Journal of legal and social studies

Issn: 2507-7333

Eissn: 2676-1742

Redefining the Professional Identity of the University Professor in the Age of Intelligent Systems: A Critical Sociological Analysis of the Profession's Symbolic Transformation.

Fatima Hadadou [*],

uneversity zayan Achour in Djelfa (Algeria),

Fatima.hadadou@univ-djelfa.dz

Date of send: 01 / 03 / 2026	date of acceptance: 01/05/2026	Date of Publication: 01/06/2026

[*]**Corresponding author**

Abstract :

This article explores the redefinition of the university professor's professional identity amid the growing dominance of intelligent systems and the rapid digital transformations reshaping higher education. Adopting a critical sociological perspective, it conceptualizes professional identity as a social and symbolic construct situated within a field structured by relations of power, legitimacy, and recognition. The study contends that intelligent systems have neither eliminated nor marginalized the professor's role; rather, they have destabilized its traditional foundations, particularly those grounded in the monopoly of knowledge and epistemic authority. The ongoing transformation is fundamentally symbolic, manifested in the redistribution of symbolic capital within the academic field and a shift in professional legitimacy from epistemic authority to knowledge mediation, interactive competence, and professional reflexivity. This transition creates new opportunities to reconstruct academic identity on more flexible, ethically grounded, and human-centered foundations aligned with the evolving demands of contemporary digital education.

Keyword: Professional identity ;Intelligent systems ; Symbolic transformation; University professor.

Introduction:

The rapid digital transformations characterizing the contemporary world have generated new modes of knowledge production and circulation. Digital technology is no longer merely a supportive tool within the educational process; rather, it has become an active structural force reshaping the logic of education, its mechanisms, and patterns of interaction within the academic system. The widespread diffusion of intelligent systems and artificial intelligence applications has contributed to the reorganization of educational functions through the automation of certain pedagogical tasks, the facilitation of access to knowledge, and the transformation of relationships among educational actors within the university. This structural shift has produced a new educational context characterized by cognitive flexibility and the gradual decline of the traditional monopoly over knowledge.

Within this framework, a central sociological problem emerges concerning the professional identity of the university professor as a social and symbolic construct formed within a field structured by relations of power, status competition, and legitimacy. The dominance of intelligent systems has destabilized key foundations of this identity, particularly epistemic authority and the symbolic monopoly over scientific expertise. This situation raises profound questions regarding the professor's position and role in a digital educational

environment where technology and human actors increasingly share the functions of knowledge production and orientation.

Accordingly, this article addresses the following central question: How has the dominance of intelligent systems reshaped the professional identity of the university professor, and what are the symbolic implications of this transformation within the academic field? A related subsidiary question concerns the nature of the shifts affecting the professor's symbolic authority and the mechanisms of adaptation mobilized in response to these changes.

This study seeks to provide a theoretical sociological analysis of the transformations affecting the professor's professional identity in the context of intelligent systems. It does so by deconstructing the changes that have impacted professional representations, roles, and symbolic capital. The article argues that this transformation does not necessarily signal a decline in the professor's status; rather, it reflects a symbolic transition from a model grounded in traditional epistemic authority to a new model based on knowledge mediation, interactive competence, and professional reflexivity.

The analysis adopts a critical sociological framework drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's theory of fields and symbolic capital, Anthony Giddens's reflections on identity reconstruction in late modernity, and Manuel Castells's contributions on the network society and transformations of knowledge. This theoretical framework enables an understanding of the current transformation as the outcome of complex social and symbolic relations rather than as a deterministic consequence of technological progress.

Preface on the first topic and the issues to be addressed,
Preface on the first topic and the issues to be addressed.

1. Conceptual Clarification and Theoretical Framework:

Conceptual clarification and precise definition constitute fundamental methodological requirements in sociological research, given that concepts do not carry fixed or stable meanings. Rather, their significance is shaped by the theoretical and social contexts within which they are employed. Accordingly, this article focuses on three central concepts that structure its analytical framework: professional identity, intelligent systems, and symbolic transformation.

