Socratika: Journal of Progressive Education and Social Inquiry
E-ISSN: 3047-020X
Vol. 3 No. 3 (September–December 2026), pp. 1129-1146
https://doi.org/10.58230/socratika.v3i3.915
© 2026 The Authors. Licensed CC BY 4.0

Gender Differentiation of Teacher Technology-Based Feedback in Online English Classroom: A Case Study of Indonesian EFL Teachers

Lathifah Hanim[1], Nuskhan Abid [2]
[1, 2] Tadris Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kudus, Indonesia

[1] lathifhanim12@gmail.com [2] nuskhan@uinsuku.ac.id

Abstract

Purpose : Teacher feedback plays an important role in English language learning by helping students recognize the quality of their work and areas for improvement. In online learning, technology has expanded the ways lecturers provide feedback and revealed variations in feedback approaches between male and female lecturers. This study aims to identify gender differences in lecturers' technology-based feedback content in online EFL learning at higher education institutions in Central Java, Indonesia.

Method : A qualitative case study was conducted with seven EFL lecturers, comprising four male and three female lecturers, who had experience teaching English online and providing feedback through digital platforms. Data collected through an open-ended interview via Google Forms was analyzed thematically.

Results : The findings revealed two main themes: characteristics of technology-based feedback content and challenges and future improvements. Male lecturers tended to emphasize academic aspects, efficiency, clarity, and process management, while female lecturers more often incorporated motivational support, student engagement, interaction, and attention to AI use.

Conclusion : Future development should integrate technological efficiency with pedagogical strategies that enhance student understanding, engagement, digital literacy, and academic integrity.

Keywords: Technology-based feedback; gender differences; EFL learning; online learning; lecturers.

1. Introduction

Teacher feedback plays a significant role in language development through various strategies implemented in the ESL/EFL context (Hossain et al., 2024). In terms of implementation, the level of learning motivation, self-confidence of students, and language skills of EFL learners provided inclusive results in the progressive improvement of these aspects, with corrective feedback from teachers on the writing assignments of EFL students (Nguyen et al., 2022). Furthermore, gender differences among teachers could influence differences in the style and content of feedback in a comprehensive manner, potentially causing an emotional response toward EFL learners (Guo, 2024). One of the factors contributing to differences in oral feedback in communication style, empathy, and the level of assertiveness in criticism or suggestions has been identified as the gender of the teacher (Yakışık, 2021). Therefore, Verbal feedback through

explaining instructions and reformulating statements was more commonly used by female teachers, as opposed to male teachers, who had a tendency to provide feedback without reformulating statements, simply providing instructions to EFL learners (Khairisya & Fithriani, 2023).

The differences in feedback styles between male and female teachers suggest that personal and communication characteristics strongly influence how teachers guide EFL learners (Khairisya & Fithriani, 2023; Yakışık, 2021). In line with these developments, the form of feedback in this era has also expanded through the use of technology, introducing a new pattern of interaction between teachers and students. Technology-based feedback used by teachers is considered an effective tool in pronunciation training, as it facilitates EFL learners' access to discussion materials, interaction with teachers, and the submission of recorded assignments, thereby enhancing ICT proficiency among EFL learners (Yang, 2022). In addition to supporting pronunciation practice, technology has also been integrated into corrective feedback systems such as Speech-Enabled Corrective Feedback (SECF). These systems extend the role of technology by giving English as a foreign language (EFL) learners the opportunity to practice speaking, identify errors, and receive contextualized corrections in real-time (Shadiev et al., 2024). Seroussi et al. (2023) found that gender differences influence peer feedback to achieve equality and comfortable learning in EFL classes, Female participants are more sensitive to emotional factors as compared to males being more independent in providing feedback such as self-esteem. Gender differences have become a main focus in technology-based EFL learning activities, shaping the content of feedback in response to varying levels of activity and responsiveness among EFL learners (Hashemi et al., 2022). Technology was the main tool used to demonstrate discussion materials, digital projects, and provide feedback from teachers to EFL learners (Zhang & Fang, 2022). Gender differences in technology-based feedback tend to have different approaches to digital learning experiences for EFL learners (Lee et al., 2016).

Previous studies from Rabab'ah and Belgrimet (2020) investigate technology-based feedback using emails sent by teachers to EFL learners demonstrates differences in responses based on gender from the perspective of EFL learners. However, the use of email technology in EFL classrooms has become a challenge for teachers. Hamzehloo (2019) and Iraji et al., (2014) Investigating how oral feedback is influenced by gender differences, one finding is that female teachers tend to be more corrective and detailed, while male teachers focus more on criticism and suggestions when giving non-technology-based feedback to EFL students. Furthermore, Previous case studies have also examined that technological developments in EFL classrooms change the learning styles of EFL students, presenting teachers with new challenges in adapting technology-based feedback strategies to student learning experiences in using ICT (Saeed et al., 2018; Cheng et al., 2023).

However, the majority of prior research has focused only on the influence of student gender differences on responses to technology-based feedback delivered through online applications. Studies that focus on teacher gender differences in providing technology-based feedback in practice, within an ethical and pedagogical framework, have rarely been analyzed. This study aims to further identify gender differences among teachers that influence the content of technology-based feedback in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning in Central Java, Indonesia. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of technology-based feedback content provided by male and female teachers in online EFL learning?

2. What are the Challenges and future improvements of Technology-Based Feedback provided by male and female teachers in online EFL learning?

