



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

www.techniumscience.com



Vol. 76/2025
A New Decade for Social Changes

PLUS
COMMUNICATION P



International
Communication & PR

Cultural Migration in Lecturer Workload Reporting (BKD): Assessor Perspectives on the Adaptation of Digital Immigrant Lecturers Through the Lens of Critical Intercultural Communication

**Julia Magdalena Wuysang¹, Ira Patriani², Rahmawati³, Feibe Engeline Pijoh⁴,
Imelda Hermilinda Abas⁵**

^{1,2}Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak, ³Universitas Unsyiah Banda Aceh, ⁴Universitas Negeri Manado, ⁵Shinawatra International University

julia.magdalena@fisip.untan.ac.id, ira.patriani@fisip.untan.ac.id,
rahmawati.1962@usk.ac.id, feibepijoh@unima.ac.id, Imelda.a@siu.ac.th

Abstract. This study explores the digitalization of academic performance reporting systems, particularly the *Beban Kerja Dosen (BKD)* or Lecturer Workload Reporting in Indonesia, which introduces new institutional norms and challenges related to intercultural communication. Senior lecturers—categorized as “digital immigrants”—face considerable difficulties in adapting to these new digital platforms. While often reduced to technical issues, such adaptation processes in fact intersect with broader issues of intercultural communication, power relations, and epistemological tensions. This study investigates how digital immigrant lecturers interact with BKD assessors during the reporting process, positioning assessors as institutional agents who safeguard academic legitimacy and reproduce dominant values within higher education institutions. Drawing upon Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016), Critical Pedagogy (Freire, 1970), Foucault’s Discourse Theory (1977), and Face-Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey, 2005), the research adopts a qualitative case study design. In-depth interviews were conducted with six senior BKD assessors and sixteen digital immigrant lecturers at Tanjungpura University, a state university in Indonesia. Data were analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to uncover discursive dominance, power asymmetries, and adaptation strategies in the BKD reporting process. The findings reveal that BKD reporting functions as a contested site of cultural and political negotiation between lecturers and assessors. These interactions often result in the reproduction of reductive, quantitative metrics that oversimplify the complexity of academic performance. This study recommends the development of a more inclusive evaluation system, the implementation of targeted training programs for digital immigrant lecturers, and the integration of intercultural communication frameworks into the BKD reporting mechanism (Sorrells, 2016; Freire, 1970).

Keywords. Critical Intercultural Communication; Digital Cultural Migration; Academic Performance Reporting; Assessors and Power Relations in Higher Education

1. Introduction

In the era of digitalization in higher education, the *Beban Kerja Dosen* (BKD) or Lecturer Workload Reporting system in Indonesia has undergone a significant transformation towards a more standardized and accountable online reporting system. However, this shift has introduced cultural and epistemic challenges, particularly for senior lecturers, categorized as "digital immigrants"—individuals who built their academic careers in a pre-digital era and are now required to adapt to a digital platform-based evaluation system (Prensky, 2001; Selwyn, 2016). The digitalization of lecturer workload reporting (BKD) is not merely a technical issue but also reflects a cultural migration, one that involves the negotiation of values, norms, and power relations within academic institutions (Sorrells, 2016).

In this context, BKD assessors are not only administrative evaluators but also symbolic power agents who represent the dominant epistemic structure (Foucault, 1977; Apple, 2004). Their evaluations are not only technical but also political, as they have the potential to marginalize lecturers with an analog work culture. Much of the existing literature continues to emphasize the technological aspects of lecturers' adaptation to digitalization (Rogers, 2003; Kocayörük & Olgan, 2020), without critically addressing the aspects of **critical intercultural communication**, especially in the context of the relationship between assessors and lecturers. Notably, two of the most relevant works by Julia Magdalena Wuysang (2025a, 2025b) focus predominantly on the lecturers' perspective, rather than the assessor's role, and do not delve deeply into power theory or critical communication.

This article seeks to fill this gap by employing **Critical Intercultural Communication Theory** (Sorrells, 2016; Halualani & Nakayama, 2010), which highlights the role of power, social position, and colonial history in intercultural interactions. The article also integrates **Critical Pedagogy** by Paulo Freire (1970), which critiques the dehumanization inherent in technocratic educational systems, and Foucault's **Discourse Theory** (1977, 1980), to deconstruct the BKD reporting process as a practice of classification and normalization in academia. By framing the BKD reporting system as a site of meaning and power production, this study analyzes how assessors interpret the performance of digital immigrant lecturers, as well as how this evaluation process contains dynamics of **face-negotiation** (Ting-Toomey, 2005), epistemic inequalities, and the reduction of academic value into quantitative metrics. Focusing on the assessor's perspective makes this study unique, as it opens up space for a reinterpretation of power relations within formal evaluation systems. The four key issues addressed in this research are:

1. Epistemic Inequality between assessors and digital immigrant lecturers;
2. The BKD Reporting Process as a Face-Negotiation Arena in the context of high-context Malay culture;
3. The Reduction of Academic Performance to Quantitative Metrics, which neglects reflective and pedagogical work;
4. The Role of Assessors as Symbolic Power Agents, reproducing dominant institutional values.

Thus, this study not only offers a theoretical contribution to the field of **critical intercultural communication** and **power studies in higher education** but also proposes more reflective, inclusive, and humanistic academic evaluation practices in alignment with the principles of **social justice in critical pedagogy**.

Literature Review: Critical Intercultural Communication and Digital Academic Adaptation

Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) offers a robust analytical framework for understanding cultural encounters within institutional contexts, particularly in unequal structures such as academia (Collier, 2009; Sorrells, 2016). CIC does not view cultural differences merely as technical barriers but as sites of ideological negotiation structured by historical inequalities and epistemic hierarchies (Halualani, Mendoza & Drzewiecka, 2009). In the context of academic reporting systems like *Beban Kerja Dosen (BKD)*, digital migration requires more than just technical adaptation; it also entails a process of cultural resocialization (Selwyn, 2016; Dutta, 2020). Digital immigrant lecturers, who are less familiar with technology, undergo changes not only in communication practices but also in the logic of visibility and academic surveillance (Couldry & Mejias, 2019).

Social position is crucial in **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)**, where the assessor, as an agent of institutional norms, does not merely evaluate competence but also assesses how far a lecturer aligns with the dominant discourse of productivity, standardization, and technocratic rationality (Sorrells, 2016; Ahmed, 2012). Thus, the adaptation to the BKD reporting platform becomes a space of cultural migration, not only across nations but also across epistemic territories, where local pedagogical practices meet the centralized logic of digital regimes.

The **decolonial approach** in CIC (Shome & Hegde, 2002; Nakayama & Halualani, 2010) emphasizes that academic technology is never neutral. Digital systems such as *Sistem Informasi Sumberdaya Terintegrasi (SISTER)* or BKDweb embed a specific academic epistemology—prioritizing measurable output over affective work or community engagement, often marginalizing knowledge production forms that are characteristic of digital immigrant lecturers.

Key Insights for the Study

- **CIC** does not merely perceive adaptation as a model but as a negotiation of power, identity, and institutional ideology.
- The **interpreter's** role is not neutral evaluation but part of the discursive regime that determines whose academic labor is visible and valued.
- Digital academic platforms act as sites of **epistemic coloniality**, demanding adherence to technocratic norms often foreign to marginalized academic actors.

Digital Cultural Migration in Academic Bureaucracy: A Critical Intercultural Perspective

Digital Cultural Migration refers to the transition of individuals—particularly lecturers unfamiliar with technology—into new digital epistemic spaces that require not only technical adaptation but also internalization of new communication norms, bureaucratic processes, and cultures (Selwyn, 2016; Dutta, 2020). In the academic context of BKD, this migration involves more than just using digital platforms; it includes navigating symbolic power, institutional ideologies, and technocratic rationality embedded in digital infrastructures (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Digital immigrant lecturers (especially senior ones) often experience **epistemic dislocation** when they are forced to adapt to quantitative performance metrics prioritizing visibility, speed, and productivity—values central to neoliberal academic governance (Shore & Wright, 2015).

Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) highlights that digital migration is not a neutral process but a site of ideological negotiation. The role of assessors becomes crucial as they act as **guardians of epistemic legitimacy**, measuring "adaptation" based on implicit norms of

modernity and digital fluency, which often overlook deeper intercultural tensions (Collier, 2009). Therefore, the BKD reporting process becomes a contested space, where lecturers not only report their workload but also symbolically migrate between community-based academic identities and institutional demands for performative professionalism.