In light of the nature of this study, these concepts are not approached as neutral descriptive categories, but as analytically constructed notions embedded within specific sociological traditions and theoretical orientations.

1.1. The Concept of Professional Identity

1.1.1. Professional Identity as a Social Construct

Professional identity refers to the set of representations, values, norms, and roles that individuals acquire through their affiliation with a particular profession, which grants them a sense of belonging and distinction within the broader social structure. Professional identity is not a fixed attribute or an inherent individual essence; rather, it is a social construct that emerges through continuous interaction between the individual actor, institutional frameworks, and the surrounding social context[1]. (Dubar, 2004, p. 34)

Anthony Giddens argues that identity in modern societies has become a reflexive project, continuously reconstructed in response to the structural transformations shaping social life. This perspective applies equally to professional identity, which evolves in accordance with ongoing changes in work structures and knowledge systems[2]. (Giddens, 2010, p. 76)

2.1.1. The Symbolic and Organizational Dimensions of Professional Identity:

Professional identity rests upon two interrelated dimensions: an organizational dimension linked to regulations, career trajectories, training systems, and promotion structures; and a symbolic dimension associated with social status, recognition, and professional legitimacy. Pierre Bourdieu emphasizes that the true value of a profession is not derived solely from its organizational position, but from the symbolic capital it confers upon its holder within the social field.[3]

Accordingly, the professional identity of the university professor is closely linked to the volume of cultural and symbolic capital he or she possesses, as well as to the degree of recognition granted by other actors regarding his or her role and status within the university system.

2.1. The Concept of Intelligent Systems

2.1.1. Defining Artificial Intelligence and Intelligent Systems in the Educational Context

Artificial intelligence refers to the set of computational technologies and systems capable of simulating certain human cognitive functions, such as learning, analysis, and decision-making. In the educational context, intelligent systems are digital applications that employ algorithms and machine learning techniques to enhance teaching processes, assessment practices, and learning management.

The presence of such systems is no longer confined to technical support functions; rather, it now extends to content production, learning guidance, and the analysis of students' performance. Consequently, intelligent systems have become structural components of the educational process.

2.2.1. The Distinction Between Technical Tool and Structural Actor

Sociological analysis distinguishes between technology as a neutral instrument and technology as a structural actor capable of reshaping social relations. When intelligent systems become organizing elements of academic work, they transcend their purely technical function and emerge as actors influencing the distribution of roles, authority, and meaning within the educational framework[4].

Manuel Castells argues that network societies are no longer structured solely around the control of material resources, but rather around the management and regulation of flows of information and knowledge. This shift grants technology a central position in the reconfiguration of power relations[5].

1.3. The Concept of Symbolic Transformation

1.3.1. Symbol and Symbolic Power in Sociology

In sociology, the symbol is understood as a carrier of social meaning and a medium through which legitimacy and recognition are produced. Symbolic power, in turn, refers to the capacity to impose a particular vision of the social world that is accepted by social actors as legitimate and natural. Pierre Bourdieu argues that this form of power operates indirectly through language, institutions, and social representations[6].

Within this framework, the academic profession may be considered one of the occupations that has historically accumulated a significant degree of symbolic power, closely associated with knowledge and scholarly authority.

2. The Professional Identity of the Professor in Classical and Contemporary Sociology:

The academic profession occupies a central position within the social system due to its cognitive, pedagogical, and symbolic functions. As such, it has attracted sustained attention in both classical and contemporary sociology, where it serves as a key model for understanding the relationship between knowledge, power, and professional legitimacy within society.

2. The Professional Identity of the Professor in Classical and Contemporary Sociology:

The academic profession occupies a central position within the social system due to its cognitive, pedagogical, and symbolic functions. As such, it has received sustained attention in both classical and contemporary sociology, where it serves as a key model for understanding the relationship between knowledge, power, and professional legitimacy within society.

