PJEE

Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics
e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345
https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english
DOI: 10.24127/pj.v15i1.14262

THE DYNAMICS OF GENDERED PERCEPTIONS TOWARD GPT USE BY UNIVERSITY LECTURERS IN ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING

by

Rina Wahyuni*
Diploma III in Midwifery, Akademi Kebidanan Wahana Husada Bandar Jaya, Indonesia
rhyna93.rw@gmail.com

Weda Ayu Ardini
Diploma III in Midwifery, Akademi Kebidanan Wahana Husada Bandar Jaya, Indonesia
wedapasca13@gmail.com

corresponding author

(Article History: Received:22-09-2025;Reviewed1:12-11-2025;Reviewed2:05-01-2026: Accepted:04-02-2026;Published:10-02-2026).

Abstract:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has increasingly transformed higher education, particularly in the domain of academic writing. Among AI tools, Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) has been widely adopted to support drafting, editing, and enhancing scholarly texts. However, limited attention has been given to how gender influences lecturers' perceptions of GPT, especially in Indonesia where publishing in English remains both a professional requirement and a challenge. This study investigates gendered perceptions of GPT adoption in academic writing. A descriptive qualitative design was employed, involving 10 lecturers (5 male and 5 female) selected from a larger pool of 40 participants across disciplines. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and analyzed thematically using NVivo 12 within the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) framework. Findings reveal distinct gender-based differences: male lecturers emphasized efficiency and speed, while female lecturers expressed concerns regarding quality, ethics, and accuracy. Moderator variables such as age, technological experience, and voluntariness of use further shaped these perceptions. The study concludes that gender functions as a significant contextual moderator in GPT adoption in academic writing. These insights contribute to refining technology acceptance models and highlight the need for inclusive training programs in higher education that address gender dynamics and promote equitable use of AI tools.

Keywords: GPT, gender, academic writing, UTAUT, higher education

Abstrak:

Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) semakin mengubah pendidikan tinggi, terutama dalam domain penulisan akademik. Di antara alat AI, Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) telah diadopsi secara luas untuk mendukung penyusunan, penyuntingan, dan penyempurnaan teks ilmiah. Namun, perhatian terbatas diberikan pada bagaimana gender memengaruhi persepsi dosen tentang GPT, terutama di Indonesia di mana penerbitan dalam bahasa Inggris tetap menjadi persyaratan profesional dan tantangan. Studi ini menyelidiki persepsi gender tentang adopsi GPT dalam penulisan akademis. Desain kualitatif deskriptif digunakan, melibatkan 10 dosen (5 laki-laki dan 5 perempuan) yang dipilih dari kumpulan yang lebih besar dari 40 peserta lintas disiplin ilmu. Wawancara semi-terstruktur dilakukan dan dianalisis secara tematik menggunakan NVivo 12 dalam kerangka kerja Unified Theory

How to cite this article:

Wahyuni, R., and Ardini,W.R (2026). The dynamics of gendered perceptions toward GPT use by university lecturers in English academic writing. *Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*.**15(1), 1-20.** https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v15i1.14262

of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). Temuan mengungkapkan perbedaan berbasis gender yang berbeda: dosen laki-laki menekankan efisiensi dan kecepatan, sedangkan dosen perempuan menyatakan keprihatinan terhadap kualitas, etika, dan akurasi. Variabel moderator seperti usia, pengalaman teknologi, dan kesukarelaan penggunaan semakin membentuk persepsi ini. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa gender berfungsi sebagai moderator kontekstual yang signifikan dalam adopsi GPT dalam penulisan akademik. Wawasan ini berkontribusi untuk menyempurnakan model penerimaan teknologi dan menyoroti perlunya program pelatihan inklusif di pendidikan tinggi yang membahas dinamika gender dan mempromosikan penggunaan alat AI yang adil.

Kata kunci: *GPT, gender, penulisan akademik, UTAUT, pendidikan tinggi*

INTRODUCTION

The integration of digital technologies into education has transformed how knowledge is created, accessed, and disseminated. Among these innovations, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a disruptive force that significantly influences teaching, learning, and research. One of the most prominent AI-based tools is the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT), which has the capability to generate human-like text and provide interactive responses (Ouyang & Jiao, 2021). In higher education, lecturers are increasingly expected to publish academic articles in reputable journals, both nationally and internationally, as part of their professional duties related to the *Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi*. Publications are not only indicators of research productivity but also function as key requirements for academic promotions and institutional recognition (Ahmad et al., 2022). However, English academic writing remains a major challenge for many lecturers, particularly those whose academic background is not in English language education (Utami & Wahyuni, 2022; Wahyuni, 2023; Wahyuni & Utami, 2022). Consequently, GPT is perceived as a potential tool that can support lecturers in producing well-structured manuscripts (Gocen & Aydemir, 2020). While recent studies have examined GPT's role in higher education, little attention has been given to lecturers' perspectives, especially in Indonesia. This study offers novelty by foregrounding gendered perceptions of GPT adoption in academic writing.