Academic Performance Reporting as a Site of Epistemic and Cultural Tension

Academic performance reporting—specifically, the BKD reporting process—is not a mere neutral administrative procedure. It reflects technocratic governance imposing performance standards based on the logic of quantification and digital visibility (Shore & Wright, 2015; Espeland & Sauder, 2007). Standardized online reporting systems, such as SISTER, force lecturers to transform affective, contextual, and collaborative academic activities into formats that align with the audit culture logic (Power, 1997; Strathern, 2000). This process creates **epistemic pressures**, particularly for digital immigrant lecturers who now face gaps in digital competencies and cultural dislocation in articulating their academic labor digitally.

From the perspective of CIC, BKD reporting becomes a site where **cultural hegemony** is enacted symbolically. Local knowledge, oral pedagogy, and collective contributions are often rendered invisible or even delegitimized by systems that only recognize specific performance indicators (Sorrells, 2016; Dutta, 2020). Assessors, in their role, act as **intercultural brokers**, determining the legitimacy of academic performance within the framework of modern epistemology.

Assessors as Power Relations in Higher Education

Within the bureaucracy of higher education, assessors do not merely serve as evaluators but as agents of institutional power. They operate within **biopower** (Foucault, 1979), where bodies, knowledge, and productivity are regulated through subtle surveillance and normalization. In the BKD reporting system at Indonesian universities, assessors act as intermediaries between the performance metrics imposed by the state and the diverse academic realities of lecturers. Through tools like the SISTER system, assessors operationalize "accountability technologies" (Shore & Wright, 2015), often reinforcing regimes of performance based on quantification, visibility, and standardization (Espeland & Sauder, 2007). From the CIC perspective, assessors occupy a **hegemonic position**, serving as arbiters of legitimacy that often prioritize dominant epistemologies rooted in Western productivity and output (Dutta, 2020). For digital immigrant lecturers, this creates **structural inequalities**, as locally or culturally-linguistic modes of academic contribution become invisible or invalid. Assessors, therefore, are not neutral agents but play roles akin to what Althusser (1971) describes in the **Ideological State Apparatus**, reinforcing dominant norms while obscuring alternative modes of knowledge production rooted in local or collective traditions.

Conclusion

This literature provides critical insights into the interaction between digital technology, intercultural communication, and power within academic reporting. Through the lens of **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)**, this article suggests that digital adaptation is not merely a technical transition but a complex negotiation between symbolic power, academic identity, and dominant epistemologies. The study emphasizes that the migration to digital academic reporting is laden with power dynamics, particularly for digital immigrant lecturers navigating new digital environments that often marginalize their pedagogical and cultural contributions.

Research Methodology

This study employs a critical qualitative approach with the aim of analyzing the structures of power, ideology, and communicative practices in the *Beban Kerja Dosen* (BKD) reporting system, focusing particularly on digital immigrant lecturers and BKD assessors. This approach does not merely seek to understand the phenomenon, but also to critique the power relations inherent in institutional intercultural communication (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Sorrells, 2016). The research is emancipatory in nature, intending to foster critical awareness and potential change in academic workload reporting practices.

1. Research Design

The investigation utilizes a critical qualitative case study design, which enables an in-depth exploration of the cultural migration experienced by digital immigrant lecturers within the BKD reporting system at a university. This case study focuses on two main groups:

- **BKD Assessors**, as representatives of the institutional evaluative structure and of the dominant culture within the academic institution.
- **Digital Immigrant Lecturers**, i.e. lecturers who have transitioned from manual reporting systems to digital platforms within the past five years.

2. Theories Employed in Analysis

Several theoretical frameworks are applied to provide a deep analytical lens:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)** (Sorrells, 2016; Halualani & Nakayama, 2010): used to identify digital cultural domination in BKD communication and to position digital immigrant lecturers within the institutional communication structure. CIC emphasizes power, social position, and historical context in shaping intercultural relations.
- **Critical Pedagogy** – Paulo Freire (Freire, 1970): to analyze BKD reporting as an educational practice that can either reinforce or transform power structures. The concepts of "critical consciousness" and "humanistic dialogue" help reveal how lecturers may experience dehumanization when judged by standards that do not account for cultural diversity in working practices.
- **Power and Discourse Theory** – Michel Foucault (Foucault, 1977; 1980): to examine how BKD reporting constructs the subjecthood of lecturers through discursive practices and assessments that yield symbolic power. Assessors act as agents of knowledge-power, while workload reporting becomes part of the campus bureaucracy's regime of truth.
- **Face-Negotiation Theory** – Ting-Toomey (2005): employed to explain how senior lecturers manage cultural conflicts in their interactions with BKD assessors, particularly how social identity and power are at stake in intercultural communication.

3. Subjects and Research Site

The subjects of this study are:

- Six (6) BKD assessors with at least three years of experience;
- Digital immigrant lecturers who have shifted from manual to digital reporting in the last five years.

The research is located at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak, West Kalimantan Province, a public university in Indonesia that employs a standardized online BKD reporting system.

Purposive sampling is used to select participants. To bolster validity, the study also employs triangulation (data, source, and theoretical triangulation).

4. Data Collection Techniques

Several data-gathering techniques are used to uncover the experiences and perceptions of the subjects:

- **In-depth interviews** with assessors and lecturers to understand the dynamics of their communication within the BKD reporting process.
- **Document analysis** of BKD reports, assessment guidelines, and evaluation records to identify discursive structures and norms.
- **Limited participatory observation** of the report preparation process and evaluator interactions, to capture cultural dynamics and nonverbal communication.

5. Data Analysis Techniques

Data are analyzed using **Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)** as developed by Norman Fairclough (2010), in conjunction with the framework of Critical Intercultural Communication. Analytical steps include:

1. **Textual description:** Identifying words, phrases, and symbols in BKD reports and in interactions between assessors and lecturers.
2. **Interpretation of discursive practice:** Relating report texts to socio-cultural practices, such as how assessors define “ideal work.”
3. **Socio-cultural explanation:** Placing communicative practices in the context of broader power structures, for example, digitalization as a dominant ideology in BKD reporting.

CDA aligns well with Foucault’s and Sorrells’ theories, as it connects discourse, power, and cultural practice in critical analysis (Fairclough, 2010).

6. Methodological Conclusion

This methodology is designed to deeply investigate the dynamics of power and culture in BKD workload reporting, using a critical qualitative framework that integrates theories of intercultural communication, critical pedagogy, Foucaultian discourse, and face-negotiation. The combination of data collection methods—interviews, document analysis, and participatory observation—allows the researcher to identify power relations within interactions between lecturers and assessors. The use of Critical Discourse Analysis provides profound insight into how the BKD system, as an administrative mechanism, shapes academic subjectivity and either reinforces or alters existing power structures.

4. Results

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Digital Immigrant Lecturers (DILs) in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak – 2025

No	Birth Year	Field of Study	Public Administration		Sociology	
			Male	Female	Male	Female
1	1955–1959		–	1	–	–
2	1960–1970		20	7	8	7
3	1971–1978		–	4	2	1
4	1980–1988		7	5	3	3
5	1989–1995		12	11	1	12
	Total		44	28	14	23

Source: Author's field data (May 2025)

Interpretation of Results

A substantial proportion of these lecturers were born between **1946 and 1964**, falling within the **Baby Boomer** generation. According to generational theory, Baby Boomers tend to perceive technology as a domain governed by experts and institutional authorities, often showing a cautious or skeptical stance toward digital transformation (Prensky, 2001; Tapscott, 2009). For many in this group, the shift from analog to digital systems—such as in the academic performance reporting platform (BKD)—represents not merely a technical transition but a **deep cultural and epistemic shift**. Their reluctance or resistance to adaptation can be understood as a reaction to this profound restructuring of academic work modalities. In contrast, lecturers born between **1965 and 1980** belong to **Generation X**, often characterized as the first generation to engage directly with emerging personal computing technologies. Having witnessed the evolution from analog to digital systems, Generation X lecturers are generally more **technologically literate** and **adaptable** to change (Selwyn, 2016; Kocayörük & Olgan, 2020). Their experiences with early digital tools provide them with a relatively smoother cultural transition into current digital academic systems. These generational distinctions are not merely demographic, but **epistemological and communicative**. Baby Boomers may find it challenging to reconcile their analog pedagogical paradigms with the **performance metrics, visibility logic, and algorithmic rationality** imposed by digital reporting systems like SISTER (Coudry & Mejias, 2019). Meanwhile, Generation X lecturers—although more digitally fluent—may still grapple with the institutionalization of these systems and their embedded technocratic ideologies. Thus, this demographic mapping offers a critical foundation for understanding the broader **cultural migration** and **intergenerational tensions** in adapting to digital academic governance, especially as they intersect with power relations in the BKD assessment process.