2.1. The Professor’s Position within the Educational Field:

Pierre Bourdieu conceptualizes the educational field as a relatively autonomous social space governed by its own internal logic, within which relations of power and struggles over legitimacy and status are continuously produced[7].

Within this field, the professor occupies a central position as an actor endowed with epistemic authority that is institutionally and socially recognized. The professor's status derives both from his or her structural location within the educational system and from the recognition granted by institutions, students, and society as a legitimate producer and transmitter of knowledge[8].

However, this status is not fixed; rather, it evolves in accordance with transformations affecting the conditions and instruments of knowledge production.

From another perspective, Max Weber links professional status to the concept of social status (Status), which is determined by social esteem and symbolic recognition, rather than solely by formal occupational position[9].

Accordingly, the professor's position cannot be measured exclusively by formal function, but also by the social value attributed to knowledge and scholarship within society.

2.2. Cultural and Symbolic Capital in the Academic Profession

Cultural capital constitutes one of the principal foundations of the professor's professional identity. Bourdieu defines it as the set of knowledge, qualifications, and cultural competencies possessed by an individual, which enable him or her to occupy a distinguished position within the social field[10].

By virtue of academic training and scholarly trajectory, the professor accumulates a significant volume of cultural capital that is converted within the educational system into symbolic capital, conferring legitimacy and authority[11].

Bourdieu further argues that symbolic capital becomes effective only insofar as it is socially recognized namely, when the professor is perceived as a legitimate scientific authority[12].

Yet this recognition remains contingent upon structural transformations, particularly in light of technological shifts that have affected the monopoly over knowledge and its instruments of production.

From a Weberian perspective, the professor's professional authority is associated with rational legal authority, which is grounded in formally recognized qualifications and regulatory frameworks[13].

Thus, the legitimacy of the professor stems from officially recognized scientific competence and integration within a rational institutional apparatus that regulates the conditions of professional practice.

3.2. The Professor as a Knowledge Producer and Social Mediator:

The role of the professor extends beyond the mere transmission of knowledge to encompass its production and the reproduction of the social order. From Bourdieu's perspective, the professor performs a dual function: the production of knowledge on the one hand, and the reproduction of cultural and social structures on the other, through the transmission of dominant modes of thought and prevailing values[14].

This dual role positions the professor as a social mediator involved in the formation of consciousness and the shaping of social norms, rather than merely a technical actor operating within the educational institution.

In a related vein, Max Weber argues that the professor exercises both an ethical and epistemic role, consisting in the promotion of rationality and scientific thinking, while maintaining a necessary distinction between personal values and academic work[15].

Weber further emphasizes that, despite occupying a position of authority, the professor is required to uphold value neutrality, a condition that grants moral legitimacy within society.

Accordingly, the professor's professional identity is constituted at the intersection of two dimensions: a productive epistemic dimension and a social-symbolic dimension. This intersection renders such identity open to reconfiguration whenever the conditions governing knowledge and power within society undergo transformation.

3. Intelligent Systems as a Factor in the Reconfiguration of Academic Practice:

The digital revolution, accompanied by the widespread diffusion of intelligent systems, has generated profound transformations in the structure of academic practice affecting knowledge production, circulation, and the organization of relations among actors within the educational system. In this regard, Manuel Castells's theory of the network society provides a central interpretive framework for understanding these transformations, insofar as knowledge is increasingly produced within digital networks that transcend institutional and territorial boundaries.

3.1. The Decline of Knowledge Monopoly:

The monopoly over knowledge historically constituted one of the symbolic foundations of the professor's authority within the educational institution, as academic status was traditionally linked to being the primary source of legitimate scientific knowledge. However, the development of intelligent systems, search engines, and digital learning platforms has disrupted this monopoly and rendered knowledge accessible within open networked spaces[16].