2. Method

Research approaches

This study employed a case study within a qualitative research framework. According to Nasution (2023) case studies involve an intersubjective relationship between researchers and participants, in which they influence each other in the processes of data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and the reporting of results. In addition, a case study has specific time and place constraints, which help researchers define and describe the specific case being studied (Creswell & Báez, 2021). Thus, it provides an in-depth understanding of an issue, where the scope of that issue is defined and explained through the context of the case under study (Creswell & David, 2024).

Data sources

This study involved EFL teachers who implemented online English classrooms in their teaching practice at the University of Central Java, Indonesia. Participants included several male and female EFL teachers with experience providing technology-based feedback to students through various digital platforms. They were selected for their active involvement in online English classrooms and their teaching experience using technology to provide feedback on students' English assignments. Therefore, participant selection plays an important role in ensuring the credibility and relevance of research findings (Severiano et al., 2025).

Sample selection

This study involved seven university-level EFL lecturers in Central Java, Indonesia, comprising four male and three female lecturers. The participants were selected through purposive sampling based on the following criteria: they taught English at higher education institutions, had experience with online English teaching, actively used digital platforms to provide feedback to students, and voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The participants came from two types of higher-education institutions: an Islamic university and an open university. The composition of four male and three female lecturers reflected the participants who met the selection criteria and agreed to take part in the study, rather than a predetermined gender quota. To protect their privacy, pseudonyms were used throughout the manuscript, and each participant was identified using a code from P1 to P7. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the EFL teachers. The teachers who agreed to participate in this research were then required to give approval before the data collection process began. This participant recruitment procedure was adopted from (Hidayat & Saleh, 2022).

Table 1. *EFL Teacher's demographic characteristics*

Name	Gender	Age	Teaching Experience	Institution	Tools Use
P1	Male	33 Years Old	10 years	Islamic University	Google Docs, Google Forms, WhatsApp, Microsoft Word

P2	Female	38 Years Old	17 years	Islamic University	WhatsApp, Telegram, Microsoft Word in the feature track: Changes Comments
P3	Male	37 Years Old	17 years	Islamic University	Zoom, Google Meet
P4	Male	44 years Old	10 Years	Open University	Google Docs, Microsoft Word, LMS University
P5	Female	35 Years Old	11 Years	Open University	Google Classroom, Microsoft Word, Google Docs, Zoom, WhatsApp, in the feature: Video note
P6	Female	43 Years Old	6 Years	Open university	AI Detector
P7	Male	41 Years Old	8 Years	Islamic University	V class, Google Docs, WhatsApp, Google Meet

Instrument

The instrument in this study employed interviews with 7 lecturers as participants, and their identities have been anonymized. The research instrument was an open-ended interview administered through Google Forms. The interview was designed to elicit the lecturers' written accounts of their experiences in providing technology-based feedback in online EFL learning. The open-ended questions covered feedback practices, digital platforms, feedback content, challenges encountered, and suggestions for improvement. The researchers used several interview questions adapted from research by Albogami (2020), Mahmood (2025), Rajab (2018), Stahl (2021), and Zareekbatani (2015). Furthermore, the questions were adjusted again to the research question of gender differences among educators (teachers in Central Java, Indonesia) that influence the content of technology-based feedback in learning English as a foreign language (EFL). Through the interview, researchers can obtain data on lecturers' experiences, views, and practices in providing technology-based feedback in online English learning. Thus, the collected data were analyzed to answer the research questions.

Data Collection

Data were collected through an open-ended interview created using Google Forms. According to Ulum et al., (2023); Ibhar and Ibhar (2023) stated that Google Forms can serve as a tool for researchers, as it facilitates survey distribution, enables efficient data collection, and offers respondents flexibility in the time and location for completing the open-ended interview. The interview link was distributed to the participants through WhatsApp. The participants submitted their responses in writing through the online form. No semi-structured interviews or follow-up interviews were conducted. Therefore, the dataset consisted exclusively of the written responses submitted through Google Forms

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns in the participants' written responses. This method is a systematic approach used to identify, organize, and interpret specific themes from the data (Ahmed et al., 2025). First, the researchers read the responses

repeatedly to become familiar with the data. Second, meaningful segments related to technology-based feedback practices, feedback content, challenges, and suggestions for improvement were identified and assigned initial codes. Third, codes with similar meanings were grouped into broader categories. Fourth, the categories were compared and organized into two main themes: (1) Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content and (2) Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback. Finally, the themes were reviewed against the original responses to ensure that the interpretations remained consistent with the participants' accounts. Relevant excerpts were selected to illustrate the findings and support the interpretation of each theme (Naeem et al., 2024). Table 2 presents examples of the initial codes, categories, and themes developed from the participants' responses to illustrate how the data were systematically organized and analyzed.

Table 2: The *examples of initial codes, categories, and themes.*

Excerpt	Coding	Interpretation	Category	theme
P1: ***Written*** *feedback,* ***direct comments, voice notes,*** *and all* ***aspects.***	Multiple feedback modes	Lecturers use various forms of feedback to convey information more effectively and in accordance with learning needs.	Types of Technology-Based Feedback	Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content
P2: *The type of feedback I provide most frequently is* ***written feedback****.*	Written feedback	Written feedback is the primary form of feedback used.	Types of Feedback	Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content
P1: *At times, students* ***lack sufficient digital literacy*** *regarding the use of digital media.*	Low digital literacy	The low level of digital literacy among students is a barrier to understanding and using online feedback.	Challenges	Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback.
P2: *Another challenge is that* ***not all students read and act upon the feedback provided.***	Feedback implementation challenges	The main obstacles stem from limited time and low student responsiveness to feedback.	Challenges	Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback.

