NEGOTIATION OF IDENTITY OF DIGITAL IMMIGRANT LECTURERS AT THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, TANJUNGPURA UNIVERSITY, PONTIANAK IN LECTURER WORKLOAD REPORTING (BKD): AN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PERSPECTIVE

JULIA MAGDALENA WUYSANG[1], IRA PATRIANI[2], MUKHLIS[3], SYARMIATI[4], RAHMAWATI[5]

[1,2,3,4]UNIVERSITAS TANJUNGPURA PONTIANAK, INDONESIA
[5]UNIVERSITAS UNSYIAH BANDA ACEH, INDONESIA
*Corresponding Author: Julia.magdalena@fisip.untan.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The world of higher education in Indonesia is experiencing a digital transformation that not only affects the learning process, but also administrative aspects such as reporting on lecturer performance or BKD. Initially, many lecturers still did it manually, now they have switched to an online system based on information technology. Digitalization encourages the efficiency of lecturer accountability but also creates new challenges, especially for lecturers who are in the digital immigrant generation. This study uses a qualitative approach with a phenomenological study method. This approach was chosen because it aims to deeply understand the subjective experiences of lecturers in negotiating their professional identities when dealing with a digital-based BKD reporting system and the dynamics of communication that occur across generations and work cultures. This study also places BKD reporting as an intercultural communication phenomenon, when differences in values, perceptions, and ways of working between generations (especially between lecturers *digital immigrants* and digital systems designed by *digital natives*) influences the process of adaptation and professional relations through the theory of Hall, Gudykunst, Ting Toomey, Rogers & Prensky. This paper identifies the following facts: 1. The process of negotiating the identity of digital immigrant lecturers facing digital BKD reporting occurs in three transformative phases: the identity dissonance phase, the resistance or accommodation phase, and the reconstruction phase. 2. Intercultural communication factors which influence the existence of differences in communication context, natural generation gaps, negotiation of face and social status & humanistic values & self-actualization. 3. The reconstruction of lecturers' professional identities in digital BKD reporting is reflected through adaptation strategies that combine traditional academic values. with the demands of a digital work culture. This process takes place through three key strategies: 1. Translation of academic contributions into digital format. 2. Self-reflection and alignment of personal values with the system. 3. Strategically negotiating social identities in digital spaces especially increasing digital literacy and cross-generational collaboration. The important findings of this article are: there are several lecturers who refuse to participate in carrying out BKD reporting until now, then there is 1 person who chooses and asks for early retirement as a lecturer.

Keyword: Lecturer identity negotiation, BKD, intercultural communication

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation in the world of higher education not only affects the learning process, but also administrative aspects such as reporting on lecturer performance or Lecturer Workload (BKD). The BKD reporting system, which was initially done manually, has now switched to an online system based on information technology. This digitalization brings efficiency and accountability, but also creates new challenges, especially for lecturers who are classified as the digital immigrant generation.

Specifically, Marc Prensky (2001) refers to digital immigrants as individuals who were born before the digital era and did not grow up with technology, so they have to adapt to a digital world that is foreign to them. In the context of BKD reporting, senior lecturers often experience technological gaps, anxiety, and even resistance to reporting systems that rely on digital logic and structure. It is not surprising that Marc Prensky (2001) stated: Digital immigrants experience inequality in adopting systems created by digital natives.

The existence of this generational difference is key in understanding how lecturers who fall into the category of digital immigrants manage their roles in the academic world. They must learn new languages and norms in communicating with increasingly complex digital systems, while maintaining the academic traditions that have become the hallmark of higher education in Indonesia.

This phenomenon is not just a technical problem, but is part of the negotiation of professional identity in facing a changing work culture. Lecturers are not only required to learn technology, but also have to adjust their professional identity as academics in the digital work ecosystem.

In the perspective of intercultural communication, this adjustment process can be seen as a form of interaction between two different cultures: conventional work culture (analog/manual) and digital work culture (automatic/system-structured). Therefore, the intercultural communication approach in understanding the challenges faced by lecturers as a digital generation of immigrants is very relevant, as stated by Hall, E. T. (1976; Rogers, E. M. (2003); Mansell, R. (2002:23-30; (Lievrouw, L. A., Livingstone, S. (2006) & Prensky (2001). Stella Ting Toomey (2006).

Based on the above explanation, the main questions in this article are: 1. How is the identity negotiation process carried out by lecturers as digital immigrants in facing the digital BKD reporting system, viewed from the perspective of intercultural communication? 2. What intercultural communication factors influence the interaction between lecturers and other actors (staff, systems, institutions) in the BKD reporting process? 3. How is the reconstruction of lecturers' professional identities reflected through adaptation strategies to digital work culture in BKD reporting?

LIBRARY STUDY

Identity Negotiation

Stella Ting-Toomey (2005) through *Identity Negotiation Theory,* states that identity is not something static, but is continuously negotiated through social interaction. The process of identity negotiation involves the need for recognition (*acceptance*), clarity (*predictability*), and the effectiveness of interactions in changing contexts. In the digital workplace, lecturers face dissonance between their old professional identities and the demands of new digital identities. Even Ting-Toomey (2005) stated that**: Identity is the result of negotiation between the individual and the social context; resistance and adaptation are a natural part of intercultural interaction.