Table 2
Demographic Overview of Lecturers as Assessors
at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak

No	Assessor's Age	Ethnicity
1	49 years	Malay Pontianak
2	60 years	Chinese Javanese
3	61 years	Bugis
4	46 years	Malay Pontianak
5	65 years	Malay Sintang
6	62 years	Javanese

Source: Author's field data (September 2025)

Interpretation of Results

Table 2 presents the **demographic profile** of the lecturers serving as **assessors** at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak. This table highlights the **age distribution** and **ethnic diversity** of the assessors involved in the **Beban Kerja Dosen (BKD)** evaluation process. The assessors vary in age, ranging from **46 to 65 years**, indicating a mix of **generations** within the faculty. This generational variation suggests differing levels of **digital literacy**, with older assessors potentially encountering challenges related to the **digitalization of academic work** (Prensky, 2001; Selwyn, 2016). The presence of assessors

from diverse ethnic backgrounds, including **Malay Pontianak, Chinese Javanese, Bugis, Malay Sintang, and Javanese**, reflects the cultural **heterogeneity** within the faculty, which may influence how academic work is **evaluated** and **perceived** within this **institutional framework** (Sorrells, 2016). The **ethnic diversity** of the assessors plays a significant role in shaping their approaches to academic assessment, particularly in the context of **intercultural communication** (Ting-Toomey, 2005). Differences in **cultural norms** and **values** may influence the way assessors interpret academic work, particularly when dealing with **digital immigrants** who may bring **non-digital** cultural practices into the **formal evaluation** system (Foucault, 1977). Given the **intergenerational and intercultural diversity** of the assessors, the study underscores the need to explore how these variables intersect with **epistemic power relations** in the digital evaluation process.

4.1. Epistemic Inequality between Assessors and Digital Immigrant Lecturers

4.1.1 Cultural Gap in the Digital Lecturer Workload Reporting System (BKD)

Research

How does the digitized lecturer workload reporting system (BKD) create new cultural norms that are difficult for digital immigrant lecturers to access or comprehend?

Problem:

Theoretical

In the context of intercultural communication, the digital transition is not merely a technological change but also a form of cultural migration that compels adaptation to new value systems, practices, and epistemic logics (Sorrells, 2016; Kim, 2001). However, systems such as the BKD were not designed with consideration for the cultural diversity of lecturers, particularly those transitioning from the analog to the digital era (Prensky, 2001; Selwyn, 2016).

Justification:

4.1. Focus 1: Cultural Negotiation in the Digitalization of BKD Reporting

Focus:

To identify how digital immigrant lecturers navigate the cultural shifts in the lecturer workload reporting (BKD) system, and the subsequent impact on their understanding, engagement, and academic performance.

Guiding Focus Question:

How does digital cultural migration affect the adaptation of digital immigrant lecturers in meeting the standards of lecturer workload reporting (BKD)?

Cultural Gap Analysis in the Digital Lecturer Workload Reporting System (BKD)

Sub-Topic 4.1.1:

How does the BKD reporting system represent the dominant digital cultural values that are exclusive to digital immigrant lecturers?

Explanation:

This section focuses on how technology, terminology, and reporting procedures within the BKD system are shaped by values such as efficiency, speed, and seamless digital interaction—values that are more attuned to **digital natives** than to **digital immigrants**.

Objective:

To demonstrate that technology is not neutral, but embedded with specific cultural values (Selwyn, 2016).

Supporting Theory:

Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016); Technocultural Hegemony (Andrejevic, 2009).

Analytical Exposure: The Non-Neutrality of the Lecturer Workload Reporting System (BKD) in the Digital Cultural Context

The **Lecturer Workload Reporting System (BKD)** is a digital instrument that mandates lecturers to periodically report their academic workload. On the surface, this system appears to be a neutral and efficient technological solution. However, a deeper analysis reveals that the system represents certain **cultural values**, namely, a digital culture aligned with **digital natives**—those who grew up with technology.

In contrast, **digital immigrant lecturers**, particularly senior faculty who did not grow up with digital technology and have only adopted it later in life, often encounter difficulties in accessing and fully utilizing the reporting system. As a result, the BKD reporting system implicitly creates **digital and cultural exclusion**.

The reporting system is structured around principles that prioritize **speed, efficiency, and seamless digital operation**, which are inherent to **digital natives** but present significant barriers for **digital immigrants**. This can create an invisible **epistemic inequality** between these two groups, as digital immigrant lecturers are forced to adapt to a technological framework that does not resonate with their previous experiences or ways of knowing (Selwyn, 2016). This underscores that the **digitalization of academic practices** is not merely a technical shift, but a **cultural migration** that impacts the very structure of academic labor and evaluation.

Interpretation and Discussion:

The BKD system is a clear example of how technology is never neutral. Its structure embeds a **dominant digital culture** that privileges certain values—speed, efficiency, and seamless interaction—while disregarding the **cultural and epistemic differences** of those who were not part of the early technological revolution (Andrejevic, 2009). For **digital immigrants**, especially older lecturers, these norms can be difficult to internalize or comply with, leading to a form of **digital marginalization**. This scenario reflects a **cultural tension** that goes beyond mere technical issues and calls for a deeper understanding of the **power dynamics** inherent in the digital transformation of academia.

Theoretical and Critical Analysis

Aspect	Critical Analysis	Scholarly Source
Technology is not Neutral	The lecturer workload reporting system (BKD) is not merely a technical tool but a cultural artifact imbued with values of efficiency, speed, and automation—values that are not universal for all lecturers. This system represents what Selwyn (2016) refers to as "the myth of technological neutrality," where technology is assumed to be neutral but in reality reflects the interests and values of the dominant group.	Selwyn, N. (2016). <i>Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates</i> . Bloomsbury.
Technocultural Hegemony	In the context of BKD, the dominant digital cultural values create a form of technocultural hegemony (Andrejevic, 2009), where the experiences and comfort of digital natives are taken as the norm. Digital immigrant lecturers	Andrejevic, M. (2009). <i>iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era</i> . University Press of Kansas.

Aspect	Critical Analysis	Scholarly Source
	who have not internalized these values are seen as ‘inept,’ not because of inability but because the system is designed without accounting for their needs.	
Access and Representation Inequality	The BKD reporting system operates with complex technical and procedural language, which is communicatively "inclusive" only for users who are already familiar with digital terminology and online management systems. Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016) explains that such technology can become a tool for communicative exclusion because it does not account for cultural diversity in communication and technological experiences.	Sorrells, K. (2016). <i>Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice</i> . SAGE.
Social and Institutional Consequences	When digital immigrant lecturers feel alienated, face difficulties, or are even "ashamed to ask," they tend to be inactive in reporting. This is not only a technical issue but relates to access to digital justice and academic participation. The long-term consequence can be structural marginalization within the academic system.	Sorrells (2016); Selwyn (2016).

Source: Author’s Data (September, 2025).

Conclusion: Technology Holds Values and Creates Inequities

The lecturer workload reporting system (BKD) functions not only as an administrative tool but also as an ideological medium that reinforces the dominance of certain digital cultures. By designing a system focused on efficiency, speed, and seamlessness—without considering the diverse digital competencies of lecturers—the system has the potential to systematically exclude digital immigrant lecturers.

Critical Implications:

- The system design must be inclusive, taking into account the digital diversity among lecturers.
- Intercultural training is necessary to bridge the digital and cultural gaps.
- The evaluation of technology should not solely be based on functionality, but also on the values and power structures it carries (Selwyn, 2016).

Several aspects are embedded within the lecturer workload reporting system (BKD), which can be better understood through the theoretical frameworks used by the author. The impact on digital immigrant lecturers, when striving to become professionals in their work performance and adopting new values inherent in the digitization of the reporting system, results in a unified approach to providing education and teaching for students.

Conclusion: Technology Embodies Values and Creates Inequality

The Faculty Workload Reporting System (Beban Kerja Dosen/BKD) does not merely serve as an administrative tool but also functions as an ideological medium that reinforces the dominance of specific digital cultural values. By designing a system that prioritizes efficiency, speed, and smoothness—without considering the digital competencies of diverse lecturers—the system has the potential to systematically exclude digital immigrant lecturers.