3. Result

The research findings are presented from the perspectives of male and female lecturers, followed by a discussion of the similarities and differences between them. Based on the analysis process, this study yielded two main themes: (1) Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content and (2) Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback. These themes are further elaborated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the similarities and differences in male and female lecturers' approaches to providing technology-based feedback, in line with the study's objective of examining how gender differences influence the content of technology-based feedback in EFL learning.

Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content

Across the seven participants' responses, lecturers described using technology to support students' English learning, although they differed in the aspects of feedback they emphasized. Some focused more on content, grammar, vocabulary, and writing organization, while others also highlighted student motivation, speaking performance, academic communication, and originality. These differences did not fall neatly along gender lines. For example, P7 (male) emphasized the importance of feedback that motivates students and supports their future development, whereas P6 (female) focused more on originality and the use of AI detection tools. Therefore, the participants' responses indicate that perspectives on and approaches to technology-based feedback varied both among male lecturers and among female lecturers.

This study focuses on three key aspects of technology-based feedback: the form of the feedback, the specific elements targeted by the feedback, and the tools used to deliver it. The form of feedback refers to the method lecturers use to convey responses to students, such as written comments, direct comments, voice notes, video feedback, or verbal feedback. The targeted aspects relate to specific elements of student work that receive the lecturer's attention, such as content, grammar, vocabulary, writing organization, speaking skills, and originality. Meanwhile, the term "tools" refers to the various digital platforms and media used to deliver feedback, including Google Docs, Microsoft Word, WhatsApp, Google Classroom, LMS, Zoom, Google Meet, and AI detection tools. Consequently, these three aspects serve as the basis for examining how male and female lecturers exhibit differing tendencies in providing technology-based feedback that aligns with learning needs and the characteristics of student assignments.

Male lecturers employ various forms of technology-based feedback, with written feedback being the most commonly used. Nevertheless, there are differences in the forms of feedback utilized and the aspects prioritized by each lecturer, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 1: "***Written*** *feedback,* ***direct comments***, ***voice notes,*** *and all* ***aspects***, *particularly* ***content and grammar,*** *as they align with the background of students in the TBI study program" (P1)*

Excerpt 2*: "I* ***focus*** *more on the* ***content of the presentation material****. I don't really worry about minor grammatical errors or mispronunciations; limited time forces me to focus only on what truly matters in the discussion." (P3)*

Excerpt 3*: "I tend to provide* ***written feedback*** *more often. I rarely use videos or voice notes because I find written comments sufficiently clear and more efficient. I also* ***usually focus on grammar and organization****; when grammar is solid, it is easier for students to convey their ideas correctly." (P4)*

Excerpt 4*: "The type of feedback I provide most frequently is* ***written feedback****... In addition to written comments, I also utilize* ***voice notes, video feedback, and peer feedback****. Furthermore, I focus not*

*only on linguistic aspects but also on the **holistic development** of students' academic communication skills... I also provide feedback that is motivational and forward-looking." (P7)*

From excerpts 1-4, the accounts of the four male participants reveal varied approaches to feedback in terms of both format and focus. P1 used written comments, direct comments, and voice notes to provide feedback on content and grammar. P3 prioritized presentation content due to time constraints, while P4 preferred written comments to help students improve their grammar and writing organization. Meanwhile, P7 used several feedback formats while also paying attention to student motivation and broader academic communication. These findings suggest that feedback choices were influenced by task requirements, time availability, and individual teaching practices. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that all male lecturers adopted the same approach to providing feedback.

Female lecturers also employ various forms of technology-based feedback, with a focus tailored to learning aspects and the characteristics of student assignments. This variation is evident in the forms of feedback used and the specific aspects prioritized by each lecturer, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 5: "*The type of feedback I provide most frequently is **written feedback**. Furthermore, I tend to emphasize **aspects** such as **grammar, vocabulary, organization**, and **content**... In addition, I also offer **appreciation and motivation** through **positive comments**.*" (P2)

Excerpt 6: "*Since the introduction of the new **video note feature on WhatsApp**, I have used it to provide feedback on students' **speaking**. While I actually pay attention to all **aspects**, I focus more on speaking because it demonstrates their **English language skills**." (P5)*

Excerpt 7: "*Since I teach **TUTON or online tutorials** where the tutor's role is limited to providing written feedback and assigning grades, I primarily provide **written feedback**. Key **aspects** I emphasize include the content (specifically whether it addresses the given instructions or questions), grammar, and **originality**." (P6)*

These excerpts 5-7 demonstrate that female lecturers tailor the form and focus of their feedback to learning needs and the characteristics of student assignments. In **Excerpt 5**, P2 provides written feedback on grammar, vocabulary, organization, and content, and offers appreciation and encouragement through positive comments. In **Excerpt 6**, P5 adapts her feedback to the specific skills being assessed, using video notes to provide feedback on speaking assignments. In addition to using various digital media, some lecturers also provide feedback through Universitas Terbuka's Online Tutorial (TUTON) system. TUTON is an online learning service provided by Universitas Terbuka to support students' learning processes through asynchronous interaction between students and tutors within the online learning system (Jamil, 2022). In **Excerpt 7**, P6 uses written feedback within TUTON, focusing on content, grammar, and originality, including the extent to which answers align with assignment instructions. Overall, the three lecturers demonstrate that feedback does not merely focus on linguistic aspects but is also tailored to the type of assignment and student needs, with additional attention paid to appreciation, speaking skills, and originality.