The identity of lecturers as owners of intellectual authority now intersects with the reality that they need to be efficient, fast, and objective users of digital administrative systems. This change in role often gives rise to resistance, anxiety, and even distrust of the system. Referring to the theory of Stella Ting-Toomey (Identity Negotiation Theory), identity is a "self-image" that is continuously negotiated through social interaction. In this case, the lecturer is negotiating his professional self-image:

- From expert teacher → to digital system user who must continue learning
- From academic authorities → become administrative reporters subject to algorithms and systems

Intercultural Communication

As for William B. Gudykunst (2003), intercultural communication involves interactions between individuals from different cultural backgrounds, including values, norms, perceptions, and symbol systems. Although usually associated with ethnic or national differences, contemporary approaches extend this concept to differences between generations and work cultures, including between analog and digital generations.

Differences in perspectives on technology between senior lecturers (digital immigrants) and staff or digital systems (representation of digital natives) often lead to communication breakdowns, misinterpretations, or psychological tensions. This is where an intercultural communication approach is needed to bridge the gap.
In BKD reporting, communication occurs between:

1. Senior lecturer vs young admin staff
2. Lecturer vs digital application system (based on digital natives logic)
3. Manual work culture vs data and system-based work culture
4. Digital Culture as 'Other Culture'

In the intercultural communication approach, digital culture can be considered as "another culture" because it has different value systems, symbols, ways of communicating, and meaning structures from manual work culture. For example:

- The value of automatic efficiency vs. human reflective processes
- Visual/symbolic interface language vs traditional administrative text
- Systemic interaction vs personal interaction

For digital immigrant lecturers, adopting BKD reporting technology means interacting with a foreign culture. in a cultural and communicative sense. This gives rise to a complex process of identity negotiation: they must maintain their professional dignity while learning to navigate a system they did not design.

Digital Work Culture as an Intercultural Environment

Edward T. Hall (1976) stated that culture is a communication system, both visible and invisible. In the context of digitalization of BKD reporting, digital systems, interfaces, symbols, and ways of working reflect *high context culture* new, to which individuals must adapt cognitively and symbolically.

BKD reporting is no longer just about data input, but also about the ability to understand *"system language"*, database logic patterns, and algorithmic work rhythms. This demands a transformation of the lecturer's identity from merely "teacher and researcher" to "active user in a data-based performance management system".

Digital Culture as Organizational Innovation

The transformation of BKD reporting from manual to digital is a form of organizational technological innovation that has an impact on work systems, ways of thinking, and the structure of professional relations in the campus environment. This innovation not only has an impact on technical aspects, but also deeply influences the work culture of lecturers. Everett Rogers in his theory *Diffusion of Innovations* (2003) explains that technological innovation spreads in society through five categories of adoption:

1. **Innovators**– quick to adopt technology, often from young people or technical staff.
2. **Early Adopters** – highly educated, open to change.
3. **Early Majority**– following after seeing the success of the previous group.
4. **Late Majority**– tend to be skeptical, only use it when the system becomes standard.
5. **Laggards**– slowest to accept, tends to stick to tradition.

Many senior lecturers (digital immigrants) are in the late majority or laggards category, not because of low intellectual abilities, but because of the mismatch between their professional identity and the demands of digital work culture. the new one.

Barriers to Innovation Adoption and Intercultural Dimensions

Rogers (2003) stated that there are five factors that influence the speed of innovation adoption as shown in the following table:

Table 1 Factors & Relevance in BKD Reporting

Factor	Relevance to BKD Reporting
Relative Advantage	Lecturers do not always see immediate benefits from digital systems.
Compatibility	Systems often do not fit with old working habits.
Complexity	Many lecturers find the system interface and flow confusing.
Trialability	Lack of simulation or experience-based training.
Observability	It is difficult to observe the benefits of the system without assistance.

Source: Author Data (June 2025).

The five factors above can cause intercultural communication tensions between:
- Lecturer vs system developer (different technological backgrounds & perceptions)
- Senior lecturer vs young lecturer/operator (different generations and communication styles)

Lecturers and Professional Identity

Lecturers in Indonesia often form their professional identity through:
- Academic expertise
- Hierarchical social relations
- Classic manual or administrative work tradition
- Use of printed documents as proof of work

However, digital reporting systems (such as online BKD) demand a redefinition of the role of lecturers as:
- Technologically skilled subjects
- Digital system-based independent reporting
- Part of the institutional data architecture
- Agents in a platform-based work ecosystem

As for Marc Prensky is an important figure in the study of education and technology who first introduced the term "digital natives" and "digital immigrants" in his famous article entitled "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants" (2001). Then Prensky divides the digital generation into 2 poles, namely digital natives and digital immigrants. As for generation: Digital natives are a generation that since birth have lived amid digital technology such as computers, internet, smartphones, and social media.