Critical Implications:

- The system design must be inclusive, taking into account the digital diversity among lecturers.
- Intercultural training is necessary to bridge the digital and cultural gaps.
- Evaluating technology should not be based solely on functionality but also on the values and power it brings (Selwyn, 2016).

Several aspects are embedded within the Beban Kerja Dosen/BKD reporting system. These can be explained through the theories utilized by the author, along with the impacts on digital immigrant lecturers as they are encouraged to become more professional in their performance and capable of adopting the new values embedded in the digitalization of the reporting system.

This alignment contributes to the integration of teaching and learning for students. The following outlines key aspects:

Aspect	Explanation	Impact on Digital Immigrant Lecturers	Theoretical Foundation and Literature
Technology in BKD Reporting	The BKD reporting system is designed with a focus on a digital interface emphasizing speed and efficiency. Interactive dashboards, electronic forms, and process automation support a seamless experience for users familiar with the latest digital technology (digital natives).	Digital immigrant lecturers, unfamiliar with modern interfaces and automation, often experience navigation difficulties, leading to resistance and stress.	Selwyn (2016) emphasizes that technology is not neutral; it is shaped by specific cultural values reflecting the needs of dominant groups (digital natives).
Terminology and Language	Technical terms and digital jargon such as "upload", "real-time update", "dashboard analytics", and "automated validation" become communication standards in the BKD system. These terms are easy for digital natives to understand but confusing for digital immigrants.	Understanding barriers lead to difficulty in reporting, reducing participation, and compromising the accuracy of the BKD report by digital immigrant lecturers.	Sorrells (2016), in <i>Critical Intercultural Communication Theory</i> , highlights the importance of intercultural communication differences and the implications of unequal access to information.

Aspect	Explanation	Impact on Digital Immigrant Lecturers	Theoretical Foundation and Literature
Reporting Procedures	The procedures prioritize speed and smoothness with tight deadlines and minimal adaptive training for new users, reflecting a high-efficiency cultural orientation.	Digital immigrant lecturers need more time to adapt, and these procedures may result in stress and repeated reporting errors.	Andrejevic (2009) examines technocultural hegemony, showing how the dominance of certain digital cultures can marginalize other groups that do not conform to such standards.
Dominant Digital Cultural Values	Values of efficiency, speed, and automation become priorities in the design of the BKD system, reflecting the values of digital natives who are more adaptive to new technology and multitasking.	Digital immigrants feel sidelined as these values ignore the learning and adaptation processes they require, exacerbating the digital divide.	Selwyn (2016) shows that technology implies and reinforces specific cultural values, often exclusive of digital minorities.
Social and Cultural Consequences	This digital cultural imbalance can deepen the digital divide in the academic environment, hinder cross-generational collaboration, and reinforce the marginalization of digital immigrant lecturers.	Reduced participation and contribution by digital immigrant lecturers in BKD reporting, potentially hindering their career development.	Sorrells (2016) emphasizes the importance of critical awareness of cultural and communication differences in technology to prevent the hegemonization of certain cultures.

Source: Author's Data (September, 2025).

Summary of Analysis

The Faculty Workload Reporting System (Beban Kerja Dosen/BKD) inherently represents the dominant digital cultural values that prioritize efficiency, speed, and seamless digital experiences—values that align more closely with the characteristics of digital natives. This creates an exclusionary effect for digital immigrant lecturers, who often face adaptation challenges due to differences in digital culture, comfort with technology, and the technical language used. Further, Selwyn (2016) asserts that technology is not neutral but embodies specific cultural values. When the BKD system is designed with the values of digital natives in mind, it tends to marginalize groups that do not align with those values. This is reinforced by the concept of technocultural hegemony (Andrejevic, 2009), which explains how the dominance of certain digital cultures can hinder the participation of digital minority groups. Additionally, Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016) emphasizes the importance of understanding intercultural communication and the values embedded within technology, so that the reporting system can be made inclusive and supportive of user diversity.

Subsection 4.1.2: Forms of Access, Understanding, and Participation Inequality Experienced by Digital Immigrant Lecturers in the Faculty Workload Reporting System (BKD)

Explanation:

This section delves into the empirical experiences of lecturers who face limitations in digital literacy, technology access, and understanding of the frequently changing Faculty Workload Reporting System (BKD) procedures.

Objective:

The goal is to uncover the dimensions of cultural gaps that are systemic rather than merely technical.

Supporting Theories:

- **Digital Cultural Capital** (Bourdieu, modified by Hargittai, 2010)
- **Cross-Cultural Adaptation Theory** (Kim, 2001)

The following table (Table 3) presents some empirical experiences from lecturers encountering limitations in digital literacy, technology access, and interpretation of the evolving BKD procedures:

Table

3

Empirical Experiences of Lecturers in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD)

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Related Sources
Digital Literacy Limitations	Lecturers with limited understanding and use of digital technology struggle to comply with the digital BKD reporting procedures. This is linked to reliance on ever-evolving technology without adequate training.	Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)	Sorrells, K. (2016); Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010)
Limited Access to Technology	Lecturers in certain institutions or regions with inadequate access to hardware and internet are hindered in fulfilling their online BKD reporting duties. This limitation exacerbates inequality in academic evaluation.	Power and Discourse Theory – Foucault	Foucault, M. (1977; 1980)
Shifting BKD Procedures	The inconsistent and often changing BKD reporting procedures cause confusion among lecturers, especially those newly adapting to the digital system. This lack of clarity contributes to inaccurate performance assessment.	Critical Pedagogy – Paulo Freire	Freire, P. (1970); Sorrells, K. (2016)
Disparity in Experiences	Lecturers with prior experience in technology (digital natives) find it	Critical Intercultural Communication	Sorrells, K. (2016);

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Related Sources
between Digital Natives and Immigrants	easier to adapt to the BKD system compared to digital immigrant lecturers, who have less experience with digital devices. This creates inequality in reporting and evaluation.	(CIC), Power Theory – Foucault	Foucault, M. (1980)
Issues of Openness and Transparency of Procedures	Some lecturers report a lack of transparency in the BKD reporting procedures, leading to confusion regarding the evaluation standards and performance assessment. This ambiguity results in uncertainty and unfairness.	Power and Discourse Theory – Foucault	Foucault, M. (1977)
System Changes and Uncertainty	Lecturers accustomed to manual procedures feel anxious about sudden changes in the reporting system, leading to adaptation difficulties. They require more time to adjust to the new procedures.	Critical Pedagogy – Paulo Freire	Freire, P. (1970); Sorrells, K. (2016)

Source: Author's Data (September 2025).

Explanation and Critical Analysis:

Digital Literacy Limitations:

Lecturers with limited digital literacy face difficulties in following the digital procedures for Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD). This suggests that digital literacy is not only a technical skill but also a cultural aspect of communication that should be considered within the educational system (Sorrells, 2016). This limitation can lead to inequality in the academic performance evaluations of lecturers.

Limited Access to Technology:

Limited access to technology poses a significant barrier to the implementation of the digital BKD reporting system. This issue is not just about accessibility; it is also connected to the power dynamics involved in accessing equal resources, a major concern in Foucault's Power and Discourse Theory (Foucault, 1980). Unequal access to technology exacerbates disparities in the evaluation of lecturers' performance.

Changing Interpretations of BKD Procedures:

Constant changes in the procedures for reporting faculty workload create confusion among lecturers, especially those who are not yet familiar with the new system. This leads to a disparity in understanding between more experienced lecturers and those who are still adapting to the new system. Critical Pedagogy (Freire, 1970) emphasizes the importance of critical awareness in this process, where lecturers need a clear understanding and transparency in the procedures to enhance fairness and clarity in evaluations.

Disparity in the Experiences of Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants:

Lecturers who are already familiar with digital technology can adapt more quickly to the BKD reporting system compared to digital immigrant lecturers. This inequality creates a disparity in the evaluation system, where lecturers with a stronger technological background have an advantage in performance assessments.

Issues of Openness and Transparency in Procedures:

A lack of transparency and openness in the BKD reporting procedures leads to difficulties for lecturers in understanding what should be reported and how their performance will be evaluated. This exacerbates uncertainty and anxiety related to fairness in the evaluation process.

System Changes and Uncertainty:

Sudden changes in the reporting procedures, especially those related to digitalization, make it difficult for lecturers to adapt. This can lead to a decline in lecturers' self-confidence, which ultimately affects the quality of reporting and the outcomes of performance evaluations.

