &amp; Empirical Support</b>
<b>Digital Reporting as a Marker of Professionalism</b>	Reframing digital BKD from a bureaucratic task into a tool of performance validation	Enhances professional legitimacy and transparent academic recognition	Giddens (1991); Selwyn (2016)
<b>Digital Presence as Academic Branding</b>	Actively managing online academic profiles (e.g., SINTA, Google Scholar, OJS)	Increases visibility and institutional/cross-disciplinary recognition	Castells (2009); Giddens (1991)
<b>Digital Integration in Pedagogy &amp; Development</b>	Utilizing LMS, DOIs, and digital content to improve access and teaching quality	Affirms the identity of an innovative and reflective educator	Selwyn (2016); Giddens (1991)
<b>Digital Agency and Reflexivity</b>	Exercising critical awareness and control in leveraging technology for academic purposes	Builds an adaptive and autonomous identity in the face of systemic change	Giddens (1991); Castells (2009)

**Source:** Author's Data (July 2025)

**In-Depth Academic Analysis**

◆ **1. Identity as a Reflexive Project in Late Modernity (Giddens, 1991)**

According to Giddens, identity in the context of reflexive modernity is not a static state, but a continuous project—shaped through personal narrative and contextual adaptation. Digital immigrant lecturers who successfully redefine themselves as digital academics engage in a reflective reconstruction of their identity, where digital transformation becomes part of their evolving professional trajectory:

*“Self-identity is a reflexive project continually reconstructed in the context of modernity’s demands”* (Giddens, 1991: 54).

◆ **2. Digital Presence as Power and Reputation in Network Society (Castells, 2009)**

Castells emphasizes that in a network society, digital communication platforms become arenas of influence and power. Lecturers who cultivate a digital presence through indexed publications, academic networking, and citation visibility are effectively enhancing their authority and legitimacy within both institutional and global academic communities:

*“Power in the network society derives from the capacity to communicate and influence through digital networks”* (Castells, 2009: 136).

◆ **3. Technology as a Vehicle for Educational Transformation (Selwyn, 2016)**

Selwyn argues that educational technologies are not neutral tools, but are embedded within power negotiations and cultural shifts in professional practice. The redefinition of the digital academic involves accepting technology not as an imposed system, but as an integral part of pedagogy and lifelong professional development:

*“Technology reshapes educational practices and challenges traditional professional roles”* (Selwyn, 2016: 98).

**Discussion**

**Negotiating Professional Identity in the Midst of Digital Cultural Migration**

The transformation of the BKD (Lecturer Workload Report) system into a digital format at Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak has triggered a complex negotiation of professional identity among digital immigrant lecturers. This process reflects not merely a technical adaptation but a deeper cultural and existential struggle over the meaning of academic professionalism in the digital regime.

In its initial stages, identity dissonance emerged from a clash between analog academic cultures—grounded in seniority, reflective depth, and symbolic authority—and the demands of a digital system that prioritizes speed, data-driven accountability, and technological literacy (Erikson, 1968; Mezirow, 1991). Resistance, in this context, is not inherently regressive; rather, it serves as a defensive mechanism in response to perceived threats to professional identity. Selective accommodation occurs through strategies such as delegation and symbolic rhetoric, aiming to preserve autonomy within the shifting landscape (Hall, 1996).

Over time, some lecturers have demonstrated signs of identity reconstruction, evidenced by a transition from passive users to active agents shaping the digital academic ecosystem. Within the framework of *reflexive identity* (Giddens, 1991), these lecturers are no longer merely complying with system demands—they are rewriting their professional narratives. Identity, viewed as discourse (Hall, 1996), is articulated through active engagement in digital academic spaces such as Open Journal Systems (OJS), Learning Management Systems (LMS), and online scholarly forums. Supported by digital agency and technological self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001), they not only adapt but also lead innovations, mentor across generations, and reclaim professional agency within a once-alien domain.

Thus, the negotiation of professional identity in the digital age is not a linear process, but a dynamic arena shaped by reflection, discourse, and agency. Dissonance should not be seen as dysfunction but rather as the starting point of transformation. Ultimately, successful adaptation is determined not by chronological age, but by reflective capacity and openness to change.