1. The characteristics of the Native digital generation are stated by Prensky (2001):

- Accustomed to fast and instant information.
- Learn through images, videos, and interactivity, not just text.
- Multitasking: able to do several digital things at once.
- Have a preference for games, simulations, and experience-based activities.
- Non-linear thinking style: moving between information quickly.
  Example: The generation born after the early 1990s or mid-1990s, who have interacted with the internet and mobile devices since childhood.

2. Digital Immigrants

Digital immigrants are the generation that was born before the digital era and only started to know technology when they were adults. They did not grow up in a digital environment, but had to learn and adapt to technology.

Characteristics of the digital immigrant generation based on Prensky's opinion (2001) are as follows:

- Adopting technology differently and more slowly.
- Tends to maintain an analog mindset.
- More comfortable with face-to-face or printed communication.
- Does not always understand the logic of digital systems (e.g. application interfaces).
- Often "translating" digital experiences into legacy frameworks.
  Example: Senior lecturers or professionals who started their careers before the 1990s.

Through a combination of intercultural communication theory (Ting-Toomey, 2005; Gudykunst, 2003) and diffusion of innovation (Rogers, 2003), it can be understood that resistance, awkwardness, or even conflict in digital BKD reporting cannot be seen solely as individual weaknesses. Instead, it reflects socio-cultural tensions that arise due to differences in perception, values, and identities between groups of system users—between generations, roles, and understandings of work culture.

In this framework, the main challenge in digital reporting is not the technology alone, but the process of intercultural communication and the negotiation of bridged identities. BKD reporting is the meeting point between *actors with old work culture* and *digital structure with new work culture*. Therefore, the technical approach must be complemented by a more empathetic and transformative intercultural approach.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach with a phenomenological study method, which aims to deeply understand the subjective experiences of lecturers in negotiating their professional identities when dealing with a digital-based BKD reporting system. This approach was chosen to explore the dynamics of intercultural communication that occurs between digital immigrant generation lecturers (aged 45 years and above) and the reporting system designed by digital natives, as well as how differences in values, perceptions, and ways of working affect adaptation and professional relationships in the higher education environment.

This research was conducted at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP) of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak, which has implemented an online-based BKD reporting system for three years. The subjects of the study were permanent lecturers with functional status, ranging from Lecturers to Professors, who came from the digital immigrant generation, aged 45 years and over, and had direct experience in digital BKD reporting. They must also have faced challenges or experienced a process of adaptation and conflict in the reporting. The object of this study is the behavior of digital immigrant generation lecturers involved in digital-based BKD reporting and their interactions with the system and related parties.

Data were collected through three main techniques. First, in-depth interviews (semi-structured) aimed at exploring personal narratives, perceptions, emotions, and strategies used by lecturers in dealing with the digital reporting system. Second, limited participant observation to observe lecturers' interactions when accessing or filling out the BKD system, as well as communication that occurs between lecturers and operators, admins, or colleagues. Third, analysis of communication records, such as emails or academic WhatsApp groups, related to BKD reporting.

Data analysis was conducted using a thematic analysis approach. The first stage is the verbatim transcription of interview data to ensure the accuracy of the information. Next, open coding was carried out to find the main patterns and themes of the collected data. From the results of the coding, thematic categories such as symbolic resistance, identity adaptation, intergenerational communication, digital anxiety, and work culture symbols will be further analyzed. The data that has been grouped and analyzed will be interpreted using intercultural communication theory (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey), innovation diffusion theory (Everett Rogers), and the concept of digital generation (Marc Prensky).

To ensure the validity of the data, this study used four strategies. Credibility was maintained through triangulation of data sources, namely interviews, observations, and relevant documents. Transferability was ensured by providing an in-depth contextual description of the institutional background. Dependability was

ensured through an audit trail, which revealed the data collection and analysis process transparently and consistently. Finally, confirmability was achieved through the researcher's self-reflection on their biases and social positions, ensuring that the interpretation of the data remained objective and unaffected by the researcher's personal views.

With this methodology, it is hoped that the research can provide an in-depth picture of the dynamics of communication in BKD reporting and the challenges faced by digital immigrant generation lecturers in adapting to digital technology.

RESULTS

Lecturers as digital immigrants, experience an identity adaptation process in three interconnected phases. The first phase is identity dissonance, where lecturers feel that their academic identity is disrupted by the demands of the digital BKD system. Several things that become feelings of discomfort are: (1) scientific autonomy which should be a priority is now replaced by numerical bureaucracy; (2) qualitative reflection which is considered important in the academic world is not accommodated in the reporting system; and (3) the intellectual pride of lecturers which has been part of their identity, is now forced to give in to the logic of compliance with the system.

The second phase is resistance or accommodation, which reflects the existence of two patterns of interaction formed between lecturers and staff and the system. First, the hierarchical-resistive pattern, where the seniority of lecturers creates a distance of communication and reluctance to accept change. Second, the collaborative-participatory pattern, which is created when horizontal relations between lecturers and other actors open up space for joint learning, sharing knowledge, and minimizing barriers to communication between generations.