Castells argues that in the network society, knowledge is no longer produced within closed institutional structures, but rather within dynamic, flexible, and collaborative networks, leading to a decline in the centrality of the traditional actor in knowledge production[17].

Thus, it can be argued that the professor no longer monopolizes knowledge production, but instead becomes one among multiple actors within a broader epistemic network.

This decline, however, does not imply the disappearance of the professor's role. Rather, it signals a functional shift from controlling knowledge to organizing, contextualizing, and critically framing it within an informational environment characterized by abundance and fragmentation[18].

2.3.1. Symbolic Transformation as a Redistribution of Meaning and Status:

Symbolic transformation refers to the transfer of meanings and statuses from one symbolic system to another as a result of changing social and structural conditions. In the context of this article, symbolic transformation manifests itself in the redistribution of the professor's professional status and legitimacy from a model grounded in the monopoly of knowledge to a participatory model in which intelligent systems and human actors share the production of meaning[19].

This transformation reflects a redefinition of status according to a new logic governed by digital competence and the capacity for guidance and knowledge mediation; it does not necessarily imply a loss of status.

2.3. Changing the Relationship Between Professor and Student:

Intelligent systems have reshaped the traditional hierarchical relationship between professor and student, which was historically based on vertical authority structures. Within digital environments, students are now able to access knowledge sources directly and interact with educational content beyond the temporal and spatial boundaries of the university institution[20].

Castells argues that the logic of the network imposes horizontal relationships grounded in interaction and collaboration rather than rigid hierarchies. As a result, the pedagogical relationship has evolved into a negotiated one, in which roles between professor and student are continuously redistributed.

In this context, the professor is no longer the sole transmitter of knowledge, but rather becomes a guide and facilitator of learning, while the student emerges as an active agent participating in the construction of his or her own learning trajectory through the use of intelligent tools and digital platforms[21].

3.3. From Epistemic Authority to Interactive Competence:

Within the network society, academic authority is no longer built exclusively upon the possession of knowledge, but rather upon the capacity to engage with it, guide it, and transform it into meaningful knowledge. Castells emphasizes that

power in contemporary societies is increasingly linked to the ability to manage information flows within networks rather than to exercise direct control over them[22].

Accordingly, academic practice is shifting from a model of epistemic authority based on monopoly and traditional legitimacy to a new model grounded in interactive competence—that is, the professor's ability to use intelligent systems effectively, engage dynamically with students, and foster critical thinking.

This shift constitutes one of the most significant dimensions in the redefinition of the professor's professional identity, as innovation, flexibility, and digital competence become central components of professional legitimacy within the educational field without eliminating the continued necessity of the human and ethical dimensions of educational practice.

4. The Symbolic Transformation of the Professor's Professional Identity:

The concept of symbolic transformation refers to changes affecting the social meanings, representations, and patterns of recognition associated with a given profession, without necessarily entailing direct material or organizational transformation. In higher education, the symbolic transformation of the professor's professional identity reflects a gradual shift in the meanings of status, authority, and professional legitimacy under the structural changes brought about by intelligent systems.

4.1. The Destabilization of the Traditional Image of the Professor:

The traditional image of the professor has historically been associated with scholarly prestige, epistemic authority, and the symbolic monopoly of knowledge within the educational field. However, this symbolic model has experienced increasing destabilization due to the abundance of digital knowledge, the ease of access to information, and the declining centrality of the university institution as the sole source of legitimate knowledge[23].

Bourdieu argues that symbolic power is grounded in collective recognition of an actor's legitimacy; when the conditions of such recognition change, symbolic status becomes destabilized[24].

Within this context, the professor is no longer necessarily perceived as the sole epistemic authority, but rather as one actor among multiple actors within an open epistemic space.

This transformation represents one of the most salient expressions of the symbolic crisis affecting the academic profession, as traditional symbolic capital alone is no longer sufficient to guarantee social recognition unless reinforced by new competencies aligned with the digital context.