**Intercultural Communication Dynamics in the Context of Digital BKD Reporting**

The digital transformation of BKD reporting in higher education institutions has created a new communicative field—an intercultural space between digital immigrant lecturers (Gen X/Boomer) and institutional actors (Gen Y/Z administrative staff). Generational differences are manifested not only in contrasting technical preferences but also in deeper cultural dissonances related to communication styles, authority structures, and the interpretation of professionalism. Within Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions framework, this generational gap reflects differences in power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Senior lecturers typically adopt more formal and hierarchical communication styles, whereas

younger staff exhibit egalitarian and improvisational tendencies. These mismatches are exacerbated by the limitations of digital media (Daft & Lengel, 1986), turning technology into more than a tool—into a cultural mediator capable of negotiating intergenerational meaning. Moreover, the digital system reconfigures power relations within academic institutions. From a Foucauldian (1980) *knowledge/power* perspective, younger staff who possess digital literacy become strategic actors in defining the tempo and structure of academic labor. This shift produces functional asymmetries that conflict with formal institutional hierarchies (Katz & Kahn, 1978), often resulting in role identity crises among senior faculty members. Nevertheless, this tension can be mitigated through *co-facilitation* and *reverse mentoring* strategies, which not only strengthen intergenerational cohesion but also redistribute authority in a more collaborative and functional manner. At a more conceptual level, digitalization alters the meaning of academic professionalism—shifting from relational and reputational paradigms to a technocratic logic centered on quantifiable data. Drawing from Giddens' (1991) theory of the *reflexive self*, the professional identity of lecturers is now shaped not solely by lived experience and social relations but also through digital reporting that renders performance as a form of self-representation. BKD digital systems become sites of *symbolic interaction* (Blumer, 1969), where lecturers negotiate the meaning of work and professional legitimacy within a new narrative—one that is performative, systematic, and measurable. In this context, the ability to communicate digitally with reflexivity, collaboration, and precision becomes a key marker of academic professionalism within a *post-bureaucratic environment* (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994).

### **5.3. Communication Strategies and Adaptive Practices of Digital Immigrant Lecturers in Navigating the BKD Digital System**

The digital transformation of the BKD (Lecturer Workload Report) system has compelled digital immigrant lecturers (primarily Generation X and Baby Boomers) to not only acquire new technical competencies but also to reconstruct their professional identities and communication strategies within an increasingly technocratic institutional regime. These adaptive efforts are not merely technical in nature, but instead encompass symbolic, social, and reflective dimensions that renegotiate academic legitimacy in the face of systemic change.

#### **5.3.1 Symbolic Strategies: Silent Resistance to the Reduction of Academic Values**

*Senior lecturers often deploy symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990)—including* scholarly track records, historical reputations, and epistemic authority—as a form of tacit resistance to digital reporting systems that are perceived to reduce the complexity of academic work to mere quantifiable metrics. Through dramaturgical strategies (Goffman, 1959), these lecturers utilize digital spaces (e.g., webinars, opinion pieces, and reflective narratives) as alternative “stages” to reaffirm their professional identity. As Becher & Trowler (2001) argue, such resistance is often discipline-specific, particularly among scholars in the humanities who prioritize contextual meaning over administrative quantification.

“Symbolic power is the power to make people see and believe in a certain vision of the social world.” (Bourdieu, 1990: 135)

#### **5.3.2 Informal Cross-Generational Collaboration as an Adaptive Social Mechanism**

Rather than rejecting the system outright, many senior lecturers engage in informal collaborations with digitally native staff or students as a form of *learning-in-practice* (Wenger, 1998; Eraut, 2004). These interactions facilitate *reverse mentoring* and *reciprocal learning*, where technical skills are exchanged for academic values and institutional

wisdom. Brown and Duguid (2001) emphasize that adaptation and knowledge development within organizations arise from social practice rather than formal training structures.

“Knowing is inseparable from doing, and emerges from the context of social interaction.”  
(Brown & Duguid, 2001)

### **5.3.3 Identity Redefinition: The Lecturer as a Digital Academic**

In alignment with Giddens’ (1991) concept of the *reflexive self-project*, a growing number of lecturers are redefining themselves as *digital academics*, reframing the BKD system not as a bureaucratic burden but as a tool for validating their academic contributions. Through strategic management of their *digital presence* (Castells, 2009)—including platforms such as SINTA, Google Scholar, Open Journal Systems (OJS), and Learning Management Systems (LMS)—they consolidate academic authority within the network society. Selwyn (2016) contends that technology in education is far from neutral; it actively reshapes professional roles, credibility, and academic practice.