The third phase is identity reconstruction, where lecturers begin to develop three adaptive strategies to adjust to the changes. The first strategy is symbolic-defensive, where lecturers maintain their traditional identity while trying to avoid the system that is perceived as threatening. Second, collaborative-intergenerational, where senior lecturers begin to share knowledge and learn from the younger generation about the use of technology. Finally, the role redefinition strategy, where lecturers realize the need to become professionals who not only master scientific knowledge, but can also operate digital technology effectively.

Intercultural Communication and Its Challenges

Intercultural communication factors play an important role in influencing the interaction between lecturers and other actors (such as staff, systems, and institutions) in the BKD reporting process. In this regard, there are major challenges for lecturers from the digital immigrant generation who are faced with a digital-based reporting system. In particular, intercultural communication between lecturers who have limited technological backgrounds and systems designed by the digital native generation creates inconsistencies in the way they communicate and work.

At the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP) of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak, there are 109 lecturers involved in the digital-based Lecturer Workload (BKD) reporting process. Most of them are digital immigrants, who face major challenges in adapting to the technology used for the reporting. Tanjungpura University, which is the oldest campus in West Kalimantan Province and was established in 1959, has lecturers who have mostly served for a long time, with varying levels of experience related to technology. However, the adoption of new technology in BKD reporting presents obstacles for some lecturers who are not yet accustomed to using digital technology in their academic work.

Table 1 Data on Lecturers at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Untan Pontianak Based on Age in 2025

No	Age	Amount
1	65 - 50 Years	20 People
2	59 - 55 Years	26 People
3	54 - 50 Years	13 People
4	49 – 45 Years	10 People
5	44 – 35 Years	11 People

6	34 – 24 Years	29 People
7	24 - 20 Years	1 Person
Total		**110 People**

Source: Processed by the Author, 2025

From the table above, it appears that most of the lecturers at FISIP Untan were born in the 1980s and they lived in a manual era when playing and living with manual technology, still simple, especially when they first worked, there was no internet technology, smartphones and laptops as work aids as lecturers. In general, these 109 lecturers are a generation of digital immigrants (MarcPrensky, 2001) who experience a digital technology gap. As a group that grew up outside the digital era, they face technical and cultural barriers that not only affect their ability to use technology, but also the way they understand and carry out their academic tasks. At this moment, the writing of the negotiation of the face of FISIP Untan Pontianak Lecturers in the BKD report is present to deeply understand the world of higher education has experienced a technological revolution and intercultural communication clashes in the digital era.

Table 2 Data on Staff of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Untan Pontianak Based on Age in 2025

No	Age	Amount
1	59 - 55 Years	5 People
2	54 - 50 Years	9 People
3	49 - 45 Years	7 People
4	44 – 35 Years	5 People
Total		**26 People**

Source: Processed by the Author, June 2025

Based on table 2 above, it turns out that the administrative staff of FISIP Untan Pontianak are mostly in the same era as the digital immigrant lecturers, but what distinguishes them from the teaching staff is that they regularly receive public service training at the Faculty and university levels so that work related to digital technology, administrative staff do not experience a technological gap. The facts also show that the interaction between senior lecturers and administrative staff tends to be able to share information on BKD reporting, Siremun and all digital work.

Cultural Meeting

Digital BKD reporting is not only a matter of information systems, but also an arena of intercultural communication that involves meetings between various cultures that interact and clash. There are four main cultural dimensions involved in this process: generational culture, which includes the differences between more traditional senior lecturers and younger lecturers who are more open to technology; professional culture, which distinguishes between scientists who prioritize academic processes and bureaucrats who focus more on efficiency and numbers; technological culture, which shows the differences between analog technology still used by some lecturers and digital technology that is now mandatory in the BKD reporting system; and institutional culture, which consists of the differences between a more hierarchical top-down system and a more participatory system in decision-making. This digital BKD reporting becomes more complex because it involves cross-cultural interactions between digital immigrant generation lecturers, staff, systems, and institutional policies, each of which is rooted in different values.

Several intercultural factors that influence interactions in digital BKD reporting are differences in values, language and communication style, power distance, and the system as a cultural actor. First, differences in values upheld by lecturers who value hierarchy and process more than young staff who emphasize efficiency and results. Second, differences in language and communication style, where lecturers tend to use high-context communication that prioritizes relationships and context, while young staff use low-context communication that is direct and efficient. Third, high power distance between lecturers and staff, where lecturers are reluctant to humble themselves in interactions with staff, while staff hesitate to provide direct corrections to lecturers. Fourth,

the digital BKD system as a cultural actor that brings new values such as efficiency, standardization, and objectivity, which often clash with academic values that prioritize deep reflection and process. Finally, top-down organizational communication, where instructions are given without sufficient dialogue or feedback, causes latent resistance among lecturers.

In the context of the relationship between lecturers and staff, Face Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey) explains that the relationship is formed by a strong academic hierarchy, where lecturers maintain their self-face or authority as academics, while staff tend to use mutual-face to maintain good relationships. Staff often use indirect communication to avoid hurting the lecturer's authority, because they highly value the lecturer's honor. The value of honor upheld by lecturers makes them very sensitive to technical corrections, which often triggers symbolic resistance or rejection of criticism that is felt to undermine their academic self-esteem.