Recent studies have increasingly explored the adoption of GPT in higher education. In general, this body of literature highlights both opportunities and challenges, ranging from technology acceptance, perceived usefulness, and practical benefits to ethical concerns and potential bias issues (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024; Bhullar et al., 2024; Das & J.V., 2024; Espartinez, 2024; Krecar et al., 2024; Lucy & Bamman, 2021; Markos et al., 2024; Polakova & Ivenz, 2024; Ravšelj et al., 2025; Strzelecki, 2024; Uppal & Hajian, 2025). Collectively, these studies demonstrate that the discourse on GPT in higher education is expanding

globally, although the emphasis varies depending on the research context and the groups being studied.

Previous studies have reported both the pedagogical potential of GPT in supporting academic writing, such as idea development and language refinement, and the ethical concerns related to plagiarism, dependency, and academic integrity (Fuchs, 2023; Kabir et al., 2025; Megawati et al., 2023; Niekerk et al., 2025; Yu, 2023). These mixed findings highlight the need for further exploration of how lecturers, particularly across genders, interpret both the opportunities and challenges of GPT use.

Although these studies provide valuable insights, several limitations remain. Previous research has highlighted institutional factors influencing AI adoption and has largely focused on students' and pre-service teachers' perceptions of GPT as both pedagogically beneficial and ethically problematic (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024; Das & J.V., 2024; Markos et al., 2024; Strzelecki, 2024). Global studies also report varied responses to GPT use, ranging from academic enhancement to unintended effects such as procrastination (Ravšelj et al., 2025; Uppal & Hajian, 2025). While some studies have identified divergent views on academic writing quality and potential gender bias in AI-generated texts, lecturers' gendered perceptions of GPT in English academic writing particularly in the Indonesian context remain underexplored (Knox, 2020; Krecar et al., 2024; Lucy & Bamman, 2021; Polakova & Ivenz, 2024).

Despite this increasing interest, research focusing on lecturers in Indonesia is still limited. Existing studies predominantly examine students' perceptions, technological acceptance, and the pedagogical implications of GPT (Bhullar et al., 2024; Kabir et al., 2025). Very few studies explicitly address how lecturers, who face academic publication requirements, perceive and adopt GPT in their professional practice (Prananta et al., 2023). Furthermore, gender as a determinant of technology perception has not been sufficiently explored in the context of GPT. Prior research suggests that gender differences may shape digital literacy levels, confidence in technology use, and access to technological resources (Lucy & Bamman, 2021; Stöhr et al., 2024). However, little is known about how these differences manifest among lecturers when using GPT for academic writing. This research gap highlights the importance of investigating the intersection between gender and AI

adoption in higher education, particularly in Indonesia where the pressure to publish in English is high.

While previous studies have examined GPT from the perspectives of students, general technology acceptance, or ethical debates, this study positions itself by focusing on EFL lecturers' academic writing practices and by examining gender as a critical lens in understanding GPT adoption. Prior research on GPT in higher education has primarily focused on students' perceptions, general technology acceptance, and ethical considerations, with limited attention to lecturers' academic writing practices. Few studies have examined how gender shapes lecturers' adoption of GPT or how contextual and institutional factors influence this process. Addressing this gap, the present study offers a unique contribution by exploring gendered perceptions of GPT adoption among EFL lecturers and extending the UTAUT framework within the context of English academic writing in Indonesian higher education. Situated within the field of English education, this study contributes to the improvement of EFL lecturers' academic writing capacity by examining how GPT can be adopted ethically and effectively in academic writing practices.

This study aims to address these gaps by exploring the dynamics of lecturers' perceptions toward GPT in English academic writing, with specific attention to gender differences. The objectives are: (1) to identify how male and female lecturers perceive the usefulness and challenges of GPT in writing English academic articles; (2) to analyze the factors that influence these perceptions, such as access to technology, professional expectations, and social influence; and (3) to provide recommendations for supporting inclusive and ethical use of GPT in higher education.

The contributions of this study are both practical and theoretical. Practically, the results will provide universities and policymakers with insights into how digital literacy training and academic writing programs can be designed to be more inclusive and responsive to gender dynamics. This is crucial as institutions seek to balance the benefits of AI integration with concerns about ethics and academic integrity (Niekerk et al., 2025). Theoretically, the study enriches the limited literature on GPT adoption in Indonesian higher education by foregrounding lecturers' perspectives, which have received far less attention compared to students. By incorporating gender as an analytical lens, the study also contributes to broader debates about equity and inclusivity in educational technology research.