“*Self-identity is a reflexive project continually reconstructed in the context of modernity’s demands.*” (Giddens, 1991: 54)

#### **Strategic Implications**

Digital immigrant lecturers are not merely surviving within the digital BKD system; they are actively constructing adaptive strategies that reflect their social positioning and professional ethos. These symbolic, collaborative, and reflexive approaches reveal that academic identity is not a fixed entity, but a narrative under constant negotiation within the evolving landscape of digital higher education.

#### **Conclusion**

The digital transformation of the BKD (Lecturer Workload Report) system has not merely altered administrative procedures—it has profoundly disrupted power relations, professional identity constructions, and the broader meaning of academic labor. For lecturers, particularly those classified as digital immigrants, this shift has posed both identity pressures and opportunities for renegotiation through symbolic strategies, intergenerational collaboration, and the redefinition of their roles as digital academics.

This study affirms that technological adaptation within higher education institutions is a socio-cultural transition rather than a purely technical innovation.

The findings demonstrate that:

The adaptation process among lecturers unfolds across three stages: **identity dissonance, resistance or accommodation, and identity reconstruction.**

**Generational differences in communication styles, organizational power dynamics, and shifting interpretations of academic professionalism** significantly shape the effectiveness of digital interactions in the BKD reporting process.

Lecturers respond to these changes through **symbolic resistance, collaborative adaptation, and the rearticulation of their roles** as digital academics.

#### **Key Research Findings**

##### **Reversal of Dependency & Emergence of New Power Relations**

Younger staff and digital operators have become holders of tacit institutional power through their control of the digital infrastructure, effectively reversing the traditional top-down dependency structure

(Foucault, 1980; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

##### **Identity Tensions and Symbolic Strategies**

Senior lecturers maintain professional legitimacy by reactivating symbolic capital and

reframing their roles through reflective narratives and academic self-staging (Bourdieu, 1990; Goffman, 1959).

**Intergenerational Collaboration as a Mechanism of Social Adaptation**

Informal practices such as *digital shadowing*, *reciprocal mentoring*, and *co-presence* function as adaptive learning spaces and foster micro-communities of practice (Wenger, 1998; Eraut, 2004).

**Redefinition of Professionalism and the Digital Academic Identity**

Lecturers who successfully reconstruct their roles in digital spaces—through strategic reporting, digital academic branding, and pedagogical integration—demonstrate a high degree of *reflexive agency* (Giddens, 1991; Castells, 2009; Selwyn, 2016).

**Critical Incidents of Refusal: Cultural Resistance to Systemic Change**

Notably, three lecturers have explicitly refused to comply with the digital BKD reporting system—engaging in symbolic boycotts—and one has opted for early retirement from civil service. These critical incidents underline that digitalization is not merely a matter of technology implementation but constitutes a form of *cultural migration* requiring the reconstruction of values and working relationships within the academic ecosystem.

**References:**

- [1] Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>
- [2] Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.
- [3] Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Open University Press.
- [4] Belshaw, D. (2012). *The Essential Elements of Digital Literacies*.
- [5] Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Prentice-Hall.
- [6] Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The Social Life of Information*. Harvard Business School Press.
- [7] Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and Organization: A Social-Practice Perspective. *Organization Science*, 12(2), 198–213.
- [8] Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press.
- [9] Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554–571.
- [10] Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- [11] Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2).
- [12] Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- [13] Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford University Press.
- [14] Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Stanford University Press.
- [15] Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford University Press.
- [16] Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books.
- [17] Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1–17). SAGE Publications.

- [18] Heckscher, C., & Donnellon, A. (1994). *The Post-Bureaucratic Organization: New Perspectives on Organizational Change*. (disintesis konseptual).
- [19] Heckscher, C. & Donnellon, A. (1994). *The Post-Bureaucratic Organization*. Sage Publications.
- [20] Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. SAGE Publications.
- [21] Jenkins, H., et al. (2006). *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. MacArthur Foundation.
- [22] Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- [23] Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- [24] Illeris, K. (2014). *Transformative Learning and Identity*. Routledge.
- [25] Ogburn, W. F. (1922). *Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature*. B. W. Huebsch.
- [26] Illeris, K. (2014). *Transformative Learning and Identity*. Routledge.
- [27] Martin, A., & Grudziecki, J. (2006). DigEuLit: Concepts and Tools for Digital Literacy Development. *Innovation in Teaching and Learning in Information and Computer Sciences*.
- [28] Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial Practices: Exploring Technology at Work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435–1448.
- [29] Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
- [30] Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- [31] Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing Your World*. McGraw-Hill.
- [32] Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power*. Basic Books.