In facing these challenges, lecturers began to form a new identity as digital academics through several adaptive strategies. First, the strategy of reflecting on academic values, where lecturers try to maintain the scientific substance in their work, but must reformulate it to suit the digital format. Second, the strategy of traditional-digital coexistence, where lecturers combine traditional academic practices with digital tools through intergenerational collaboration, allowing them to maintain academic values while learning to adapt to new technologies. Third, the strategy of self-repositioning, where lecturers build an image as adaptive and digitally literate academics, who are able to keep up with the demands of technology without sacrificing their academic quality.

Along with this process, academic professionalism is now interpreted in a broader way, which includes technical-administrative skills in operating digital systems for BKD reporting, readiness to undergo digital-based evaluations, and openness to transformations in the way of working. Some lecturers see this as a positive transition that increases the efficiency and quality of their work, while others feel that their intellectuality is reduced by the logic of numbers and systems that prioritize efficiency over deeper academic values.

Digital BKD reporting is not just a system change, but academic culture shift. Lecturers as cross-generational actors face negotiations of identity, values, and communication methods. Reformulation of professional identity occurs through symbolic, collaborative and adaptive strategies, with a new meaning of professionalism that is more flexible, digital and intercultural.

DISCUSSION

The identity negotiation process carried out by lecturers as digital immigrants in dealing with digital BKD reporting can be analyzed through an intercultural communication perspective. Edward T. Hall (1976) in the framework of intercultural communication emphasized that cultural differences are not only related to countries or ethnicities, but also to value systems and thinking styles. In this context, digital immigrant lecturers and the digital BKD reporting system represent two different "work cultures": analog culture, which is slow, reflective, narrative and experience-based, and digital culture, which is fast, systematic, standardized, and quantitative. This encounter creates cultural friction, which triggers identity negotiation, because lecturers are not only dealing with technology, but also with new ways of life and thinking.

Based on the Anxiety/Uncertainty Management theory (Gudykunst, 1998), in intercultural communication, there are two main things that must be managed: anxiety, which is a feeling of insecurity due to ignorance, and uncertainty, which arises due to a lack of prediction about the actions of others. In the context of BKD reporting, lecturers experience anxiety when entering a system they do not understand, while uncertainty arises because their role as "academic authorities" becomes irrelevant in the digital space. As a result, lecturers often choose passive resistance, such as postponing or handing over tasks to staff, or forming a defensive identity strategy to maintain academic self-esteem. However, lecturers who are able to manage this anxiety and uncertainty well will adapt through open communication and cross-generational learning.

Furthermore, in the Face Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey, 2005), it is explained that in intercultural interactions, individuals will always try to maintain their "face" or social self-esteem. In this study, the "face" of lecturers as senior intellectuals felt threatened when they had to rely on younger systems or technical staff. This caused them to feel uncomfortable asking for help, tend to reject training led by younger staff, and feel that their identity as "established academics" was weakened. However, some lecturers negotiated face adaptively, by sharing academic expertise while learning technical skills from staff, thus creating a healthy symbiotic relationship.

The concept of Digital Immigrant vs. Digital Native (Marc Prensky, 2001) distinguishes two generations in the context of BKD reporting. Digital Natives are those who were born and raised in a digital environment, while Digital Immigrants move into the digital world and bring an "analog accent" from their more traditional ways of working. Senior lecturers fall into the category of digital immigrants, who face three main challenges: first, unfamiliar digital language, such as system terms and quantitative reporting logic; second, new norms and values, such as efficiency, speed, and objectification of results; and third, intergenerational communication gaps,

namely gaps in understanding and interaction. Identity negotiation occurs when lecturers begin to adopt some digital norms without losing their long-held academic values, which is a form of hybridization of professional identity—not fully "digital," but also not rejecting change.

Changes in professional values occur in intercultural encounters in digital workspaces. Edward T. Hall (1976) stated that culture consists of a system of symbols, meanings, and habits that work subconsciously. Lecturers as digital immigrants are shaped by an analog academic culture that prioritizes deep reflection, narrative and discursive processes, and the value of scientific autonomy, not compliance with the system. When the digital BKD reporting system is implemented, there is a clash of work cultures between these academic values and the administrative digital culture that standardizes academic performance, prioritizes quantitative reporting, and demands procedural compliance. As a result, lecturers feel that their professional values are "shifted" or even "reduced," and some interpret this as a professional identity crisis.

In terms of identity tension and anxiety management, William Gudykunst (1998) explains that individuals experience anxiety about the possibility of losing their "self-image" and uncertainty due to not being able to read new contexts. In this study, lecturers experienced anxiety because their identity as "scientific authorities" became irrelevant in the digital system, and they had to do symbolically unfamiliar work, such as inputting data and complying with system indicators. However, lecturers who were able to manage this anxiety began to build new meanings that digital skills were also part of new professionalism, not a threat to their authority.

According to Diffusion of Innovations (Everett Rogers, 2003), innovation adoption is not only about technology, but also about social meaning and identity formed through the communication process. Lecturers who are included in the late majority or laggards category tend to reject innovation because they feel that old values are more stable. However, when innovation is successfully understood as an increase in socio-professional status, lecturers begin to adopt it. In the context of BKD, some lecturers begin to see digital reporting not as a means of control, but as a symbol of contemporary legitimacy and professionalism.