The three female participants also described varied approaches to providing feedback. P2 combined written comments on language and writing organization with positive encouragement. P5 used video notes to provide feedback on speaking tasks, while P6 described using written feedback in an online tutorial context, focusing on task alignment, grammar, and originality. These

accounts indicate that the format and content of feedback were adapted to the type of assignment and the teaching context. The findings also suggest that academic feedback and motivational support are not necessarily separate, as lecturers can provide academic guidance while simultaneously offering encouragement to students.

The use of digital tools by male lecturers reveals a preference for platforms that are practical, easily accessible, and reliable, and that support effective communication and feedback delivery in online learning, as illustrated by the following excerpts:

Excerpt 8: "***Google Docs***, ***Google Forms***, ***WhatsApp***, *and* ***Ms. Word****. it's reliable,* ***easy to use****, accessible, and user-friendly"* (P1)

Excerpt 9: "***Zoom or Meet****, two multi-party video calling platforms that allow my students and me to exchange ideas* ***effectively when distance*** *is a barrier."* (P3)

Excerpt 10: *"I most frequently* ***use the Open University's LMS and Google Docs****. I also occasionally use the comment feature in Microsoft Word when students submit assignments as documents."* (P4)

Excerpt 11: "*In my courses, I most frequently* ***use V class, Google Docs, WhatsApp groups, and Google Meet*** *as the primary platforms."* (P7)

Results from excerpts 8 through 11 indicate that the male lecturers' use of digital tools is quite varied and tailored to instructional needs. In **Excerpt 8**, P1 uses Google Docs, Google Forms, WhatsApp, and Microsoft Word because they are easy to use and access. In **Excerpt 9**, P3 utilizes Zoom and Google Meet to facilitate real-time interaction and the exchange of ideas. In **Excerpt 10**, P4 frequently uses the Universitas Terbuka LMS and Google Docs, as well as the Comments feature in Microsoft Word, to provide feedback on assignments. Meanwhile, in **Excerpt 11**, P7 combines V-Class, Google Docs, WhatsApp groups, and Google Meet to support learning activities and provide feedback. Overall, these four lecturers tend to select tools that are practical, easily accessible, and effective at facilitating communication and delivering feedback. Unlike male participants, female lecturers also utilize a variety of digital tools to provide feedback, ranging from communication platforms and digital documents to tools that support the process of grading student assignments, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 12: *"The digital platforms I use most frequently to provide feedback to students are* ***WhatsApp, Telegram, and Microsoft Word****."* (P2)

Excerpt 13: " *I use* ***Google Classroom and Google Docs*** *most frequently. In my opinion, both platforms are* ***easy to use****."* (P5)

Excerpt 14: "*I often* ***use AI detectors*** *to determine whether their work or writing is truly their own, AI-generated content that has been paraphrased, or purely AI-generated."* (P6)

Excerpts 12, 13, and 14 demonstrate that the female lecturers employ a variety of digital tools tailored to their feedback needs. P2 uses WhatsApp, Telegram, and Microsoft Word, while P5 utilizes Google Classroom and Google Docs to provide direct comments on assignments, enabling students to make immediate revisions. Meanwhile, P6 uses an AI detector to verify the authenticity of student assignments. This indicates that the use of digital tools not only facilitates the delivery of feedback but also supports the revision process and the verification of assignment authenticity.

Overall, the participants described various feedback formats, areas of focus, and digital tools. Some placed greater emphasis on clarity, efficiency, and alignment with task criteria, while others

also highlighted the importance of providing encouragement, offering audio or video explanations, and checking the originality of students' work. These emphases varied across individuals and overlapped between the male and female participant groups. Therefore, the data support a description of differences in the participants' reported feedback practices, but they do not establish gender as the cause of these differences.

Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback.

Participants encountered various challenges in providing technology-based feedback, including students' limited digital literacy, unstable internet connections, time constraints, low student engagement, difficulty understanding comments, and concerns about the use of AI to complete assignments. Based on their responses, improvement efforts could focus on two areas: enhancing technological support and the learning process, and strengthening communication and student engagement to better enable students to understand, reflect on, and apply the feedback. These two areas emerged from categorizing participants' responses and do not represent tendencies strictly determined by gender. This aligns with Yang (2022), who demonstrated that student engagement with technology-based feedback is linked to how that feedback is utilized in the learning process, as well as with Hardi et al. (2025), who emphasized the importance of pedagogical strategies in ensuring the effectiveness of feedback in online English language learning.

The male lecturers identified several challenges in providing technology-based feedback, particularly regarding students' digital literacy, internet connectivity, time constraints, and student engagement with the feedback, as reflected in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 15: *"At times, students **lack sufficient digital literacy** regarding the use of digital media, resulting in a limited understanding of the feedback provided." (P1)*

Excerpt 16: *"It's nothing significant; the only obstacle is an unstable **network connection**. Everything else can be easily resolved." (P3)*

Excerpt 17: *"The main challenge is the large number of students**; providing individual comments takes time**." (P4)*

Excerpt 18: *"In my experience, the main challenges…. include the significant amount of **time required**... the fact that **not all students read, understand, or act upon the feedback**... disparities in students' digital literacy skills, internet connectivity issues, limited non-verbal interaction, and the use of AI in completing assignments." (P7)*

Based on excerpts 15-18, several challenges arise in providing technology-based feedback, ranging from students' limited digital literacy and unstable internet connections to the significant time required for instructors to provide input. Furthermore, instructors face difficulty in verifying whether students actually read and apply the feedback provided. P7 also highlights the limitations of nonverbal interaction and the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in completing assignments. These various challenges indicate that implementing technology-based feedback depends not only on the availability of facilities but also on factors such as instructor workload, student engagement, and academic responsibility.