2.4. The Redistribution of Symbolic Power within the Academic Field:

Digital transformation has led to a redistribution of symbolic power within the academic field. This power is no longer concentrated exclusively in the hands of the professor; rather, it is increasingly distributed among technical actors, digital platforms, and intelligent systems that perform influential pedagogical and evaluative functions[25].

Bourdieu emphasizes that social fields undergo shifts in power balances whenever new actors emerge to compete with traditional agents over symbolic capital[26].

In this context, intelligent systems compete with professors in certain symbolic functions, particularly those related to the production and evaluation of knowledge. However, this competition does not eliminate the professor's role; rather, it compels its reconfiguration. Symbolic authority thus shifts from a logic of monopoly to a logic grounded in competence, guidance, and the capacity to attribute meaning to digital knowledge.

3.4. Forms of Resistance and Professional Adaptation:

Symbolic transformation does not occur automatically or seamlessly; it is often accompanied by professional tension and symbolic resistance from actors who perceive their status to be threatened. Claude Dubar notes that transformations affecting professional identity frequently generate defensive strategies through which actors seek to preserve their identity equilibrium[27].

Such resistance may manifest in the rejection of digital technologies by some professors or in the questioning of the legitimacy of knowledge produced through intelligent systems, perceived as a threat to the profession's symbolic value. Conversely, adaptive strategies are evident among other groups of professors who engage in reconstructing their professional identity by acquiring digital competencies and adopting new roles aligned with the demands of intelligent learning environments. This process enables them to regenerate new forms of symbolic capital within the academic field[28].

4.4. Symbolic Transformation and the Redefinition of Professional Meaning:

Symbolic transformation does not merely entail the loss or transfer of status; it extends to the redefinition of the meaning of the profession itself. In the context of intelligent systems, the value of the professor is no longer derived primarily from the quantity of knowledge possessed, but from the capacity to transform digital information into socially and pedagogically meaningful knowledge.

Bourdieu argues that professional meaning is continuously reproduced through practice and social recognition, rendering professional identity an open project of reconstruction rather than a fixed entity[29].

5. Redefining Professional Identity: Toward a New Sociological Model:

The transformations generated by intelligent systems necessitate a shift from a traditional model of the professor's professional identity toward a new model grounded in flexibility, reflexivity, and the reconstruction of professional meaning. In this regard, Giddens's concept of reflexive identity provides an important interpretive framework for understanding how professors reconstruct their professional selves within an evolving digital educational field.

5.1. The Professor as Knowledge Mediator and Critical Actor:

In a context characterized by the abundance of digital knowledge and the decline of its monopoly, the professor's central role no longer lies in the transmission of ready-made knowledge, but rather in knowledge mediation—organizing, contextualizing, and critically evaluating information. Giddens argues that actors in late modernity redefine their roles through reflexive practice, that is, through the capacity to continuously reassess their actions and knowledge in light of new circumstances[30].

Accordingly, the professor becomes a critical actor who guides students in distinguishing reliable knowledge from misinformation and in developing critical thinking rather than passive consumption of information. This renewed role grants the professor a reconfigured professional legitimacy grounded in analytical competence and the capacity to attribute meaning to networked knowledge.

5.2. Digital Professional Identity

Digital professional identity represents a continuation of traditional professional identity, yet it is constructed within virtual spaces governed by network logics and continuous interaction. Giddens suggests that identity in modern societies is no longer based solely on continuity, but on the self-narrative through which individuals construct their trajectories within changing contexts[31].

In this context, professors reconstruct their professional identity through digital presence, engagement on educational platforms, and the integration of intelligent tools into teaching and research practices. This digital identity extends beyond technical skills to include the management of professional image, the cultivation of trust, and the maintenance of symbolic recognition within networked spaces[32].