To interpret these dynamics, this study adopts the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) as its guiding framework. UTAUT explains that individuals' technology adoption is influenced by four main constructs: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions. In this research, gender is examined as a moderating factor that shapes these constructs, consistent with previous studies showing that men and women may differ in their digital literacy, confidence, and approach to technology adoption (Stöhr et al., 2024). By integrating UTAUT with a gender perspective, this study provides a comprehensive lens for analyzing lecturers' perceptions of GPT in academic writing, particularly within the Indonesian higher education context. Accordingly, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do university lecturers perceive the use of GPT in English academic writing based on gender?
2. What factors influence these differences in perception?
3. What are the implications of these findings for developing technology-based strategies to enhance lecturers' academic capacity?

METHOD

Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design to explore lecturers' gendered perceptions of GPT in academic writing (Ary et al., 2010; Cohen et al., 2018; Cresswell & Creswell, 2018). The approach was chosen to capture in-depth insights into subjective experiences and provide rich narratives about opportunities and challenges in adopting GPT. A qualitative approach was chosen because it allows for a detailed exploration of subjective experiences and provides rich narratives about how lecturers perceive opportunities and challenges in adopting GPT. The study was guided by the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) model (Aprianto, 2022), which consists of four key constructs: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions. These constructions were used to frame interview questions and interpret lecturers' perceptions from a gender-based perspective.

Participant

The participants of this study were 10 university lecturers (5 male and 5 female) from various higher education institutions in Indonesia. Although data were initially collected from a larger group of lecturers, this study deliberately focused its qualitative analysis on 10 participants to allow for deeper, more nuanced interpretation of lecturers' gendered perceptions of GPT in academic writing. The sample included lecturers from both English language education and non-English fields, reflecting the broader reality that publishing in English is a requirement across disciplines in Indonesian higher education. The selection of 10 participants is appropriate for qualitative research, which emphasizes depth of insight rather than statistical generalization.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed: participants were informed about the study's objectives, participation was voluntary, and confidentiality was maintained using pseudonyms in reporting the findings. This study was conducted in accordance with ethical research standards, and ethical approval has been requested from the Research Ethics Committee of AKBID Wahana Husada Bandar Jaya, informed consent was secured from all participants.

Instrument

The primary research instrument was a semi-structured interview guide, designed to explore both general and gender-related perceptions of GPT in academic writing. The guide consisted of 30 open-ended questions aligned with the UTAUT constructs and gender aspects such as access to technology and professional challenges (Aprianto, 2022). To ensure validity, the instrument was reviewed through expert judgment by two senior lecturers from external institutions. Their feedback helped refine the clarity and relevance of the interview items. Reliability was addressed by ensuring consistency in the way questions were asked across all participants, supported by a pilot test conducted with two lecturers not included in the final sample.

Data collecting techniques.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews lasting 45–60 minutes each. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face. All sessions were audio-recorded with participants' consent. Before the interviews began, participants were informed about their rights, including the confidentiality of their responses and the academic use of their data. The

interview protocol encouraged participants to share their experiences with GPT, including how they first encountered it, their perceptions of its benefits and limitations, and their reflections on ethical and gender-related aspects. The semi-structured format provided flexibility, allowing the interviewer to probe deeper into specific issues when necessary while maintaining consistency across participants.

Data analysis technique

Thematic analysis was applied to interpret qualitative data. The process followed six stages: (1). Familiarization with data: Transcribed interviews were read repeatedly to gain a comprehensive understanding of participants' narratives.(2) Initial coding: Segments of text relevant to the research focus were coded manually, ensuring close engagement with the data. (3). Generating themes: Codes were grouped into broader themes aligned with the UTAUT constructs and gender-related aspects.(4). Reviewing themes: Themes were refined to ensure they accurately reflected the data and avoided overlapping. (5). Defining and naming themes: Each theme was clearly defined to capture its essence and contribution to the research questions. (6). Reporting findings: Themes were presented in narrative form, supported by illustrative quotations from participants.

This rigorous process ensured that the analysis captured the complexity of lecturers' perceptions while maintaining transparency and trustworthiness. To enhance credibility, validation was achieved through peer debriefing with a research assistant. In addition, NVivo 12 was employed as a supporting tool to assist in organizing, managing, and visualizing qualitative data. NVivo did not function as an analytical decision-maker; rather, the researcher conducted all coding, theme development, and interpretative decisions. NVivo outputs, such as coding matrices and frequency charts, were used to cross-check manual coding and enhance the transparency, rigor, and trustworthiness of the qualitative analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

In this study, gender is examined as a moderating variable that shapes lecturers' perceptions of GPT across the main UTAUT constructs, rather than as an independent or standalone variable. Based on the thematic analysis carried out through stages of data familiarization, initial coding, theme generation, and validation with the assistance of NVivo

12, four main themes aligned with the UTAUT framework were identified, namely: (1) performance expectancy, (2) effort expectancy, (3) social influence, and (4) facilitating conditions. Gender-related variations are embedded within each theme to illustrate how male and female lecturers experience GPT use differently.