Marc Prensky (2001) introduced the term digital immigrant, which is an individual who moves into the digital world but brings an old cultural "accent." This "accent" is seen in the way lecturers complain that the system is not narrative, too rigid, or "dehumanizing." They interpret the shift in values as a loss of personal and intellectual meaning in academic work. However, some lecturers have begun to hybridize their identities by not abandoning old academic values, but adapting them to new formats.

Lecturers as digital immigrants, experience professional value dissonance when digital BKD reporting begins to be implemented. They feel that their autonomy is disrupted because their work is now measured by the system, the meaning of work has changed from intellectual to administrative, and their identity has been shaken because old academic excellence is not always relevant in the new system. However, this identity negotiation process is not static. With anxiety management (Gudykunst), reinterpretation of meaning (Rogers), and hybridization of digital identity (Prensky), lecturers begin to reconstruct the meaning of their professionalism as academics who are adaptive to the digital world.

Edward T. Hall, in his theory of cultural context, distinguishes between high-context and low-context cultures in communication. In high-context cultures, information is conveyed implicitly and relies heavily on social relationships, shared experiences, and non-verbal communication, which is common in many Asian cultures. In contrast, low-context cultures emphasize explicit, direct, and data-based communication, as in Western cultures. In the context of BKD reporting in Indonesia, which tends to rely on a high-context communication culture, lecturers often rely on personal relationships and informal communication in delivering their reports. However, the digital-based BKD reporting system, which is standardized and systematic, tends to be more low-context, demanding clear, explicit, and data-based communication. This creates communication challenges, as lecturers from high-context cultures must adapt to a more procedural and standardized reporting system. Miscommunication can occur, especially when younger staff who are more accustomed to low-context communication deliver corrections or instructions directly, which can be considered impolite by senior lecturers who are accustomed to a more personal communication style.

Carl Rogers emphasized the importance of empathy, unconditional acceptance, and genuineness in interpersonal relationships. In the context of BKD reporting, communication between lecturers and staff or institutions must be built on empathy, with respect for each party's experience. Many lecturers feel frustrated or stressed due to the mismatch between system expectations and the reality of their academic work. The main challenges that arise are the lack of empathy from institutions for the real obstacles faced by lecturers, as well as communication that is more one-way, top-down, without space for dialogue that builds mutual understanding.

Stella Ting-Toomey, in her Face Negotiation Theory, emphasizes the importance of maintaining "face" or self-esteem in intercultural communication. In the context of BKD reporting, lecturers are very protective of their professionalism and academic identity. When a standardized BKD reporting system is perceived as underestimating or even valuing their contributions, this threatens their "face." Senior lecturers who are accustomed to a more reflective and narrative way of academic work may feel threatened if they have to rely on a more mechanistic and quantitative system. This process creates emotional tension, which is sometimes

unspoken, but can reduce motivation and worsen working relationships. In this case, face-restoration (maintaining one's own dignity) and face-giving (maintaining the dignity of others) become very relevant in the interaction between lecturers and staff in BKD reporting.

In terms of cross-generational communication, there are significant differences in communication styles between senior lecturers and junior staff in BKD reporting. Senior lecturers, who are accustomed to high-context communication, rely on experience and intuition in communicating and prefer to use personal or informal communication. Meanwhile, junior staff who are accustomed to low-context communication prioritize explicit, efficient, and data-based communication and prefer to use written communication channels such as WhatsApp or email. This mismatch in communication styles can lead to misunderstandings, where junior staff may deliver corrections directly and technically, which is considered impolite by senior lecturers who prioritize relationships and social context. Conversely, senior lecturers can feel unappreciated if the staff's communication style is too rigid and technical, without sufficient relational opening.

BKD digital systems, such as SISTER or BKD Online, act as cultural actors in shaping new, lower-context communication norms, where information is delivered explicitly, standardized, and based on data. These systems do not provide space for social context or personal considerations, which are usually found in the high-context culture implemented by lecturers. This creates a symbolic distance, namely a gap in meaning, value, and how to communicate between lecturers, staff, and the system. Senior lecturers who are accustomed to relationship-based and narrative communication feel they have lost the meaning of relationships and relational recognition in the reporting process. Systems that do not "read" the dedication, struggle, or complexity of the lecturer's role, which are usually delivered contextually or informally, result in feelings of alienation and unappreciation.

Based on the perspective of Face Negotiation Theory by Ting-Toomey, the BKD digital system can be considered as a neutral actor that threatens the lecturer's face. This system does not have the capacity for empathy or social awareness of the lecturer's symbolic values, such as their integrity, dedication, and professional identity. When the system rejects reports or provides rigid validation, lecturers feel their face is hurt, their dedication is not recognized, and they feel alienated from the collective narrative of the institution. This creates a symbolic distance, where lecturers feel like "form fillers" rather than part of the wider academic culture.