Critical Conclusion:

Lecturers who face limitations in digital literacy and access to technology find themselves in a challenging position within the digital Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system. This inequality has the potential to lead to unfair evaluations, where technological skills become the primary criterion for assessing academic performance. Moreover, the frequent changes in procedures exacerbate uncertainty among lecturers, creating disparities in the understanding of the reporting processes. To ensure fairness in performance evaluations, transparency and openness in reporting procedures must be enhanced. As a solution, it is crucial to adopt a more inclusive approach in the BKD system that values the diverse experiences and contexts of lecturers.

Digital Inequalities in the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) System: Access, Literacy, and Cultural Adaptation of Digital Immigrant Lecturers

1. Theoretical Background

Theoretical Concept	Brief Explanation	Academic Source
Digital Cultural Capital	Modified from Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital, Hargittai (2010) defines digital cultural capital as the knowledge, skills, and confidence in using digital technology, which is not uniformly distributed.	Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital Na(t)ives? Variation in Internet Skills and Uses. <i>Social Inquiry</i> , 80(1).
Cross-Cultural Adaptation Theory	Kim (2001) explains that individuals entering a new cultural environment need to undergo a gradual, complex adaptation process, including acculturation to communication norms, with technology being a key part of the dominant culture.	Kim, Y. Y. (2001). <i>Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation.</i>

Source: Data from the Author (September 2025).

2. Forms of Inequality Experienced by Digital Immigrant Lecturers in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD)

Dimension of Inequality	Smart & Accurate Description	Systemic Impact
Access to Technology and Infrastructure	Not all lecturers have equal access to compatible devices, stable internet connections, and technical support. Senior lecturers in rural areas or smaller campuses often face infrastructure limitations. This highlights that the digitalization of the BKD system has not accounted for the structural inequalities within the academic environment.	Digital isolation; Reporting delays; Increased administrative burden
Digital Literacy and Technical Competence	Digital immigrant lecturers have lower digital cultural capital. They often feel insecure when trying to understand new interfaces, file upload formats, or using technical features in the BKD application. The system's constant changes, without adequate socialization, exacerbate this inequality.	Dependence on others; Frustration; Potential reporting errors
Interpretation of BKD Procedures	Digital immigrant lecturers often face confusion due to changes in regulations and administrative terms that are not culturally explained. Reporting procedures are not only technical but also carry new norms and practices of digital bureaucracy, which are difficult for those unfamiliar with digital ethics (e.g., automatic deadlines, system notifications, or digital evaluation formats).	Distorted meaning; Perceived irrelevance to the system; Administrative anxiety
Participation in the Digital System	Due to access barriers and lack of understanding, digital immigrant lecturers tend to reduce participation in training forums, self-filling tasks, or even in voicing the challenges they face. This forms a vicious circle of digital exclusion, where initial limitations lead to deeper inequalities over time.	Structural marginalization; Inequitable BKD assessment
Internalization of Digital Culture	The process of adapting to digital norms requires time and support. According to Kim (2001), successful cultural adaptation demands two-way accommodation. In the BKD system, there is insufficient space for cultural negotiation between digital immigrant lecturers and the system. Instead, the system tends to impose the norms of digital natives.	Feelings of exclusion; Resistance to digitalization

Source: Data from the Author (September 2025).

3. Critical Analysis: The Gap is Not an Individual Issue, But a Systemic Cultural Issue

The gap experienced by digital immigrant lecturers is not simply a matter of "not being able to use technology," but rather a reflection of the unequal distribution of **digital cultural capital** (Hargittai, 2010) and the systemic failure to accommodate **cross-cultural adaptation** processes (Kim, 2001). The Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system has indeed become an instrument that reproduces inequality, functioning as more than just an administrative tool. In fact, digitization that fails to consider access, literacy, and cultural context will create biased reporting that favors those who are already digitally established while simultaneously alienating lecturers who lack the valuable experience and adequate digital capital.

Conclusion:

Through the frameworks of **digital cultural capital** and **cross-cultural adaptation theory**, it becomes clear that the challenges of Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) for digital immigrant lecturers are a reflection of structural and cultural digital injustice. To achieve a fair and inclusive reporting system, transformation is needed not only in the design of technology but also in the values and cultural assumptions underlying it.

Subsection 4.1.3: How Do Interactions Between Assessors and Lecturers Reflect Cross-Cultural Communication Inequalities in the Performance Reporting Context?

Explanation:

This section analyzes the communication processes—both oral and written—between assessors and lecturers within the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system, including the correction process, self-reporting, and document validation.

Objective:

To examine how power relations, communication styles, and institutional expectations create cultural distances between the evaluator and the evaluated.

Supporting Theories:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication Theory** (Sorrells, 2016)
- **Institutional Discourse Analysis** (Foucault, 1977)

Analysis of Subsection 4.1.3: Cross-Cultural Communication Inequality Between Assessors and Lecturers in the BKD Reporting Process

1. Problem Background

The BKD reporting process (Faculty Workload Reporting) involves not only the interaction between the digital system and users, but also between human institutional actors: the reporting lecturer and the evaluating assessor. These interactions occur in various forms of communication: emails, online systems, face-to-face discussions, and written comments within the system. While seemingly ordinary administrative exchanges, these interactions are deeply embedded with cultural communication inequalities and institutionalized power relations.

2. Theoretical Framework

Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016) highlights the complexities of communication across different cultural backgrounds and the inherent power structures within institutions. This theory suggests that communication, particularly in institutional contexts like BKD reporting, is shaped by cultural norms, expectations, and practices that may marginalize certain groups based on their digital literacy and experience.

Institutional Discourse Analysis (Foucault, 1977) allows for an examination of the discourse and power dynamics within institutional settings. In this case, it can help explore how institutional norms around reporting and evaluation are framed, and how these norms often

reflect the values of the dominant cultural group, in this instance, **digital natives**, marginalizing those who are less familiar with the technological or institutional practices.

3. Theoretical Foundation

Theory	Key Concepts	Relevance
Critical Intercultural Communication Theory (Sorrells, 2016)	Cross-cultural communication is not neutral; it is always bound by power relations and dominant social structures.	Used to analyze how the communication style of assessors (often from dominant digital/institutional groups) may not align with the communication expectations of digital immigrant lecturers.
Institutional Discourse Analysis (Foucault, 1977)	Institutional discourse not only conveys information but also disciplines subjects through language, corrections, and administrative norms.	Unpacks how the assessor-lecturer interactions in the validation process reinforce institutional authority through language and corrections.

Source: Author's Data (September 2025).

4. Forms of Communication Inequality in Assessor-Lecturer Interactions

Aspect	Manifestation in Practice	Critical Analysis	References
Asymmetric Communication Style	Corrective comments from assessors are often direct, concise, and instructional. For example: "Revise due to format error," without further explanation.	This reflects high-context expectations from the assessor and a low-support style that creates a cultural communication gap. Digital immigrant lecturers, especially those accustomed to more collaborative communication styles, may feel marginalized.	Sorrells (2016)
Technical Language and Institutional Discourse	Assessors often use technical administrative terms: "Invalid SKS," "Not counted in BKD workload," "Output not verified by the system."	This language solidifies an authoritative discourse, symbolically positioning the assessor as the holder of institutional knowledge, and the lecturer as a subject to follow.	Foucault (1977); Sorrells (2016)
Lack of Dialogical Space	The process for clarification or objection to assessor corrections is highly limited. Digital systems often lack features for equal two-way communication.	The discourse is vertical and one-directional, blocking resistance, meaning negotiation, or cultural interpretation from the lecturer. This forms a type of symbolic violence within the institutional realm.	Foucault (1977); Bourdieu (1991)

Aspect	Manifestation in Practice	Critical Analysis	References
Hidden Cultural Expectations	Assessors sometimes assume that lecturers should "already know" certain assessment mechanisms or standards without explicit explanation.	These implicit expectations reflect institutional norms that are never openly communicated but are instead hegemonically passed down. This becomes an obstacle for new lecturers or digital immigrants.	Sorrells (2016)

Source: Author's Data (September 2025)

5. Micro-Macro Integration: From Experience to Structure

Micro Level	Macro Level	Explanation
Lecturers feel rigidly corrected and are not given space to explain the context of their academic work.	Institutions design evaluation systems that emphasize control and standardization rather than meaning negotiation or flexibility in evaluation.	This communication inequality cannot be separated from the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system, which prioritizes administrative discipline over professional dialogue.