The following section presents the findings narratively, accompanied by illustrative quotations from respondents to strengthen the results. Only the most representative quotations are included to ensure conciseness and avoid redundancy. NVivo 12 was used to assist in organizing and managing the data, enhancing coding consistency and transparency. The coding distribution indicated that performance expectancy and social influence were the most frequently referenced themes among both male and female lecturers.

1. *Performance expectancy*

Many lecturers, both male and female, acknowledged that GPT supported them by accelerating the writing process. About two-thirds mentioned that GPT reduced the time needed for drafting, particularly in structuring and language correction. Gender-related variations emerged in how these benefits were emphasized. Male lecturers often emphasized efficiency, while female lecturers highlighted its role in improving confidence, refining language, and organizing ideas. A smaller group mostly female lecturers noted that GPT helped improve the clarity and coherence of their manuscripts, making them easier to read (Table 1).

Table 1 Illustrative quotes:

Sub Variable	Respondent	Quotations
Acceleration of writing	Male	*"GPT really helps me work faster, especially in drafting the introduction. But the quality is still my responsibility" (M4)*
		"For me, GPT shortens revision time because sentence structures form more quickly." (M5)
	Female	*"With GPT, I feel more confident in writing because the sentences are clearer." (F4)*
		"I think my writing becomes more structured with GPT, even though the main ideas are still mine." (F5)
Quality vs. depth	Male	*"In terms of quality, GPT doesn't help much, but in terms of speed, the difference is obvious." (M1)*
	Female	*"GPT doesn't change the depth of my analysis, but it makes my English more fluent and polished." (F2)*

2. Effort expectancy

Despite this ease of use, they also reported several challenges, including limited digital literacy, lack of knowledge about advanced prompting, and technical problems such as unstable internet connections. These challenges varied among lecturers and were reported differently by male and female participants across contexts. Male lecturers reported faster adaptation, whereas some female lecturers described initial hesitation, particularly related to concerns about misuse or ethical implications. Technical barriers, such as unstable internet connections, were more frequently mentioned by lecturers working in semi-urban areas (Table 2).

Table 2 Illustrative quotes:

Sub Variable	Respondent	Quotations
Ease of use	Male	*"In my opinion, GPT is very easy to use. Just type a simple prompt, and the result comes out immediately." (M4)*
		"I had no major difficulties, in fact I learned faster compared to other applications." (M5)
	Female	*"In the beginning, I was hesitant, afraid of misusing GPT, but after trying it I found it easy." (F1)*
		"My biggest difficulty is the slow internet on campus, not the application itself." (F3)
Barriers	Male	*"At first I was confused about how to use it, but once I got used to it, it was quite simple." (M3)*
	Female	*"I still struggle with creating complex prompts, so I usually stick to simple ones." (F4)*

3. *Social influence*

Social and institutional environments influenced lecturers' decisions to adopt GPT. Male lecturers often mentioned peer encouragement and informal discussions as drivers. Female lecturers showed mixed responses: some were motivated by institutional workshops, while others remained cautious due to ethical concerns. Gender-related differences were evident in how social expectations were negotiated. Social norms also played a role, with some female lecturers feeling they needed to be more careful to avoid being perceived as lacking originality.

Table 3 Illustrative quotes:

Sub Variable	Respondent	Quotations
Peer/colleague encouragement	Male	*"I started using GPT because a colleague encouraged me, and over time it became a habit." (M1)*
		"Support from colleagues made me more confident to use GPT." (M2)
	Female	*"I joined a campus training on GPT, which gave me the courage to use it." (F2)*
		"Initially, I was skeptical, but after seeing others use it, I finally tried it too." (F3)
Social norms/ethics	Male	*"Among my peers, using GPT is sometimes seen as being lazy, so I had to be careful." (M3)*
	Female	*"Some of my female colleagues are still hesitant, worried about being seen as unoriginal if they rely too much on GPT." (F4)*

4. Facilitating conditions

Conditions that supported or hindered GPT adoption varied across lecturers. Male lecturers emphasized infrastructure such as internet access and devices, while female lecturers stressed the need for structured training and technical guidance. Only a few respondents had attended formal training, with most relying on self-learning or peer support. Another challenge was the lack of institutional policies or formal endorsement, particularly on semi-urban campuses. The absence of clear institutional policies was identified as a common constraint across genders.