The BKD digital system acts as a low-context cultural actor, which creates major challenges in maintaining lecturers' face and maintaining existing relational relationships. This system forms more objective, procedural, and impersonal communication norms, which have the potential to create symbolic distance, especially for lecturers whose work values are not fully reflected in the logic of the system. To overcome this challenge, communication that is more sensitive to the diversity of lecturers' professional identities and appreciation for their academic contributions is needed.

Lecturer Workload Reporting (BKD) is not only an administrative process, but also a social interaction space that involves various roles, especially between lecturers as owners of academic authority and implementing staff who hold system authority and technical procedures. In this interaction, tensions arise due to differences in hierarchical position, communication style, and symbolic interests, which affect the negotiation of "face" (social self-esteem) between lecturers and staff. Lecturers, as parties with academic authority, often feel their self-esteem is threatened when communication with implementing staff is too technical and does not care about the academic values upheld in their academic culture.

Ting-Toomey, in Face Negotiation Theory, emphasizes the importance of maintaining self-esteem or "face" in intercultural communication, especially in the context of hierarchical relationships. In academic culture, senior lecturers, who have high symbolic values such as experience, reputation, and scientific contributions, are very protective of their self-face. When the implementing staff corrects the BKD report with a technical and procedural communication style, without a relational approach that respects the lecturer's social position, the lecturer's face can feel threatened. For example, a correction given directly such as, "Sorry, your report is invalid because it does not match the system format," can be considered an insult to the lecturer's professional authority, especially senior lecturers who are very protective of their dignity and authority in the academic environment.

According to Edward T. Hall, the communication culture in Indonesia, especially in the academic world, tends to be high-context, which relies on communication that is more implicit, relational, and based on shared experiences. Senior lecturers, who are accustomed to a high-context culture, prefer communication that is full of meaning and respect. Meanwhile, implementing staff, especially those from the younger generation or digital natives, more often use low-context communication, which is explicit, direct, and data-based. This mismatch in communication style often causes tension, for example, when staff convey information in a way that is too technical and without regard for social relationships. Senior lecturers who are accustomed to softer, more meaningful, relational communication can feel unappreciated when staff convey corrections in a way that is too formal and systematic.

The tension that arises between lecturers and implementing staff in BKD reporting often stems from face threats that occur due to differences in communication methods. Ting-Toomey identifies several types of face, namely self-face (self-esteem), other-face (self-esteem of others), and mutual-face (shared self-esteem). In

interactions between lecturers and staff, senior lecturers try to maintain their self-face, namely their academic reputation and dignity. If the BKD or staff reporting system does not respect the lecturer's face, such as by providing criticism that is too direct or technical, then the lecturer's self-face can feel threatened, and interpersonal tensions arise.

The digital BKD reporting system acts as a low-context cultural actor, demanding explicit, systematic, and data-based communication. This creates a symbolic distance between lecturers, staff, and the system. Symbolic distance refers to the feeling of disconnection between meaning and identity between individuals and systems or institutions, which occurs due to differences in how to convey, interpret, and recognize value or contributions. Lecturers who are accustomed to relationship-based communication and social narratives often feel that the digital BKD system is unable to reflect their more complex and socially meaningful dedication and contributions.

In the context of adapting to this digital system, lecturers have begun to reconstruct their professional identity with intelligent adaptation strategies. From Carl Rogers' perspective, lecturers who are accustomed to a more high-context academic work style must adapt to the needs of a more structured and data-driven low-context system. To do so, lecturers translate their academic contributions into more formal and documented formats, such as credit points or administrative documents that are acceptable to the system. In doing so, they can maintain their academic integrity without sacrificing the efficiency expected by the digital system.

Stella Ting-Toomey, through the Face Negotiation theory, teaches that lecturers must maintain their face in interactions with staff and systems. One of the adaptation strategies used by lecturers is communicative face negotiation, which involves conveying their academic contributions clearly and authentically, even in a more technical and systemic format. In this case, lecturers do not reject the digital system, but try to show their academic value in a way that is acceptable to the system without sacrificing their face.

Lecturers who are digital immigrants must also transform their digital roles, as explained by Marc Prensky. Senior lecturers often need extra time and effort to adapt to new technologies. They realize that digital competence is now part of their academic professionalism, which includes not only mastery of knowledge, but also the ability to communicate performance efficiently and validly in digital formats.

In conclusion, digital BKD reporting forces lecturers to redefine their professionalism in a more systematic and data-driven framework. Lecturers not only adapt technically, but also have to reflect their academic values in a format that is acceptable to the system. Through this adaptation strategy, lecturers are able to maintain their academic integrity, despite facing major challenges in adjusting to an impersonal digital work culture.

CONCLUSION

The process of negotiating the identity of digital immigrant lecturers in dealing with digital BKD reporting takes place in three phases: first, identity dissonance, where lecturers feel alienated between their traditional roles and the demands of the digital system; second, resistance or accommodation, with responses varying from rejection to collaboration; and third, identity reconstruction, where lecturers redefine themselves as academics who are adaptive to technology.

Intercultural communication factors that influence interactions in digital BKD reporting include differences in communication context (Hall), digital generation gap (Prensky), negotiation of face and social status (Ting-Toomey), and humanistic values and self-actualization (Rogers).