Source: Author's Data (September 2025)

6. Critical Conclusion

The interaction between assessors and lecturers in the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) process becomes a site where power relations and cultural dynamics operate symbolically. The instructional communication style, use of institutional discourse, and the limited space for clarification suggest that this system is not culturally neutral. As Sorrells (2016) notes, intercultural communication within higher education institutions always involves power dynamics and the dominance of particular values. In the context of BKD, assessors often serve as representatives of digital and institutional authority, while lecturers—especially those from digital immigrant backgrounds—find themselves in a subordinated position, not just administratively but also symbolically. Furthermore, Foucault's (1977) approach to institutional discourse highlights that through corrective and procedural language, assessors do not merely evaluate documents but also discipline the academic bodies of lecturers, reinforcing power structures within the bureaucracy of higher education.

Reflective Conclusion:

This exposition highlights that the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) process is not merely a technical procedure, but rather a cultural and political process that reflects both structural and symbolic inequalities within higher education institutions. To create a fair and equitable evaluation system, it is essential to design a communication framework that is dialogic and sensitive to the diverse academic cultures present within the institution.

4.2. Faculty Workload Reporting /BKD as an Arena of Face Negotiation in the High-Context Culture of Malay Ethnicity

4.2.1. How does the communication structure in Faculty Workload Reporting /BKD at FISIP Untan Pontianak reflect the dynamics of "face negotiation" between digital immigrant lecturers and assessors, especially in relation to the reliance on indirect communication in the Malay culture, which values social conformity and hierarchical respect?

Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (Sorrells, 2016; Halualani & Nakayama, 2010):** Applied to identify the dominance of digital culture in BKD communication and to position digital immigrant lecturers within institutional communication structures. CIC focuses on power, social position, and historical context in shaping intercultural relationships.
- **Face Negotiation Theory – Ting Toomey (2005):** Applied to explain how senior lecturers navigate cultural conflicts in their interactions with BKD assessors, with a focus on how social identity and power are at stake in cross-cultural communication.

In high-context cultures such as Malay culture, communication tends to be implicit, dependent on context and interpersonal relationships, and prioritizes respect and hierarchical honor (Hall, 1976; Gudykunst, 2004). When digital immigrant lecturers interact with assessors in the BKD system, they engage in face negotiation, a process of maintaining or restoring face in the presence of those who hold authority over their performance evaluations. As the technocratic culture, which dominates digital reporting in Indonesian universities, becomes more globalized, digital immigrant lecturers, especially those accustomed to manual reporting systems, may experience tension in their efforts to preserve face, a value rooted in their high-context cultural background. The central question here is how they negotiate with assessors who may be more comfortable with the direct and explicit nature of digital performance evaluation systems.

Critical Analysis:

Sub-Question 1 explores how the interaction between digital immigrant lecturers and assessors in the context of Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) can be seen as a process of face negotiation. In Malay culture, communication demands the preservation of honor and social relationships through indirect means. With the shift to digital systems in academic reporting, older or less tech-savvy lecturers must confront significant changes in communication modes. By applying Face Negotiation Theory, we can analyze how cultural perceptions and engagement in intercultural communication influence evaluation outcomes, which are often overshadowed by the desire to preserve "face" in a formal and structured context.

Conclusion:

In the context of Malay culture, which emphasizes indirect communication and respect for social hierarchy, the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) process becomes a complex arena of face negotiation. Digital immigrant lecturers—especially those who are senior or less experienced with technology—face challenges in preserving their "face" when interacting with assessors who act as evaluators of power in the digital system. Ting-Toomey (2005) argues that in high-context cultures, communication relies more on social conformity and is often indirect, which creates tension in interactions. Senior lecturers, who may not possess the same digital competencies as their younger colleagues, must navigate a space where they are not only assessed based on technical competence but also must maintain their social integrity in a system that is more inclined to prioritize digital and quantitative standards.

This digital-based performance evaluation system may overlook or diminish non-technical contributions highly valued in Malay culture, such as collaborative and affective work. Therefore, face negotiation in this context is not just about recognition of performance but also about how digital immigrant lecturers can preserve their identity and status within a system that is more structured and oriented toward visible, digital outcomes.

4.2.2. In the context of Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) evaluations, how do assessors, as agents of digital culture, respond to the differences in academic performance frameworks between digital immigrant lecturers and younger or more technologically experienced lecturers, while considering the power relations inherent in the hierarchical and technology-based academic communication structure?

In the context of Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD), assessors are not just administrative evaluators; they also act as cultural agents, assessing according to prevailing institutional and technocratic norms. In Malay culture, which highly values hierarchy and respect for seniority, assessors in higher positions within the academic structure may face challenges in evaluating digital immigrant lecturers, particularly senior lecturers who are not fully accustomed to digital systems. Foucault's (1977) **Theory of Discourse and Power** explains that power is not only repressive but also productive—it shapes individuals through norms and classifications governed by dominant discourse. In this case, assessors function as guardians of the "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977), which dictates what forms of academic performance are considered legitimate, typically emphasizing productivity focused on quantification and visibility. This often disregards the work of digital immigrant lecturers, who prioritize value-based work and experience. This study aims to explore how assessors respond to the epistemic differences between digital native lecturers and digital immigrants, and how the power discourse within the Faculty Workload Reporting system influences their interpretation of academic performance.

Critical Analysis:

Sub-question 2 focuses on the role of assessors as agents of power in evaluating faculty performance. As digital audit systems increasingly dominate, pushing for performance standards based on quantification, assessors become key figures in determining the legitimacy of academic work. Here, we can apply Foucault's theory of power to analyze how dominant discourses regarding academic performance are produced and reinforced within this digital system. The differences between tech-savvy lecturers and those less experienced with technology highlight tensions in the epistemic negotiation between local culture and the technocratic culture that governs performance reporting. This approach allows for an identification of intercultural conflicts during the evaluation process, as well as the power dynamics involved in assessing academic performance at FISIP Untan Pontianak.

Conclusion:

The Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) process in higher education, especially when mediated through a digital system rooted in technocracy, exposes tensions between modern discourses of performance that prioritize quantification and digital visibility, and non-digital performance frameworks that are more contextual and value-based in local cultures. Assessors play the role of power agents in facilitating this evaluative system, but they are often trapped within the structural discourse that prioritizes global productivity standards. Foucault (1977) argues that power in the form of administrative discourse not only represses but also shapes reality, creating "regimes of truth" that overlook unquantifiable contributions within the digital system.

For digital immigrant lecturers, particularly those who are more senior and accustomed to manual or traditional systems, adapting to values that are not always aligned with the digitized, quantification-driven evaluation approach is a significant challenge. The assessor's role as gatekeeper of this dominant discourse highlights the power relations between the traditional values represented by senior lecturers and the more standardized, objective evaluation culture based on technology. This mismatch reveals an epistemic tension, where performance evaluation is not only based on technological competence but also on the perceptions of

assessors who are often more influenced by technocratic norms than local values or community-based work.

2. Overall Analysis:

Both sub-questions highlight how intercultural communication and face negotiation influence the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) process within an academic context that is increasingly centered around digital systems. In high-context cultures such as the Malay culture, social relationships and respect for hierarchy play a crucial role in determining how performance evaluations are carried out. On the other hand, digital technology introduces an evaluative logic that is more quantitative and standardized, often unable to capture the cultural and social dimensions that are highly valued in traditional cultures.

The interaction between digital immigrant lecturers and assessors reveals a conflict between the cultural identity of senior lecturers and the technology-driven evaluation standards that are increasingly dominating the academic system. The process of face negotiation becomes essential to understand, as it relates not only to technological adaptation but also to how digital immigrant lecturers can maintain their position in an academic world that is becoming increasingly oriented toward digital productivity.

Table 4.4

Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) as an Arena of Face Negotiation in the Context of High-Context Malay Culture

Phenomenon	Explanation	Relevant Theoretical Concepts	Related Sources
Face Negotiation Between Digital Immigrant Lecturers and Assessors	In Malay culture, which prioritizes indirect communication, senior digital immigrant lecturers strive to maintain their dignity during the evaluation interaction with assessors. These interactions are often implicit and highly context-dependent.	Face Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey, 2005)	Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). <i>The Matrix of Face Negotiation Theory: An Overview of a Dialectical Perspective. Communication Theory.</i>
Tension Between Digital and Non-Digital Performance	Assessors are more likely to evaluate performance based on measurable digital indicators, while senior digital immigrant lecturers may struggle to meet these standards, caught in a tension between local values and technocratic standards.	Face Negotiation and Power/Control Theory (Foucault, 1977)	Foucault, M. (1977). <i>Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.</i> Pantheon Books.
Indirect Communication in BKD Reporting	Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) in Malay culture tends to be indirect, with a strong emphasis on politeness. Senior digital immigrant	High-Context Culture (Hall, 1976)	Hall, E. T. (1976). <i>Beyond Culture.</i> Anchor Books.