5.3. The Centrality of the Ethical and Human Dimension in the Age of Intelligent Systems:

Despite the increasingly technical character of academic work, there is a renewed need to reaffirm the ethical and human dimensions of educational practice. The widespread use of intelligent systems raises ethical concerns related to responsibility, fairness, and the safeguarding of educational values.

Giddens argues that reflexivity does not merely involve identity reconstruction but also encompasses awareness of the ethical risks accompanying technological progress[33].

Accordingly, the professor plays a pivotal role in reinforcing the ethics of knowledge and ensuring that intelligent systems are employed in ways that promote human development rather than mere technical efficiency. The ethical dimension thus becomes a foundational component of the new sociological model of professional identity, where human responsibility and value-oriented reflection complement digital competence rather than oppose it.

6. Theoretical Discussion

This discussion aims to deepen the theoretical analysis of the transformations affecting the professor's professional identity under the dominance of intelligent systems, by moving beyond reductionist explanations and linking technological transformation to human agency and social context, while exploring possibilities for restoring the profession's legitimacy within the academic field.

6.1. The Limits of Technological Determinism:

Some approaches adopt a deterministic view of technology, assuming that intelligent systems automatically and directly impose changes on professional roles and social identities. While analytically useful, this perspective remains insufficient for capturing the social complexity of professional transformation[34].

Manuel Castells argues that technology alone does not determine the trajectory of social transformation; rather, it interacts with existing social and cultural structures, producing multiple and non-linear outcomes. Accordingly, the decline of certain dimensions of the professor's professional identity cannot be explained solely by the diffusion of intelligent systems, but also by the ways in which they are socially and institutionally integrated.

Similarly, Bourdieu emphasizes that social fields do not change as a result of a single factor, but through the interaction of multiple forces related to the redistribution of capital and legitimacy[35].

6.2. The Relationship Between Human Agency and Technology:

Contemporary sociology underscores the importance of human agency in shaping the effects of technology. Intelligent systems, regardless of their level of sophistication, remain conditioned by the modes of use, representations, and strategies adopted by social actors.

In this respect, Giddens argues that technical structures do not eliminate human agency; rather, they reshape the conditions under which action takes place, while actors retain a degree of capacity for choice, resistance, and reinterpretation[36].

This analysis applies to the university professor, who does not passively receive

digital transformation, but actively reappropriates it in light of professional norms and academic experience. The relationship between professor and technology is therefore interactive rather than submissive: technology may function either as a tool of domination or as a means of professional empowerment, depending on practice and institutional context.

6.3. Possibilities for Revalorizing the Professor's Professional Identity:

Despite the symbolic and professional challenges posed by digital transformation, new opportunities emerge for revalorizing the professor's professional identity. Bourdieu suggests that the loss of certain forms of symbolic capital does not signify the end of a profession, but may instead open the possibility for its reconstitution in new forms[37].

Within this framework, professors can rebuild their status by developing analytical and critical competencies and by assuming the role of ethical and epistemic mediators within intelligent learning environments. Giddens further argues that identity in modern societies is not a fixed given, but an open project of ongoing reconstruction[38].

Thus, the professor's professional identity remains capable of regaining legitimacy through critical engagement with digital transformation, without relinquishing the human values and academic standards that confer its social meaning.

This article has sought to provide a critical sociological reading of the transformations affecting the professor's professional identity under the dominance of intelligent systems, through an analysis of the symbolic and social dimensions of academic practice within a rapidly evolving digital context. By drawing on both classical and contemporary sociological perspectives, the study moves beyond reductionist interpretations and highlights the complex, relational, and symbolic character of this transformation.

Key Theoretical Findings:

The analysis demonstrates that the professor's professional identity is neither a fixed given nor a stable professional essence; rather, it is a social and symbolic construction shaped by transformations in the educational context and the conditions of knowledge production. The article shows that intelligent systems have destabilized some of the traditional foundations of this identityparticularly those associated with the monopoly of knowledge and epistemic authority without necessarily marginalizing the professor's role.