The female lecturers also identified several challenges in providing technology-based feedback, particularly regarding student engagement, understanding of the feedback, and the increasing use of AI in completing assignments, as reflected in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 19: *"Another challenge is that **not all students read and act upon the feedback provided.**" (P2)*

Excerpt 20: *"Sometimes **I don't know whether students truly understand the feedback I provide**, because we don't always meet in person." (P5)*

Excerpt 21: *"The greatest challenge is that **students struggle to change the habit of not paraphrasing AI-generated results**." (P6)*

These three excerpts illustrate distinct challenges faced by female lecturers when providing technology-based feedback. **Excerpt 19**, P2 highlights that not all students read and act upon the feedback provided. **Excerpt 20**, P5 reveals the difficulty of ensuring students understand the feedback due to limited face-to-face interaction. Meanwhile, in **Excerpt 21**, P6 emphasizes the challenge of changing student habits regarding the use of AI-generated content without proper paraphrasing. These points demonstrate that the challenges involve not only the use of technology but also student engagement, comprehension, and study habits.

The differing challenges faced by male and female lecturers reveal distinct priorities regarding technology-based feedback. Male lecturers tend to highlight technical constraints and efficiency issues such as time limitations, class sizes, internet connectivity, and digital readiness. In contrast, female lecturers place greater emphasis on student responses and engagement, particularly on the proper understanding, application, and use of feedback, including in the context of AI use. This indicates that male lecturers are more focused on the smooth execution of the process, whereas female lecturers prioritize the quality of student engagement in utilizing the feedback.

The male lecturer proposed several aspects for the future improvement of technology-based feedback, specifically enhancing students' digital literacy, improving feedback documentation, ensuring the timely and clear delivery of feedback, and providing feedback in diverse formats tailored to assignment requirements, as reflected in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 22: *"**Enhancement of students' digital literacy**"* (P1)

Excerpt 23: *"For instance, **having a note-taking app to record on-site presentation highlights**, discussions, and feedback would enhance the effectiveness of those digital platforms. This way, all the highlights could be downloaded in .doc format and reviewed later should any points need to be revisited."* (P3)

Excerpt 24: *"The important thing is that feedback **is provided in a timely manner and is clear**, so that students are not confused when revising their assignments."* (P4)

Excerpt 25: *"Feedback **should be supported by a clear assessment rubric and delivered in various formats** such as written comments, audio, or video depending on the characteristics of the assignment."* (P7)

The four excerpts demonstrate that male lecturers hold diverse views on enhancing technology-based feedback. In **Excerpt 22**, P1 emphasizes the importance of improving students' digital literacy so they can better utilize technology in the learning process. In **Excerpt 23**, P3 proposes using note-taking applications to document key points from presentations, discussions, and feedback, so they can be saved and reviewed later. In **Excerpt 24**, P4 stresses that feedback must be timely and clear to facilitate student revisions. Meanwhile, in **Excerpt 25**, P7 highlights the need for clear assessment rubrics and for using various feedback formats, such as text, audio, and video, tailored to the specific characteristics of the assignments. Overall, these views indicate that improving the quality of feedback depends not only on the technology employed but also on

student readiness, clarity of delivery, information management, and the alignment of the feedback format with learning needs.

The female lecturers proposed several aspects for the further development of technology-based feedback, specifically the integration of digital platforms, increased student engagement with feedback, the combination of various feedback formats, and the strengthening of AI-generated content detection, as reflected in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 26: "*Technology-based feedback practices can be enhanced by* ***leveraging more integrated digital platforms****... students also need to be encouraged to more actively read, reflect on, and act upon the feedback.*" (P2)

Excerpt 27: *"Lecturers should not rely on just one type of feedback. It* ***would be better to combine written feedback with verbal explanations or brief discussions via Zoom****, making it easier for students to understand the intended meaning."* (P5)

Excerpt 28: *"It would be far better if,* ***during online learning, there were an application that automatically rejected students' answers or written work detected as AI-generated*** *without paraphrasing."* (P6)

The three excerpts illustrate the perspectives of female lecturers regarding efforts to enhance the quality of technology-based feedback. In **Excerpt 26**, P2 emphasizes the need for a more integrated digital platform that simultaneously encourages students to read, reflect on, and act upon the feedback provided. **Excerpt 27**, P5 suggests combining written comments with verbal explanations or brief Zoom discussions to ensure the message is easier to understand. Meanwhile, **Excerpt 28**, P6 proposes an application capable of detecting and rejecting assignments that appear to have been generated by AI without adequate paraphrasing. Overall, these views indicate that feedback development is moving toward more integrated technology, more interactive communication, and monitoring AI use in student assignments.

Future development perspectives also reveal differing priorities. Male lecturers tend to prioritize efficiency, structure, and clarity in the feedback process, including aspects such as documentation, timeliness, and format compliance. Conversely, female lecturers focus more on student engagement and interaction through integrated platforms, diverse communication modes, and attention to AI usage. Thus, male lecturers view technology primarily to streamline feedback delivery, whereas female lecturers emphasize its role in fostering meaningful and responsive learning interactions.

Overall, findings regarding this theme reveal that the challenges and opportunities for future improvement concerning technology-based feedback differ in emphasis between male and female lecturers. Male lecturers primarily highlight obstacles related to technical limitations, workload, and the management of feedback delivery. Consequently, they propose improvements focused on student readiness to use technology, more organized information logging, and feedback delivery that is precise and tailored to assignment requirements. In contrast, female lecturers place greater emphasis on engagement, student understanding, and the use of AI, proposing developments that foster cross-media connectivity, more interactive communication, and monitoring of student work authenticity. Thus, while both groups aim to enhance feedback quality, their emphases differ: male lecturers focus on process management, whereas female lecturers prioritize the student experience and responsiveness.