Table 4 Illustrative quotes:

Sub Variable	Respondent	Quotations
Infrastructure	Male	*"If the internet is good, GPT works optimally. Otherwise, it becomes an obstacle." (M4)*
		"Facilities are adequate, but there is no clear campus policies on GPT use yet." (M5)
	Female	*"My biggest obstacle is not the app, but the unstable internet in my area." (F1)*
		"Sometimes I cannot access GPT smoothly because the internet on campus is weak." (F4)
Training & support	Male	*"Most of my knowledge comes from colleagues, not from formal campus programs." (M2)*
	Female	*"I feel there should be formal training so that usage is more structured." (F3)*

Across all themes, gender functioned as a moderating factor that shaped how lecturers experienced and interpreted the usefulness, ease of use, social expectations, and supporting conditions related to GPT. Male lecturers more frequently emphasized efficiency and productivity, while female lecturers tended to foreground ethical considerations, confidence, and language quality. These patterns were not absolute but interacted with contextual factors such as age, technological experience, and institutional environment.

Discussion

This section discusses the findings of the study by connecting them with previous research and relevant theoretical frameworks. Rather than reiterating the results, this discussion focuses on interpreting what the findings add to the UTAUT literature and to studies on GPT use in higher education, particularly within the Indonesian context. Each subsection presents the interpretation of findings aligned with the research questions and the UTAUT model, with specific attention to gender as a contextual moderating variable rather than a standalone factor.

How do university lecturers perceive the use of GPT in English academic writing based on gender?

The findings reveal distinct gendered patterns in lecturers' perceptions of GPT. Male lecturers emphasized efficiency and speed, perceiving GPT as a tool that accelerates the drafting and revision process. In contrast, female lecturers tended to foreground ethical considerations, accuracy, and language quality, indicating a more cautious engagement with GPT. These differences suggest that gender shapes show how lecturers interpret the benefits and risks of GPT rather than determining adoption outright. Within the UTAUT framework, these findings indicate that performance expectancy was more salient among male lecturers, whereas social influence and facilitating conditions were more prominent for female lecturers. This pattern reinforces the idea that gender operates as a contextual moderator influencing which UTAUT constructs are prioritized. Thus, gender does not function as an independent predictor but mediates how lecturers experience GPT's usefulness and legitimacy in academic writing.

Comparison with previous studies highlights both similarities and differences. Studies such as (Strzelecki, 2024) similarly identified performance expectancy as a key driver of GPT adoption, aligning with male lecturers' emphasis on efficiency. However, unlike (Polakova & Ivenz, 2024), who reported substantial improvements in writing quality, lecturers in this study perceived quality gains as limited. (Lucy & Bamman, 2021) identified gender bias in GPT outputs, supporting the finding that female lecturers are more sensitive to ethical and quality concerns. (Khosravi et al., 2022; Krecar et al., 2024) noted differences between students and lecturers regarding GPT's contribution to writing quality, but this study extends that comparison by showing variation within lecturers themselves, across gender lines. This nuance is novel: prior research often contrasted students and lecturers but rarely examined male vs female lecturers in the same context.

This study extends existing literature by demonstrating that gender-based variation exists not only between students and lecturers, as commonly reported, but also within the lecturer population itself. Such within group differentiation has received limited attention in prior GPT and UTAUT based research. Theoretically, these findings enrich UTAUT by demonstrating that gender moderates' adoption, influencing which constructs are most salient. Male lecturers' emphasis on efficiency reflects performance expectancy, while female lecturers' caution reflects social norms and facilitating conditions. (Booth et al., 2008; Rababah et al., 2024) argued that personal experiences and social norms shape technology interpretation, which explains why female lecturers, facing reputational risks in academic publishing, prioritize ethical safeguards. In the Indonesian context, where publishing in English is both a requirement and a challenge, these gendered perceptions are amplified: efficiency is valued under pressure to publish quickly, while ethical concerns are heightened by fears of plagiarism or reduced originality.

A limitation is that the qualitative design does not provide statistical significance, and the sample is limited to Indonesian lecturers, so generalization must be cautious. Nevertheless, the findings offer in-depth insights into how gender shapes GPT adoption in higher education, an aspect often overlooked in prior research. Future research should employ mixed-methods to measure the extent of these differences quantitatively and explore whether similar patterns exist in other cultural contexts.

Thus, male lecturers predominantly view GPT as a productivity-enhancing tool, whereas female lecturers emphasize ethical safeguards and language quality. This finding aligns with prior research on performance expectancy but diverges from studies emphasizing writing quality gains. By revealing gender as a contextual moderator within UTAUT, this study contributes a nuanced understanding of GPT adoption in Indonesian higher education.

