



## A Gender-Based Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Online English Language Instructors Performance

Mustafa Mahmood Abdullah 

Department of English / Gollege of Arts / University of Mosul/ Mosul-Iraq

Ashraf R. Abdullah 

Department of English / Gollege of Arts / University of Mosul/ Mosul-Iraq

### Article Information

#### Article History:

Received Jun 1<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Revised Jun 21<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Accepted July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Available Online June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026

#### Keywords:

Gender-Based Analysis,

Error Analysis,

Grammatical Errors,

Online English Language.

#### Correspondence:

Mustafa Mahmood Abdullah

[mustafa.23arp93@student.uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:mustafa.23arp93@student.uomosul.edu.iq)

<http://www.uomosul.edu.iq>

### Abstract

The study examines grammatical errors made by online English instructors, particularly those with large audiences. It highlights concerns over unqualified instructors spreading incorrect language and using poor teaching methods, which can hinder learner proficiency. The research aims to identify the most common grammatical errors and explore gender differences in error frequency. Using a qualitative approach and Corder's (1973) Error Analysis Model, supplemented by Norrish's (1983) and Dulay and Burt's (1974) models, the study analysed five transcribed samples. Results indicate that instructors frequently make grammar mistakes, which may negatively influence learners' language habits. The findings also show a gender imbalance, with male instructors being more prominent. The study concludes by emphasizing the importance of continuous linguistic training for online instructors.

DOI: [10.33899/radab.v56i105.63466](https://doi.org/10.33899/radab.v56i105.63466), ©Authors, 2023, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## تحليل قائم على النوع الاجتماعي للأخطاء النحوية في أداء معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية عبر الإنترنت

اشرف رياض عبدالله \*\*

مصطفى محمود عبدالله \*

المستخلص

تناولت الدراسة الاغلاط النحوية التي يحدثها معلمو اللغة الإنكليزية باستعمالهم للإنترنت، ولا سيما أولئك الذين يتمتعون بجمهور واسع. وتسلسل الضوء على المخاوف المتعلقة بانتشار معلمين غير مؤهلين يقدمون محتوى لغويًا غير دقيق ويعتمدون أساليب تدريس غير فعالة، مما قد يعيق تطور الكفاءة اللغوية لدى المتعلمين. يهدف البحث إلى تحديد أكثر الأخطاء النحوية شيوعًا، واستكشاف الفروق بين الجنسين في تكرار هذه الأخطاء. واعتمدت الدراسة منهجًا نوعيًا واستند التحليل إلى نموذج كوردر (1973) ونورش (1983) ودولاي وبيرت (1974)، تم تحليل خمس عينات مكتوبة مختارة. تشير نتائج تحليل البيانات إلى أن المعلمين عبر الإنترنت يرتكبون أخطاء نحوية بشكل متكرر، وهو ما قد يؤثر سلبيًا في عادات الطلاب اللغوية وتحصيلهم. كما تُظهر النتائج وجود تباين بين الجنسين، حيث يبرز المعلمون الذكور في عدد

\* قسم اللغة الإنكليزية / كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل – العراق  
\*\* قسم اللغة الإنكليزية / كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل – العراق

مرات ارتكاب الأخطاء. وتخلص الدراسة إلى التأكيد على أهمية توفير تدريب لغوي مستمر لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية عبر الإنترنت، بما يضمن جودة المحتوى التعليمي المقدم.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** التحليل القائم على النوع الاجتماعي، تحليل الأخطاء، الأخطاء النحوية، اللغة الإنجليزية عبر الإنترنت.

## **1. Introduction**

Given the central role of English in global communication, it is essential to investigate the quality of language instruction provided in online environments. In particular, examining the grammatical accuracy of English language instructors can shed light on instructional effectiveness. Error analysis serves as a valuable tool for identifying and understanding linguistic inaccuracies, including the patterns and underlying causes of such errors. This study adopts a gender-based perspective, exploring whether male and female instructors differ in their grammatical performance. By focusing on the types and frequencies of grammatical errors made by instructors across genders, the analysis aims to uncover potential disparities that may influence the learning experience of students.

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

The rapid expansion of online education has led to a significant increase in the number of English language instructors operating in virtual environments. While many of these instructors are well-qualified and effective, others lack formal training or teaching certifications. As a result, some disseminate inaccurate grammatical structures and utilize ineffective instructional methods, ultimately compromising the quality of language education. Despite growing concerns about instructional standards, limited research has been conducted to examine the influence of instructor characteristics, particularly gender, on the frequency and nature of grammatical errors. Understanding whether male and female instructors differ in their grammatical accuracy is crucial for improving instructional quality and ensuring equitable learning outcomes in online English education.

## **3. Research Questions**

This study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. Do grammatical error rates differ between male and female online English language instructors?
2. What are the meticulous types of grammatical errors made by online English language instructors?

## **4. Aims of the Study**

This study aims to identify the most common grammatical errors made by online English language instructors. Furthermore, it seeks to investigate gender differences in error rates among these instructors, determining which gender demonstrates a higher frequency of errors.

## **5. Research Hypotheses**

This study tries to investigate the following hypotheses:

Online English language instructors frequently make grammatical errors in areas such as tense usage, interrogative structure, and subject-verb agreement.