4. Discussion

The results obtained in this study are subsequently interpreted by relating them to the theoretical framework and relevant prior research. This approach aims to deepen understanding of the research findings while clarifying their relevance, contributions, and implications for the further development of research on technology-based feedback in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning.

Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content

Research findings reveal differing tendencies in the technology-based feedback orientations of male and female lecturers. Consequently, the discussion here focuses on how lecturers' pedagogical and communicative orientations shape the function of feedback in online EFL learning. These differences are not understood by treating gender as a direct determinant of feedback-giving behavior; rather, they are interpreted in light of prior research on teacher communication and feedback practices. The observed patterns indicate that male lecturers tend to position feedback as academic guidance to help students meet learning objectives, whereas female lecturers more frequently combine responses to student work with positive acknowledgment and encouragement.

The tendency of male lecturers to focus more on steering students toward learning objectives may be linked to direct, task-oriented communication patterns. Dhillon and Kaur (2021) indicate that the communication style of male educators tends to be direct, task-oriented, and goal-oriented. In the context of this study, this orientation helps explain why feedback focuses on aspects deemed most critical to students' academic achievement. When feedback is viewed primarily as a means to guide students toward expected standards, lecturers tend to provide information that directly helps students identify shortcomings and make necessary improvements. Thus, the tendency observed among male lecturers can be understood as a perspective that views feedback as a practical tool for clarifying academic expectations and assisting students in progressing toward learning goals.

This interpretation also aligns with the role of feedback in supporting students' learning progress. Feedback that provides clear guidance helps students identify areas for improvement and determine the next steps in their learning process. Nguyen et al. (2022) demonstrated that written corrective feedback in online EFL learning can guide student revisions and enhance the quality of their language output. From this perspective, the tendency observed among male lecturers does not necessarily indicate a narrower focus regarding student development. Instead, this pattern may reflect a pedagogical orientation that views feedback effectiveness primarily in terms of accuracy, clarity, and its immediate utility in helping students improve their academic work.

Meanwhile, the tendency for female lecturers to be more supportive can be understood through the relational and interpersonal dimensions of lecturer-student communication. Jony (2025) discusses gender-related differences in lecturer-student communication and learning dynamics, particularly regarding supportive interactions. This perspective helps explain why expressions of appreciation and encouragement can be vital components of providing feedback. Statements such as "*Good idea*," "*That's a good point*," and "*You are doing well, keep it up, keep improving*" not only indicate that a student's response is sound but also acknowledge the effort made and convey the message that the process of improvement is an ongoing part of learning. In online learning environments, where opportunities for direct and spontaneous interaction are relatively limited, such responses can also help maintain positive relationships between lecturers and students.

Such expressions of appreciation and encouragement can be understood in light of the affective function of feedback. Rabab'ah & Belgrimet (2020) In their study on formative feedback in an EFL context through a gender lens, they demonstrate that variations in feedback practices may be linked to how educators respond to students' needs and experiences. From this perspective, supportive comments serve not merely as expressions of appreciation but also as encouragement for students to remain engaged in the learning process and to respond constructively to subsequent guidance. The tendency of female lecturers to combine evaluative information with positive reinforcement can be seen as an approach to feedback that considers not only the quality of the work produced but also seeks to preserve students' self-confidence and willingness to continue learning.

Ultimately, the difference between these two tendencies can be understood as a difference in how the function of feedback is interpreted, rather than merely a difference stemming from gender. The responses of male lecturers in this study tended to reflect a more instrumental orientation using feedback to help students meet academic requirements, whereas the responses of female lecturers appeared to integrate instructional guidance with interpersonal support. These two orientations are not mutually exclusive; the presence of one does not preclude the other. In fact, the study's findings indicate that technology-based feedback can serve both academic and affective functions, depending on how lecturers perceive their role in guiding students. Therefore, the patterns observed in this study are best understood as reflections of differing pedagogical and communicative orientations which may be linked to gender rather than as fixed characteristics inherent to male or female lecturers.

Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback.

Research findings indicate that male and female lecturers differ in their focus on the challenges and future directions of technology-based feedback. These differences relate not only to the issues encountered but also to how lecturers interpret the improvements needed to make the feedback process more effective. Consequently, the discussion here focuses on the underlying orientations of both groups, specifically, how the need for process efficiency and the need for student engagement shape the development of feedback practices. These differences are understood as tendencies potentially linked to pedagogical and communicative orientations, rather than as a direct result of gender.

The tendency of male lecturers to emphasize technical aspects, workload, and process management can be understood through an instrumental orientation toward technology. When technology is viewed as a means to support teaching activities, the focus shifts toward efficiency, orderliness, and procedural clarity. Dhillon and Kaur (2021) indicate that male communication patterns tend to be more direct, task-oriented, and goal-oriented. In the context of this study, this tendency helps explain why development efforts focused on student readiness to use technology, systematic record-keeping, and the delivery of clear feedback tailored to task requirements. Thus, these proposals can be seen as an attempt to make the feedback process more focused and manageable.

This tendency can also be linked to the time-management demands inherent in online learning. Providing individual responses requires both attention and time, particularly when dealing with large student cohorts. Consequently, lecturers have a pressing need for systems that can help organize and document these processes. Cheng et al., (2023) demonstrated that technology

has the potential to support the tracking of student revisions made in response to instructor feedback. This indicates that the use of technology can help link feedback to follow-up actions in a more systematic manner. Thus, the focus male lecturers place on process management can be understood as a response to the need to maintain the effectiveness of feedback delivery amidst the demands of their teaching workload.