The findings further indicate that the ongoing transformation is fundamentally symbolic, manifested in the redistribution of symbolic capital within the academic field and the shift of professional legitimacy from a logic of epistemic monopoly to one grounded in interactive competence and knowledge

mediation. This conclusion reinforces Pierre Bourdieu's thesis regarding the dynamic nature of social fields and their continuous reconfiguration.

The article was guided by the central question: How has the dominance of intelligent systems reshaped the professional identity of the university professor, and what are the symbolic implications of this transformation?

The analysis concludes that intelligent systems have not eliminated the professor's professional identity; rather, they have compelled its reconfiguration according to a new model in which symbolic authority based on knowledge monopoly recedes in favor of roles centered on guidance, interaction, critique, and ethical responsibility.

Drawing on Anthony Giddens's concept of reflexive identity, the professor emerges as an actor required to continuously reconstruct his or her professional identity through critical adaptation to digital transformations rather than passive submission to them. Consequently, the transformation affecting the profession does not represent an existential crisis, but rather a transition toward a more complex and open professional model.

Future Directions for Sociological Research on the Academic Profession in: the Digital Age

The findings of this study open broad avenues for future sociological research on the academic profession in the digital era. On the one hand, there is a need for empirical studies that examine professors' representations of intelligent systems and their strategies for reconstructing professional identity across diverse university contexts. On the other hand, digital transformations raise ethical and organizational issues that call for critical approaches focused on the relationship between technology, power, and educational values.

Moreover, analyzing university policies, training systems, and promotion mechanisms and their role in either strengthening or weakening professional identity constitutes a fertile area for deepening sociological understanding of professional transformation under digitalization. The professor's professional identity thus remains an open field for reflection and analysis, reflecting broader transformations in contemporary society's relationship with knowledge and technology.

Recommendations:

Based on the theoretical findings and sociological analysis of the symbolic transformation of the professor's professional identity under the dominance of intelligent systems, the following recommendations are proposed for institutional actors, researchers, and policymakers within the academic field.

First: Recommendations at the Level of University Policies:

Reformulating continuous professional development policies:

Professional training, as Bourdieu's analysis suggests, represents a central mechanism for reproducing or transforming symbolic capital within the professional field.

Revising promotion and evaluation systems:

Promotion criteria should account for the professor's emerging roles such as knowledge mediation, pedagogical innovation, and interactive competence rather than relying exclusively on traditional quantitative indicators. This would enhance symbolic recognition of the evolving professional identity.

Second: Recommendations at the Level of Academic Practice:

Strengthening the professor's role as a critical actor rather than a mere technological user:

Professors should be encouraged to adopt a critical engagement with intelligent systems based on evaluation, analysis, and conscious selection rather than technological dependence. As Anthony Giddens notes, digital transformation does not eliminate human agency but reshapes the conditions of its exercise.

Reaffirming the ethical and human dimension of educational practice:

It is essential to preserve core educational values such as responsibility, academic integrity, and epistemic justice amid the expanding use of intelligent systems, in order to prevent the reduction of education to purely technical logic.

Third: Recommendations for Sociological Research:

Encouraging empirical research on digital professional identity

The article calls for qualitative and quantitative studies examining professors' perceptions of intelligent systems and their strategies of adaptation or resistance, thereby deepening sociological understanding of professional transformation.

Developing interdisciplinary approaches:

Strengthening intersections between sociology, educational sciences, and AI ethics is recommended in order to produce comprehensive knowledge capable of capturing the complexity of digital transformation in higher education.

Fourth: Forward-Looking Recommendations:

Integrating ethical considerations into university AI governance:

Universities should accompany the implementation of intelligent systems with clear regulatory and ethical frameworks that safeguard the professor's professional autonomy and protect academic values from technocratic reductionism.

Recognizing professional identity as an open project:

The study recommends conceptualizing the professor's professional identity as an open, reflexive project of ongoing reconstruction rather than as a closed model, enabling continuous renewal in response to accelerating digital transformations.