What factors influence these differences in perception?

Beyond gender, the findings indicate that age, technological experience, voluntariness of use, and institutional support significantly shape lecturers' perceptions of GPT. Younger and more digitally experienced lecturers tended to report greater ease of adoption, while older lecturers or those with limited technological confidence expressed more hesitation. Voluntariness emerged as a critical factor, with self-motivated use associated with more positive attitudes and institutionally driven use often generating resistance. Within the UTAUT framework, these factors function as moderators that influence how performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions translate into actual use. This supports prior findings emphasizing the role of digital literacy and voluntariness in technology adoption (Strzelecki, 2024; Uppal & Hajian, 2025).

Comparison with previous studies reveals both alignment and divergence. (Ravšelj et al., 2025) reported diverse student responses globally, often independent of institutional context, whereas this study shows that institutional pressure can undermine trust, particularly among female lecturers. (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024) emphasized institutional factors in shaping AI adoption, which resonates with the present findings. (Bhullar et al., 2024) highlighted the evolving nature of GPT debates, paralleling lecturers' shifting perceptions from skepticism to cautious acceptance. (Knox, 2020; Lucy & Bamman, 2021) identified gender and cultural biases in GPT outputs, which supports the finding that female lecturers are more sensitive to ethical and reputational risks.

Theoretically, these findings extend UTAUT by positioning moderators as central rather than peripheral elements in adoption processes. In the Indonesian higher education context, where English publication requirements intersect with uneven technological infrastructure, these moderators intensify adoption disparities. A limitation is that perceptions

were captured retrospectively rather than longitudinally. Future research should track changes in lecturers' attitudes over time as institutional policies and familiarity with GPT evolve.

Mini conclusion for RQ2: Age, technological experience, voluntariness, and institutional support significantly shape lecturers' perceptions of GPT. These moderators influence how UTAUT constructs are experienced, with voluntariness and experience enhancing adoption, while institutional pressure and limited literacy create hesitation. This finding both aligns with studies emphasizing digital literacy and institutional factors (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024) (Strzelecki, 2024) and diverges from global student-focused research (Ravšelj et al., 2025). In the Indonesian context, these moderators highlight the importance of designing inclusive strategies that account for generational, experiential, and institutional differences.

What are the implications of these findings for developing technology-based strategies to enhance lecturers' academic capacity?

The findings suggest several practical and theoretical implications for integrating GPT into academic writing practices. Effective adoption requires not only access to technology but also structured training, clear institutional guidelines, and ethical frameworks. Lecturers' reliance on informal peer learning highlights gaps in formal support systems, while infrastructural constraints remain a persistent barrier.

Comparison with previous studies reinforces these implications. (Kabir et al., 2025) stressed the importance of training for effective GPT integration, which aligns with lecturers' calls for structured guidance. (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024) emphasized institutional readiness as a determinant of adoption, resonating with the present finding that lack of clear policies hinders confidence. (Niekerk et al., 2025) cautioned against plagiarism risks, echoing female lecturers' ethical concerns. Meanwhile, (Krecar et al., 2024)found divergent views between students and lecturers on institutional support, which parallels the current finding that lecturers rely heavily on informal peer networks rather than formal programs.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings extend UTAUT by reconceptualizing facilitating conditions to include institutional culture, ethical clarity, and professional norms, not merely technical infrastructure. This expanded view is particularly relevant in Global South contexts, where resource limitations and policy ambiguity often coexist with strong

performance demands. A limitation is that institutional differences were not systematically compared. Future studies should examine how variations in AI governance across universities influence lecturers' adoption trajectories.

Thus, the study implies that enhancing lecturers' academic capacity through GPT requires inclusive training, clear institutional policies, and reliable infrastructure. These strategies must balance efficiency with ethical safeguards, ensuring GPT functions as a supportive rather than substitutive tool. This finding aligns with prior calls for structured training and institutional readiness (Al-Mughairi & Bhaskar, 2024) (Kabir et al., 2025)but diverges from contexts where adoption occurs informally without institutional oversight. In the Indonesian setting, the implications highlight the urgency of designing gender-sensitive and contextually grounded policies that promote equitable and responsible AI use in higher education.