The re-construction of the lecturer's professional identity is reflected in four adaptation strategies: first, the translation of academic contributions to digital formats (Hall), second, self-reflection and alignment of personal values with the system (Rogers), third, strategic negotiation of social identity in digital spaces (Ting-Toomey), and fourth, increasing digital literacy and cross-generational collaboration (Prensky). Through these strategies, lecturers are able to combine traditional academic values with the demands of a digital work culture.

REFERENCES

Arifianto, R. D., & Prakoso, S. A. (2022). Penerapan etika berkomunikasi oleh dosen digital immigrant kepada mahasiswa digital native sebagai strategi komunikasi dalam pembelajaran online. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, *10*(1), 45–56. http://download.garuda.kemdikbud.go.id/article.php?article=3348275&val=17905&title=

Bennett, M. J. (2022). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Paradigms, principles, and practices*. Intercultural Press.

Budiarto, M., & Lumbanraja, E. E. (2021). Implementasi peran dosen digital immigrant sebagai mediator, inisiator, inspirator, dan evaluator secara komunikasi virtual. *Jurnal Warta Dharmawangsa*, *15*(2), 115–126. https://jurnal.dharmawangsa.ac.id/index.php/juwarta/article/download/3192/2185

Deardorff, D. K. (Ed.). (2020). *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*. SAGE Publications.

Dewi, N. L. K. A., & Susanti, E. W. (2023). Penerapan komunikasi virtual dosen digital immigrant pada program RPL FKIP Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *4*(1), 18–27. https://japendi.publikasiindonesia.id/index.php/japendi/article/download/3093/1299/10460

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2023). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (2022). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hall, E. T. (2022). *The hidden dimension: Man's use of space in public and private*. Anchor Books.

Jandt, F. E. (2023). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a global community* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kasofi, A., Maulida, E., Ningrum, H. F., & Riyadi, S. A. (2022). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan komunikasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Biro Kepegawaian Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen & Bisnis Digital*, *1*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.54771/jmbd.v1i1.705

Kim, Y. Y. (2021). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. SAGE Publications.

Kurylo, A. (2021). *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction*. SAGE Publications.

Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2022). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2021). *Intercultural communication in contexts* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Parrey, M. (2025). *Determination of the role of RAGE rs1800625 polymorphism in diabetic retinopathy in South Asian Population*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4238/gmr24121

Truong, T. T., Le, Q. H., Le, H. Q., Nguyen, V. T., Nguyen, P. G., & Tran, M. T. (2025). *Laparoscopic partial nephrectomy in the treatment of large kidney tumors: Experience at Thanh Hoa General Hospital*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.4238/gmr24127

Bagateli, J. R., Bagateli, R. M., Bandeira, W. J. A., Carvalho, I. R., Loro, M. V., da Silva, J. A. G., Pradebon, L. C., & Sangiovo, J. P. (2025). *Vigor of seeds and use of biostimulant: Effect on resulting seedling and soybean performance in the field*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.4238/k1ne5m72

Liao, T., Huang, Q., Tang, H., Xie, H., Liao, K., Su, Z., Ban, C., Cheng, Z., & Yi, X. (2025). *Pan-cancer analysis of ACHE as a biomarker for cancer prognosis and immunotherapy*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.4238/z2qb9g57

AL-Shammaa, N. F. K. (2025). *Enhancing women's fertility: Insights and strategies based on scientific evidence*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.4238/r162h338

Rasheid, A. W., Ghafer, A., Hamad, S. T., Ali, R. B., & Al-Khayali, B. D. H. (2025). *Association of mutations and polymorphisms in the lipoprotein lipase gene with coronary heart disease in Iraqi patients at Tikrit Hospital, 2024*. *Genetics and Molecular Research, 24*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.4238/x27vjc05

Neuliep, J. W. (2022). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Nurhadi, A. R. (2010). *Perilaku adaptasi sosial dalam perspektif negosiasi identitas mahasiswa Sunda di lingkungan multikultural* [Skripsi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang]. https://eprints.umm.ac.id/id/eprint/12981/1/PENDAHULUAN.pdf

Prensky, M. (2023). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning*. Corwin Press.

Rogers, C. R. (2020). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & McDaniel, E. R. (2021). *Intercultural communication: A reader* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Sari, D. E., & Juariyah, J. (2023). Hambatan komunikasi antarbudaya perantau Banyuwangi di Jepang. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Komunikasi Digital*, *1*(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.47134/jbkd.v1i1.1911

Siregar, D. R., & Hasibuan, Y. M. (2021). *Strategi komunikasi dosen digital immigrant dalam proses mengajar daring di bidang ilmu pengetahuan dan teknologi* [Tesis, Universitas Sumatera Utara]. https://123dok.com/document/z1dpjlrv-strategi-komunikasi-digital-immigrant-mengajar-teknologi-universitas-sumatera.html

Subekti, D., Jusdijachlan, R., & Priatna, D. K. (2023). Pengaruh kompetensi komunikasi dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Badan Pendapatan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nusantara*, *1*(4), 161–171. https://doi.org/10.38035/jpkn.v1i4.973