References:

[1] Dubar, Claude. *The Crisis of Identities*. Translated by Ali Watfa. Damascus: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Muʿasir, 2004, p. 34.

[2] Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Translated by Ahmed Zayed. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2010, p. 76.

[3] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Questions in Sociology*. Translated by Ibrahim Fathi. Beirut: Dar Al-Tanweer, 2007, p. 112.

[4] Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Ali Moqalled. Beirut: Markaz Al-Inma' Al-Qawmi, 1990, p. 27.

[5] Castells, Manuel. *The Network Society*. Translated by Fadel Jatkar. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2005, p. 214.

[6] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Symbolic Domination*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1998, p. 45.

[7] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Questions in Sociology*. Translated by Ibrahim Fathi. Beirut: Dar Al-Tanweer, 2007, p. 112.

[8] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Translated by Ahmed Hassan. Beirut: Dar Al-Farabi, 2003, p. 45.

[9] Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Translated by Fouad Zakaria. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2010, p. 305.

[10] Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Forms of Capital." In *Sociology and Power*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1994, p. 241.

[11] Ibid., p. 245.

[12] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Symbolic Capital*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1994, p. 63.

[13] Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Translated by Fouad Zakaria. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2010, p. 217.

[14] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Translated by Ahmed Hassan. Beirut: Dar Al-Farabi, 2003, p. 71.

[15] Weber, Max. *Science as a Vocation*. Translated by Mohammed Abdullah. Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabia, 2005, p. 18.

[16] Castells, Manuel. *The Network Society*. Translated by Fadel Jatkar. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2005, p. 214.

[17] Ibid., p. 219.

[18] Dubar, Claude. *The Sociology of Professional Identities*. Translated by Georges Zainati. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2012, p. 102.

[19] Dubar, Claude. *The Sociology of Professional Identities*. Translated by Georges Zainati. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2012, p. 96.

[20] Selznick, Neil. *Education in the Digital Age*. Translated by Mohamed Shawqi. Cairo: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, 2018, p. 56.

[21]Castells, Manuel. *Communication Power*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 2012, p. 33.

[22] Castells, Manuel. *The Network Society*. Translated by Fadel Jatkar. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2005, p. 312.

[23] Dubar, Claude. *The Crisis of Identities*. Translated by Ali Watfa. Damascus: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Muʿasir, 2004, p. 41.

[24] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Symbolic Domination*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1998, p. 45.

[25] Castells, Manuel. *The Network Society*. Translated by Fadel Jatkar. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2005, p. 25.

[26] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Questions in Sociology*. Translated by Ibrahim Fathi. Beirut: Dar Al-Tanweer, 2007, p. 119.

[27] Dubar, Claude. *The Sociology of Professional Identities*. Translated by Georges Zainati. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2012, p. 88.

[28] Ibid., p. 94.

[29]Bourdieu, Pierre. *Symbolic Capital*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1994, p. 67.

[30] Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Translated by Ahmed Zayed. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2010, p. 30.

[31] Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Translated by Ahmed Zayed. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2010, p. 75.

[32] Dubar, Claude. *The Sociology of Professional Identities*. Translated by Georges Zainati. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2012, p. 134.

[33] Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Translated by Mohamed Al-Jawhari. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2005, p. 122.

[34] Fazio, Michel. *The Sociology of Technology*. Translated by Hassan Qubaisi. Beirut: Dar Al-Farabi, 2016, p. 19.

[35] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Questions in Sociology*. Translated by Ibrahim Fathi. Beirut: Dar Al-Tanweer, 2007, p. 121.

[36] Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Translated by Ahmed Zayed. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2010, p. 54.

[37] Bourdieu, Pierre. *Symbolic Capital*. Translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelali. Casablanca: Dar Toubkal, 1994, p. 71.

[38] Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Translated by Mohamed Al-Jawhari. Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2005, p. 131.