Conversely, the tendency of female lecturers to prioritize student engagement and understanding can be linked to a greater emphasis on the interpersonal dimensions of the learning process. Jony (2025) highlights the significance of communication patterns and lecturer-student relationships in shaping learning dynamics. In the context of this study, this focus helps explain why feedback strategies emphasize multiple communication channels and forms of interaction to enable students to gain a more comprehensive understanding. Thus, the use of technology is viewed not merely as a means of conveying messages but as a medium that facilitates students' comprehension of the lecturer's intent and their active participation in the improvement process.

This perspective aligns with research by Yang (2022), which indicates that student engagement with technology-based feedback is linked to how such feedback is utilized within the learning process. Hardi et al., (2025) also emphasize the importance of pedagogical strategies in determining the effectiveness of feedback in online English language learning. Meanwhile, the focus on AI usage can be understood as a response to the evolving digital academic landscape, which necessitates safeguarding the authenticity of student work. Koka et al., (2024) demonstrate that AI has become an integral part of technological advancements in foreign language learning. Therefore, the attention female lecturers pay to AI does not merely signal apprehension about the technology but rather reflects a need to ensure that the technology continues to support an authentic learning process.

Overall, these differences reveal two complementary orientations in the development of technology-based feedback. Male lecturers tend to view development in terms of how the process can be managed more efficiently, structurally, and clearly, whereas female lecturers place greater emphasis on how students experience, understand, and respond to feedback within the learning process. Neither orientation is inherently superior; rather, they demonstrate that effective feedback requires attention to both process management and the student experience. Consequently, a more comprehensive approach to developing technology-based feedback needs to combine support for lecturer work efficiency with mechanisms that foster interaction, understanding, engagement, and responsible technology use.

5. Conclusion

This study aims to further identify gender differences among teachers that influence the content of technology-based feedback in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning in Central Java, Indonesia. Based on the thematic analysis, this study identified two main themes: (1) Characteristics of Technology-Based Feedback Content and (2) Challenges and Future Improvement of Technology-Based Feedback. The findings indicate that both male and female lecturers utilize various digital platforms to provide feedback aimed at enhancing students' English language proficiency. However, differences exist in the approaches employed: male lecturers tend to focus their feedback on the most critical academic aspects, such as content, grammar, and writing

organization, to increase efficiency and achieve learning objectives. In contrast, female lecturers provide more comprehensive feedback by integrating academic aspects, motivation, and appreciation with attention to the development of students' learning processes. Furthermore, the study reveals that implementing technology-based feedback faces various challenges, including low student digital literacy, lecturers' time constraints, internet connectivity issues, limited student engagement with the feedback provided, and the increasing use of AI to complete academic assignments. Therefore, the future development of technology-based feedback needs to combine technological innovation with pedagogical strategies that enhance communication, digital literacy, and academic integrity.

Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. The relatively small number of participants and the fact that the lecturers were drawn from only two types of higher education institutions in Central Java mean that the findings cannot yet be generalized to the broader EFL context. Furthermore, because the data were collected solely via Google Forms, the study could not directly capture actual classroom practices in providing technology-based feedback. Despite these limitations, this study contributes to the field by enriching the literature on technology-based feedback through the lens of lecturers' gender perspectives, an area rarely addressed in previous research. Future studies are encouraged to involve participants from diverse educational levels and institutions, employ a wider range of data collection methods (such as classroom observations and analyses of feedback documents), and explore the relationships among lecturers' perspectives, student responses, and the impact of technology-based feedback on learning outcomes. Such efforts would facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the implementation of technology-based feedback in EFL instruction.

6. References

Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., & Ameen, B. M. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, *6*(March), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198

Albogami, M. M. (2020). *An Inquiry into Effective Written Feedback from EFL Teachers' and Students' Perspectives at a Saudi University*. university of exeter. https://hdl.handle.net/10871/123088

Cheng, G., Chwo, G. S. M., & Ng, W. S. (2023). Automated tracking of student revisions in response to teacher feedback in EFL writing: technological feasibility and teachers' perspectives. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *31*(8), 5236–5260. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2001539

Creswell, J. W., & Báez, J. C. (2021). *Thirty essential skills for the qualitative researcher* (Veronica Stapleton Hooper, Ed.; Second, Vol. 2). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & David, J. C. (2024). *RESEARCH DESIGN Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Tracy Buyan, Ed.; sixth). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dhillon, N., & Kaur, G. (2021). Self-Assessment of Teachers' Communication Style and Its Impact on Their Communication Effectiveness: A Study of Indian Higher Educational Institutions. *SAGE Open*, *11*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211023173

Guo, W. (2024). Gender differences in teacher feedback and students' self-regulated learning. *Educational Studies*, *50*(3), 341–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2021.1943648

Hamzehloo, M. (2019). A Gender-based Analysis of EFL Female Teachers' Attitude Towards Oral Error Correction in Iranian Classroom Setting Maryam. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, *11*(1), 1–14. doi:10.22034/ijpie.2024.192904

Hardi, I., Nur, R., Ammade, S., Latifa, A., & Syawal. (2025). Effective Feedback Strategies in Online English Learning: A Systematic Literature Review. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, *8*(2 SE-Articles), 201–221. https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v8i2.14523

Hashemi, A., Si Na, K., Noori, A. Q., & Orfan, S. N. (2022). Gender differences on the acceptance and barriers of ICT use in English language learning: Students' perspectives. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2085381

Hidayat, M., & Saleh, M. N. I. (2022). Feedback in The Learning Process on Indonesian Master ' s Degree Experience Studying Abroad. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, *24*(August), 158–170. doi:10.21009/jtp.v24i2.25856

Hossain, K. I., Ahmed, M. K., & Mahmud, M. S. (2024). A Comprehensive Review on the Impact of Teacher Feedback in Language Development for ESL/EFL Learners. *Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, *7*(1), 218–229. https://doi.org/10.3329/iubatr.v7i1.74421

Ibhar, Z. M., & Ibhar, F. F. (2023). Exploring EFL learners' perception of Google Forms as an assessment tool in learning english. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics*, *7*(3), 53.