Overall, this study demonstrates that GPT adoption in academic writing is shaped by the contextual moderators, particularly gender, age, technological experience, and institutional conditions shape GPT adaptation. By positioning gender as a contextual moderator within the UTAUT framework, this research contributes empirical evidence from Indonesia, a Global South context that remains underrepresented in AI adoption studies. The findings offer both theoretical enrichment of UTAUT and practical guidance for higher education institutions seeking to integrate AI tools responsibly and equitably.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Conclusion

This study provides a logical response to the three research questions by demonstrating how lecturers' adoption of GPT in academic writing is shaped by gendered perceptions, contextual moderators, and institutional conditions. RQ1 was addressed by showing that male lecturers emphasize efficiency, while female lecturers prioritize ethics and quality, highlighting gender as a moderating factor. RQ2 was answered through the identification of age, technological experience, voluntariness, and institutional support as key influences that shape adoption beyond gender. RQ3 was resolved by proposing practical strategies such as inclusive training, clear institutional policies, and reliable infrastructure that

balance productivity with academic integrity. Collectively, these findings extend the UTAUT framework by positioning gender and contextual dynamics as central to technology adoption, while offering actionable guidance for higher education institutions to foster equitable and responsible integration of AI in academic practice. Importantly, this study underscores the significance of GPT adoption for EFL lecturers, particularly in academic writing contexts, by highlighting the need to balance technological efficiency with ethical awareness and pedagogical responsibility. For EFL lecturers, the findings offer practical insights into how AI can be used as a supportive tool in academic writing instruction without compromising academic integrity. Furthermore, this study contributes empirical evidence to broader discussions on technology-enhanced English language teaching by highlighting the importance of AI-based EFL lecturer training that integrates technical proficiency, ethical considerations, and pedagogical competence in academic writing instruction.

Limitation

This research, while offering new insights, has several limitations. First, the study was limited to lecturers in Indonesia, which may affect the generalizability of the findings to broader contexts. Second, Although the initial pool involved 40 lecturers, the qualitative analysis focused on 10 participants, which limits statistical generalization. Third, the study relied on a descriptive qualitative approach; although thematic analysis yielded rich findings, future studies could integrate quantitative or mixed methods to provide stronger evidence. Fourth, the research was conducted within a single time frame, leaving open the possibility that lecturers' perceptions may evolve as AI technology becomes more widespread. Future researchers are encouraged to address these limitations by conducting cross-national comparative studies, involving larger and more diverse samples, and applying longitudinal designs to capture changes over time. Additionally, combining qualitative and quantitative methods would allow for deeper exploration and stronger validation of the role of gender in shaping AI adoption in academic writing.

Implication

The findings of this study carry both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the study extends the UTAUT model by showing how gender operates as a moderator in lecturers' adoption of GPT. This suggests that models of technology acceptance in education should pay greater attention to social and demographic dynamics. Practically, the

study highlights the importance of designing inclusive digital literacy and academic writing programs that account for gender differences in needs and perceptions. Universities and policymakers can use these insights to develop training, support systems, and ethical guidelines that not only promote effective use of AI but also ensure equity and inclusivity. Empirically, this study offers a foundation for future research and policy discussions on the role of AI in higher education, particularly in non-English-speaking contexts where the pressure to publish in international journals remains strong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided through the junior researcher study or known as *Penelitian Dosen Pemula* (PDP) grant from the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology of Indonesia, which made this study possible. Sincere appreciation is also extended to the home institution for its continuous academic and administrative support throughout the research process. The authors would like to thank all lecturers who generously shared their time, insights, and experiences as research participants. Their valuable contributions were essential to the completion of this study. It is hoped that this research may contribute to the development of future, higher-quality studies in similar fields.

BIO-PROFILE:

Rina Wahyuni is an English lecturer, holding bachelor's degree from Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro and a master's degree from Universitas Ahmad Dahlan with expertise in English language education. Corresponding email: **rhyna93.rw@gmail.com**

Weda Ayu Ardini is a public health lecturer, holding a bachelor's degree from Universitas Aysiyah Pringsewu and a master's degree from Universitas Mitra Indonesia. Both are lecturers at Akademi Kebidan Wahana Husada Bandar Jaya with the academic rank of Lektor.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, S. F., Alam, M. M., Rahmat, M. K., Mubarik, M. S., & Hyder, S. I. (2022). Academic and Administrative Role of Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031101

Al-Mughairi, H., & Bhaskar, P. (2024). Exploring the factors affecting the adoption AI techniques in higher education: insights from teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-09-2023-0129

Aprianto, I. G. L. A. (2022). Tinjauan Literatur: Penerimaan Teknologi Model UTAUT. *KONSTELASI: Konvergensi Teknologi Dan Sistem Informasi*, *2*(1), 138–144. https://doi.org/10.24002/konstelasi.v2i1.5377

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education Eight Edition* (Eight Edit). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Bhullar, P. S., Joshi, M., & Chugh, R. (2024). ChatGPT in higher education - a synthesis of the literature and a future research agenda. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(16), 21501–21522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12723-x

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The Craft of Research* (Vol. 16, Issue 1). The University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methodology in Educaation. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.

Cresswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design. In *Writing Center Talk over Time*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469237-3

Das, S. R., & J.V., M. (2024). Perceptions of higher education students towards ChatGPT usage. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, *7*(1), 86–106. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.583

Espartinez, A. S. (2024). Exploring student and teacher perceptions of ChatGPT use in higher education: A Q-Methodology study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*(June), 100264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100264

Fuchs, K. (2023). Exploring the opportunities and challenges of NLP models in higher education: is Chat GPT a blessing or a curse? *Frontiers in Education*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1166682

Gocen, A., & Aydemir, F. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in Education and Schools. *Research on Education and Media*, *12*(1), 13–21. https://doi.org/10.2478/rem-2020-0003

Kabir, A., Shah, S., Haddad, A., & Raper, D. M. S. (2025). Introducing our custom GPT: An example of the potential impact of personalized GPT builders on scientific writing. *World Neurosurgery*, *193*, 461–468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2024.10.041

Khosravi, H., Shum, S. B., Chen, G., Conati, C., Tsai, Y. S., Kay, J., Knight, S., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Sadiq, S., & Gašević, D. (2022). Explainable Artificial Intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*(May).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100074

Knox, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence and education in China. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *45*(3), 298–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1754236

Krecar, I. M., Kolega, M., & Jurcec, L. (2024). Perception of ChatGPT usage for homework assignments: students' and professors' perspectives. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *12*(2), 33–60. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.12.2.02

Lucy, L., & Bamman, D. (2021). Gender and representation bias in GPT-3 generated stories. *Proceedings Ofthe 3rd Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, 48–55. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.nuse-1.5

Markos, A., Prentzas, J., & Sidiropoulou, M. (2024). Pre-service teachers' assessment of ChatGPT's utility in higher education: SWOT and content analysis. *Electronics (Switzerland)*, *13*(10), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13101985

Megawati, R., Listiani, H., Pranoto, N. W., Akobiarek, M., & Megahati S, R. R. P. (2023). Role of GPT chat in writing scientific articles: A systematic literature review. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, *9*(11), 1078–1084. https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9i11.5559

Niekerk, J. Van, Delport, P. M. J., & Sutherland, I. (2025). Addressing the use of generative AI in academic writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *8*(December 2024), 100342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100342

Ouyang, F., & Jiao, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*(March), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100020

Polakova, P., & Ivenz, P. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT feedback on the development of EFL students' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2410101

Prananta, A. W., Megahati S, R. R. P., Susanto, N., & Raule, J. H. (2023). Transforming Education and Learning through Chat GPT: A Systematic Literature Review. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, *9*(11), 1031–1037. https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9i11.5468

Rababah, L. M., Rababah, M. A., & Al-Khawaldeh, N. N. (2024). Graduate Students' ChatGPT Experience and Perspectives during Thesis Writing. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*, *14*(3), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v14i3.48395

Ravšelj, D., Keržič, D., Tomaževič, N., Umek, L., Brezovar, N., Iahad, N. A., Abdulla, A. A., Akopyan, A., Segura, M. W. A., AlHumaid, J., Allam, M. F., Alló, M., Andoh, R. P. K., Andronic, O., Arthur, Y. D., Aydin, F., Badran, A., Balbontín-Alvarado, R., Saad, H. Ben, … Aristovnik, A. (2025). Higher education students' perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early reactions. In *PLoS ONE* (Vol. 20, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315011

Stöhr, C., Ou, A. W., & Malmström, H. (2024). Perceptions and usage of AI chatbots among students in higher education across genders, academic levels and fields of study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*(August 2023), 0–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100259

Strzelecki, A. (2024). Students' acceptance of ChatGPT in higher education: An extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *Innovative Higher Education*, *49*(2), 223–245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-023-09686-1

Uppal, K., & Hajian, S. (2025). Srudents' perception of ChatGPT in higher education: A study of academic enhancement. procrastination and ethical concerns. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(1), 199–211. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.1.199

Utami, S. N., & Wahyuni, R. (2022). Exploring teaching methods used by the English teachers in teaching speaking. *SIGEH ELT : Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, *2*(2), 136–151. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v2i2.1101

Wahyuni, R. (2023). ICT to overcome the students' speaking anxiety. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, *12*(3), 810. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v12i3.7418

Wahyuni, R., & Utami, S. N. (2022). The efffect of E-learning toward students' learning interest at Pandemi Covid '19 Era in rural area. *SIGEH ELT : Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, *2*(2), 125–135. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v2i2.1100

Yu, H. (2023). Reflection on whether Chat GPT should be banned by academia from the perspective of education and teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181712