Phenomenon	Explanation	Relevant Theoretical Concepts	Related Sources
	lecturers often avoid directly acknowledging their technological shortcomings, as doing so could be seen as impolite or self-deprecating.		
Evaluation as a Form of Social Surveillance	Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) becomes a site of social surveillance where lecturers, especially senior ones, must align with technocratic expectations established by the digital system. Assessors function as agents of power, evaluating according to standards that may not reflect local values.	Biopower and Surveillance (Foucault, 1980)	Foucault, M. (1980). <i>The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception</i> . Pantheon Books.
Hierarchy in Communication and Evaluation	In Malay culture, with its strong social hierarchy, assessors hold a higher position in the academic structure and serve as authority figures who set performance standards, both administratively and socially. Senior or digital immigrant lecturers must maintain their social status during the evaluation process.	Social Structure and Hierarchy (Hall, 1976)	Hall, E. T. (1976). <i>Beyond Culture</i> . Anchor Books.
Conflict Between Technology and Cultural Identity	Digital immigrant lecturers, particularly senior ones, face an identity crisis when adapting to digital platforms that demand recognition for technology-based productivity. They feel that their cultural values, which emphasize social collaboration and affective pedagogy, are overlooked in this system.	Critical Intercultural Communication (Sorrells, 2016)	Sorrells, K. (2016). <i>Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice</i> . SAGE Publications.

Source: Data by Author (September 2025)

Analysis:

Through this analysis, it is evident that Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) becomes an arena of face negotiation that showcases the tension between the standardized digital culture and the Malay culture, which emphasizes indirect communication and respect for social hierarchy. The assessor plays a crucial gatekeeping role in evaluating faculty performance, often disregarding social values and community-based work. Meanwhile, digital immigrant lecturers—particularly senior ones—struggle to maintain their dignity in a system that increasingly focuses on quantification and digital visibility.

This system creates epistemic tension, which needs to be addressed with a more inclusive understanding of local values and more contextual academic practices. The focus on technocratic standards risks undermining the cultural and pedagogical contributions that are highly valued in Malay society, leading to a dissonance between the expectations of the digital academic system and the lived experiences of senior faculty members.

4.3. Reduction of Academic Performance into Quantitative Metrics that Overlook Reflective and Pedagogical Work

Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (Sorrells, 2016; Halualani & Nakayama, 2010):** This theory is used to identify the dominance of digital culture in BKD communication and position digital immigrant lecturers within the institutional communication structure. CIC focuses on power, social position, and historical context in shaping intercultural relationships.
- **Critical Pedagogy – Paulo Freire (Freire, 1970):** This theory analyzes BKD reporting systems as educational practices that either reinforce or transform power structures. The concepts of "critical consciousness" and "humanistic dialogue" help reveal how lecturers may experience dehumanization when evaluated against standards that do not take into account the diversity of cultural work practices.

Critical Analysis:

The reduction of academic performance in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) often overlooks the essential reflective and pedagogical practices that are central to higher education. According to Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC), performance measurements based solely on numbers and statistics fail to capture the complexity and richness of academic practices that occur outside of quantitative metrics. This creates tension between the academic identity of lecturers, which often emphasizes local values and affective teaching practices, and systems that prioritize measurable performance outcomes.

Sub-Question 2: How does the role of the assessor in the BKD reporting system reinforce or transform power structures in the evaluation of faculty performance, particularly in the context of work values that are not reflected in quantitative metrics?

Explanation of Sub-Question 2:

The role of the assessor in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) extends beyond that of a mere performance evaluator; they also serve as agents of power who define and regulate what constitutes legitimate academic value. When faculty performance is evaluated solely based on quantitative metrics, this evaluation process tends to overlook the diverse cultural work practices of faculty, including reflective pedagogy and collaborative interactions that are more difficult to measure. Critical Pedagogy will help analyze how the role of the assessor in this system functions as a controlling mechanism that normalizes what is considered legitimate academic performance, often marginalizing the aspects of social collaboration and local knowledge that cannot be captured in quantitative metrics.

Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (Sorrells, 2016):** This theory is employed to understand how assessors, as agents of power in intercultural communication, interact with faculty within a system that prioritizes quantification and standardization, while neglecting the richness of cultural and pedagogical values that are immeasurable.
- **Critical Pedagogy (Paulo Freire, 1970):** An analysis from the perspective of critical pedagogy will reveal how the BKD evaluation system can serve as a tool for either maintaining or transforming power structures in education, where non-quantifiable values like social work, critical consciousness, and humanistic dialogue are often sidelined.

Critical Analysis:

In Critical Intercultural Communication, the assessor functions as a power mediator who plays a dominant role in determining what counts as academic performance. However, within the Malay cultural context—where communication is refined and cultural diversity is emphasized—over-standardized assessments often treat unquantifiable work as illegitimate. This creates a tension between the academic identity of faculty, which is often focused on community-based teaching, and the role of the assessor, who prioritizes technocratic criteria.

The over-reliance on quantitative metrics in faculty evaluation is problematic because it fails to acknowledge the value of pedagogical approaches rooted in local cultures, collaborative knowledge-building, and critical teaching practices that are not easily measurable. This lack of recognition can lead to a devaluation of the holistic, community-oriented aspects of teaching that many senior faculty, especially digital immigrants, embody. The evaluator's role, in this context, reinforces a hierarchical power structure that marginalizes those who do not conform to the dominant digital, metric-driven framework.

This analysis underscores the importance of understanding how intercultural communication and pedagogical theories intersect in the evaluation of faculty performance, highlighting the need for a more inclusive approach that recognizes diverse forms of academic work beyond quantifiable measures. The imbalance between the local, affective pedagogies and the standardized, technocratic evaluation system calls for a rethinking of academic assessment practices that takes into account the broader, non-quantifiable aspects of teaching and learning.

Table 4.5

Analysis

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Relevant Source
Reduction of Academic Performance into Quantitative Metrics	The Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system evaluates faculty performance using standardized metrics, disregarding reflective and pedagogical values that are often more significant in local academic cultures.	Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)	Sorrells, K. (2016). <i>Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice</i> . SAGE.
Role of the Assessor in Evaluating	Assessors function as agents of power who evaluate faculty performance based on dominant metrics, without	Critical Pedagogy (Paulo Freire)	Freire, P. (1970). <i>Pedagogy of the Oppressed</i> . Continuum.

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Relevant Source
Faculty Performance	considering local cultural aspects or community-based teaching.		
Neglect of Work Culture Values in Evaluation	Evaluations based on quantitative metrics overlook non-measurable work culture aspects, such as deep reflective and pedagogical interactions.	Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) and Critical Pedagogy	Halualani, R., & Nakayama, T. (2010). <i>Theories of Intercultural Communication</i> . Oxford University Press.
Tension Between Evaluation System and Local Values	The Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system often creates tension between community-based local values and the technocratic standards that emphasize quantification, sidelining affective work and social collaboration.	CIC and Critical Pedagogy	Sorrells, K. (2016); Freire, P. (1970).

Source: Author's Data (September 2025)

Conclusion:

- The reduction of academic performance into quantitative metrics in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) contributes to the marginalization of the reflective and pedagogical dimensions that are central to academic culture, while also disregarding community-based teaching practices that hold greater value in high-context cultures like Malay society.
- The role of the assessor as an evaluator and control agent in this system strengthens power structures based on technocratic values, which risks overlooking the diversity of local work cultures, humanistic dialogue, and critical consciousness—elements that should be part of the evaluation process.

3. 4.4. The Role of the Assessor as a Symbolic Power Agent Reproducing Dominant Institutional Values

4. Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC)** (Sorrells, 2016; Halualani & Nakayama, 2010): This theory is used to identify the dominance of digital culture in BKD communication and to position digital immigrant faculty within the institutional communication structure. CIC focuses on power, social position, and historical context in shaping intercultural relationships.
- **Power and Discourse Theory – Michel Foucault** (Foucault, 1977; 1980): This theory analyzes how Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) shapes faculty subjects through discourse practices and evaluations that generate symbolic power. Assessors act as knowledge power agents, while BKD becomes part of the "regime of truth" within campus bureaucracy.

Sub-question 4.4.1: How does the role of assessors in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) function as a symbolic power agent that reproduces dominant institutional values in the context of a higher education system increasingly dominated by digital culture?

This study aims to understand how assessors in the BKD system function as symbolic power agents who not only evaluate but also reproduce dominant institutional values, particularly in the context of the shift toward digitalization. Thus, the assessor's evaluation can serve as an instrument that reinforces power structures in faculty workload communication, where digital culture values dominate, while more contextual and traditional values are often neglected.

Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) – Sorrells (2016):** This theory uncovers how assessors play a key role in shaping communication structures between faculty and institutions, identifying the dominance of digital culture influencing intercultural power relations within educational institutions.
- **Power and Discourse Theory – Foucault (1977, 1980):** Analyzes how discourse practices in BKD reporting act as symbolic power tools, where assessors act as agents who establish the "truth" and knowledge regarding what is considered ideal academic performance in the digital era.

Explanation and Critical Analysis:

- **The Assessor's Role as a Power Agent:** In the BKD evaluation system, assessors are not only evaluators but also power agents who produce and reproduce dominant discourses. Assessors often evaluate faculty based on more objective and standardized criteria, which may not reflect the diverse cultural contexts of faculty work, particularly for those transitioning from manual to digital systems (digital immigrant faculty).
- **Reproduction of Dominant Institutional Values:** In academic bureaucracy, assessors often judge faculty performance based on standards set by the institution, which typically prioritize numbers, productivity, and speed, while reflective processes and more subjective collaboration are sidelined. This illustrates how symbolic power acts to sustain dominant norms within the institution.
- **Dominance of Digital Culture:** The Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) theory explains how the digitalization of academic evaluation contributes to the marginalization of faculty who are not fully accustomed to technology. Assessments focusing on digital performance (such as the use of digital platforms in teaching) can overlook more local pedagogical values that are affective and community-based.

Table 4.6. Analysis

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Relevant Source
Symbolic Power Agent of Assessors	Assessors act as power agents in evaluating and reproducing dominant values in BKD.	CIC, Foucault's Discourse Theory	Sorrells, K. (2016); Foucault, M. (1980).
Reproduction of Digital Norms	Evaluation processes that focus on digitalization create standards that overlook local values.	CIC	Sorrells, K. (2016).

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Relevant Source
Marginalization of Traditional Culture	Faculty unfamiliar with digitalization face difficulties in a system that prioritizes numbers and quantitative metrics.	Foucault, CIC	Foucault, M. (1977); Sorrells, K. (2016).

Source: Author's Data (September 2025)

Critical Conclusion:

Assessors in the BKD system function not only as evaluators but also as symbolic power agents who reproduce dominant values in higher education. Evaluations focused on numbers and quantitative standards tend to neglect the pedagogical complexities rooted in the diverse work cultures of faculty members. Digital immigrant faculty, in particular, experience marginalization in an evaluation system that prioritizes digitalization, potentially overlooking their more reflective and collaborative contributions.

Sub-question 4.4.2: How does the discourse of assessment in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) shape faculty subjects through symbolic power practices transmitted by assessors in the context of digital culture dominance?

Focus:

This sub-question investigates how the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system functions as a discourse of power that shapes faculty subjects within the higher education system. This discourse is produced by assessors as power agents who evaluate academic performance in ways that reflect the dominant values of digitalization, often disregarding the critical dimensions of more localized and contextual pedagogies.

Theories Used:

- **Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) – Sorrells (2016):** This theory is used to analyze how the discourse in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) creates social positions for faculty, both digital natives and digital immigrants, in the context of a more dominant digital culture.
- **Power and Discourse Theory – Foucault (1977, 1980):** Analyzes how discourse practices in BKD act as power processes that shape faculty subjects according to the "regimen of truth" – the prevailing standards of digitalization and productivity.

Explanation and Critical Analysis:

- **Assessment Discourse and Symbolic Power:** Through evaluation practices, assessors produce discourse that not only judges but also shapes faculty subjects to conform to academic standards. In the increasingly digital BKD system, assessors act as knowledge power agents who establish what is considered "truth" and quality academic performance (Foucault, 1977).
- **Faculty's Social Position in Discourse:** The evaluation discourse does not just speak to numbers or productivity but also to the social position of faculty within the power structure generated by the digital system. Faculty unable to adapt to digitalization often find themselves marginalized, leading to dehumanization in the standardized evaluation process.
- **Digitalization as a Regimen of Truth:** The BKD system, which prioritizes technology and digitalization, acts as a "regimen of truth" that dominates the measurement of academic quality, while more diverse pedagogical approaches and local contexts are often neglected.

Table 4.7:
Analysis of Key Phenomena in Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) System

Phenomenon	Explanation	Theories Used	Relevant Sources
Power Discourse in Evaluation	The Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system creates faculty subjects linked to symbolic power.	CIC, Foucault's Power Theory	Sorrells, K. (2016); Foucault, M. (1980)
Social Position in Digital Discourse	Faculty who have not fully adapted to technology face dehumanization within the evaluation system.	CIC, Foucault	Sorrells, K. (2016); Foucault, M. (1977)
Digitalization as a Regime of Truth	Digitalization in BKD evaluation becomes a regime of truth that overlooks pedagogical diversity.	Foucault	Foucault, M. (1980)

Source: Author's Data (September 2025)

Critical Conclusion:

The discourse of evaluation within the Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) system functions as a mechanism of symbolic power that shapes faculty subjects in ways that reflect structural and symbolic imbalances in higher education institutions. The following conclusions can be drawn from the analysis:

- The Process of Faculty Workload Reporting (BKD) is a Cultural and Political Process:** Communication between assessors and faculty members in the BKD system is not merely a technical process but a cultural and political one. It reflects structural and symbolic inequalities inherent in higher education institutions.
- The Negotiation Arena Between Digital Immigrant Faculty and Assessors at FISIP Untan Pontianak:** In the context of Malay high culture, the BKD reporting system creates a complex negotiation arena between digital immigrant faculty and assessors. This dynamic is influenced by cultural factors, social hierarchies, and the shift toward a more technocratic, digital-based evaluation system.
- Reduction of Academic Performance into Quantitative Metrics:** The reduction of academic performance into quantifiable metrics within the BKD system reveals a tension between numeric evaluation standards and the more socially and reflective-based pedagogical and local work culture values.
- The Role of the Assessor in Reproducing Dominant Values in Higher Education:** The role of the assessor in the BKD system can be understood as a mechanism of symbolic power that reproduces dominant values within higher education, particularly in the context of increasing digitalization that is gradually dominating academic evaluation systems.

Research Findings:

- BKD Reporting as a Cultural and Political Process:** The process of BKD reporting is deeply embedded within cultural and political dynamics that shape both the evaluation process and the relationships between faculty and assessors.
- A Negotiation Arena Between Digital Immigrant Faculty and Assessors:** Faculty who are less familiar with digital systems, referred to as digital immigrants, find themselves in a complex negotiation with assessors, who embody the institutional power and set the standards for evaluation, which increasingly favor digital performance.

3. **Reduction of Academic Performance into Quantitative Metrics:** The BKD system's focus on quantifiable metrics often undermines the diverse and nuanced aspects of academic performance, such as community-based teaching and reflective pedagogical practices.
4. **The Assessor's Role in Reproducing Dominant Institutional Values:** Assessors in the BKD system play a key role in maintaining and reproducing the dominant values of the institution, especially in the context of the increasing prioritization of digital technologies and productivity standards.

Recommendations:

1. **Develop an Evaluation System that Respects Pedagogical Diversity and Local Culture:** There is a need to build a more inclusive system of evaluation that acknowledges the richness of diverse pedagogical practices and local cultural values, rather than just focusing on digital metrics.
2. **Training and Support for Digital Immigrant Faculty:** Institutions should provide adequate training and ongoing support for faculty who are transitioning into digital systems to ensure that they are not marginalized in the evaluation process.
3. **Utilize Intercultural Communication Perspectives in BKD Reporting:** The incorporation of intercultural communication theories in the BKD reporting system could improve understanding between assessors and faculty, especially regarding the complexity of diverse teaching practices and work cultures.

References

- [1] Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Routledge.
- [2] Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- [3] Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage.
- [4] Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- [5] Gudykunst, W. B. (2004). *Bridging Differences: Effective Intergroup Communication*. SAGE Publications.
- [6] Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *Critical Intercultural Communication Studies: At a Crossroads*. Routledge.
- [7] Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [8] Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.
- [9] Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants*. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
- [10] Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. Bloomsbury.
- [11] Sorrells, K. (2016). *Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice*. Sage.
- [12] Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2015). *Governing by Numbers: Audit Culture, Rankings and the New World Order*. Social Anthropology.
- [13] Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). *The Matrix of Face: An Updated Face-Negotiation Theory*. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing About Intercultural Communication* (pp. 71–92). Sage Publications.