Iraji, S., Zoghi, M., & Nemat-Tabrizi, A. (2014). Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake Across Gender in an EFL Context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 680–687. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.468

Jamil. (2022). Optimalisasi Layanan Tutorial Online dan Aksesibilitas Terhadap Kepuasan Bantuan Belajar Online Mahasiswa UT. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, *5*(1), 141–150. https://doi.org/10.30605/jsgp.5.1.2022.1714

Jony, M. S. (2025). Investigating the role of gender in teacher-student communication and classroom dynamics. *Journal of Education For Sustainable Innovation*, *3*(1), 87–99. https://doi.org/10.56916/jesi.v3i1.1250

Khairisya, T., & Fithriani, R. (2023). An Investigation of Male and Female Teachers' Oral Feedback in English Classroom: A Focus on Elicitation & Reformulation. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(2), 209–223. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i2.2806

Koka, N. A., Khan, M. R., Ahmad, J., Aftab, S., & Wahab, M. O. A. (2024). Gender Dynamics in Digital Classroom; Measuring Artificial Intelligence (AI) Acceptance and Integration by Senior Lectures in Foreign Language Instruction. *Archives Des Sciences*, *74*(5), 35–44. https://doi.org/10.62227/as/74506

Lee, C., Alexander Seeshing, Y., & and Ip, T. (2016). Use of computer technology for English language learning: do learning styles, gender, and age matter? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *29*(5), 1035–1051. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2016.1140655

Mahmood, S. (2025). *AI or peer feedback: what works best in improving writing?* University of Oxford. https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:b4726753-1818-4d8d-9945-0e353345ac08

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2024). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*(October), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789

Nasution, A. F. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif* (M. Dr. Hj. Meyniar Albina, Ed.; 1st ed.). CV harfa creative.

Nguyen, H. U. N., Duong, L. N. T., & Pham, V. P. H. (2022). Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Applied by Van Lang University's EFL Lecturers in Teaching Online. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, *13*(2), 21–41. https://doi.org/10.54855/acoj.221322

Rabab'ah, G., & Belgrimet, S. (2020). Postgraduate instructors' formative feedback on EFL students' assignments in email communication: A gender-based study. *JALT CALL Journal*, *16*(2), 85–105. https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v16n2.188

Rajab, H. (2018). *EFL Teachers and Learners ' Perceptions , Beliefs and Practices on Written Corrective Feedback in the Saudi Higher Education Context* . The University of Exeter. https://hdl.handle.net/10871/33972

Saeed, M. A., Ghazali, K., & Aljaberi, M. A. (2018). A review of previous studies on ESL/EFL learners' interactional feedback exchanges in face-to-face and computer-assisted peer review of writing. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0084-8

Seroussi, D. E., Peled, Y., Sharon, R., Rothschild, N., Halperin Barlev, O., Weissblueth, E., & Harpaz, G. (2023). 'A Different Voice' in Peer Feedback: Gender Specificity in Students' Willingness to Provide Peer Feedback. *Education Sciences*, *13*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070654

Severiano, D. A., de Souza Vasconcelos, A. L. F., & Neto, O. R. M. (2025). Selection of participants in qualitative research. In *Evolving Designs, Applications, Technological Advances, and the Future of Qualitative Research* (pp. 59–70). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. doi:10.4018/979-8-3373-4432-4.ch003

Shadiev, R., Yingying, F., Roza, Z., & and Altinay, F. (2024). Effects of speech-enabled corrective feedback technology on EFL speaking skills, anxiety and confidence. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2430761

Stahl, D. J. (2021). *Secondary Classroom Teachers' Beliefs and Decision Making Regarding the Use of Feedback to Improve Student Learning*. The University of st. Thomas Minnesota. https://researchonline.stthomas.edu/esploro/outputs/991015132333403691

Ulum, N. H., Basuki, A., & Eliasa, eva imania. (2023). Use of Google Forms as an Instrument for Assessment of Student Needs. *Journal of Education Policy Analysis (JEPA)*, *1*(1), 15–23. https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/4954641

Yakışık, B. Y. (2021). EFL Learners ' Preferences and Emotions about Oral Corrective Feedback at Secondary Education in Turkey : Are There Gender and Grade-level Differences ? *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i1.889%0A

Yang, L. (2022). Student Engagement With Teacher Feedback in Pronunciation Training Supported by a Mobile Multimedia Application. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094604

Zareekbatani, A. (2015). *Technology and L2 writing: EFL student perspectives on electronic feedback using online learning logs*. university of exeter. https://www.proquest.com/openview/5dd1ff368267aab43efab82e303c6b96/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=51922&diss=y

Zhang, M., & Fang, X. (2022). Exploring University EFL Teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Teacher Efficacy in Technology-integrated Flipped Classroom. *SAGE Open*, *12*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221116105