1. Error rates among male instructors in online instructional content are significantly higher than those of female instructors, a disparity that is largely attributable to socio-cultural influences.

## **6. Significance of the Study**

This study is valuable to various stakeholders in the field of online education. It contributes to the growing body of research on virtual English language instruction by examining teaching quality from a gender-based perspective. By identifying common grammatical errors made by male and female instructors and analyzing their impact on learners, the study sheds light on important challenges within the online learning environment. Additionally, it provides targeted recommendations for improving instructional practices, benefiting educators, learners, and policymakers. Ultimately, this research aims to enhance the quality and credibility of online English education by addressing gender-related differences in instructor performance.

## **7. Scope of the Study**

This study focuses exclusively on publicly accessible educational content shared by online English language instructors on platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube. It excludes private or paid instructional materials. The research does not take into account the instructors' formal qualifications or academic backgrounds. The analysis is confined to content published within a specific time frame, disregarding any materials shared outside this period. Furthermore, the study does not include direct feedback from instructors or interviews that might offer deeper insights into their pedagogical decisions and language use.

## **8. Review of Related Literature**

### **8.1 Gender**

The study of language and gender began to develop during the second wave of feminism in the 1970s and 1980s. During this time, a view known as “difference feminism” had a strong influence. It led researchers to focus on the differences between how men and women speak, often presenting gender in binary terms (Hall et al., 2021).

In sociolinguistics, the term “gender” is preferred over “sex” because each conveys a distinct meaning. While “sex” refers to biological differences, “gender” is more appropriate for studying language, as it encompasses social and cultural behaviors (Holmes, 2013). Holmes (2013) explains that men and women communicate differently in all speech communities; these differences are shaped largely by social

and cultural influences rather than biological ones. They are evident in pronunciation, vocabulary, and overall language use. Furthermore, Afrin and Afrin (2024) note that language differences between men and women appear in various aspects, including word choices, voice tones, sentence structures, and conversational styles, all of which display clear gender-based patterns.

In addition to gender, age also contributes to language variation for two primary reasons. First, traditional differences in social status can influence both perception and communication patterns. Second, men and women frequently occupy different social roles, engage in different activities, and participate in distinct social settings, all of which shape their linguistic behavior (Coates, 2015). Thus, both gender and age function as key sociolinguistic variables that affect how language is used and understood within a community.

More recently, gender is no longer seen as directly tied to biological sex. Researchers now explore how language can be used to express identity, manage social roles, and show power dynamics. In this view, language is seen as a tool people use for specific social purposes (Hall et al., 2021).

## **8.2 Error Analysis**

Errors play a vital role in language learning, offering insights into how learners acquire and process a new language. Error Analysis (EA) is especially important in language education, as it helps teachers understand learners' strategies and adjust their methods to better support the learning process (Corder, 1967, p. 16).

EA gained prominence after the earlier method of Contrastive Analysis (CA), which was popular in the 1950s. CA focused on comparing a learner's first language (L1) with the target language (TL) to predict errors, emphasizing the negative influence of L1 on second language acquisition (Maruti, 2023, p. 16). However, CA was found to be limited, as not all predicted errors occurred, and learners from different language backgrounds often made similar mistakes.

James (1994, p. 180) highlighted that while CA is predictive, EA identifies actual errors by examining the learner's interlanguage (IL), which represents their evolving internal understanding of the TL. Brown (2007, p. 227) also noted that EA examines all possible sources of errors, not just those caused by L1 interference.

Corder (1967, pp. 165, 167) redefined errors as part of the learning process, viewing them as signs of learners testing and forming hypotheses about the TL. He introduced the concept of IL, which combines features from both L1 and TL and evolves through learning. Errors, therefore, reflect cognitive development rather than failure. Known as the father of EA, Corder (1967, p. 167) emphasized that errors are valuable for understanding learners' internal language systems (Ridha, 2012, p. 26).

Before Corder's work, errors were mostly seen as problems to be corrected. His perspective shifted the focus to seeing errors as useful for both teaching and learning. By the 1960s and 1970s, EA became a recognized field in applied linguistics (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 201), distinguishing itself from CA by highlighting universal learning strategies, not just L1 interference.

EA has both theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, it helps explain how learners develop their IL. Practically, it guides teachers in identifying common learner errors and creating targeted teaching strategies to address them (Corder, 1974, p. 2).

### **8.2.1 Errors and Mistakes**

Distinguishing between errors and mistakes is essential in language learning. Chomsky (1965, p. 4) introduced the concepts of competence, which is a person's internal language knowledge, and performance, which is their actual language use. Building on this, Corder (1967, p. 167) explained that mistakes are performance-related and can be self-corrected, while errors are systematic and reflect a lack of knowledge that cannot be corrected without guidance.

Brown (2007, p. 226) added that mistakes often result from factors like fatigue or inattention, whereas errors come from not knowing the correct form. James (1998, p. 83) agreed, noting that mistakes can be corrected once identified, but errors cannot.

Richards and Schmidt (2002, p. 201) emphasized that errors are caused by incomplete knowledge, while mistakes are due to temporary performance issues. Ellis (1997, p. 17) also stated that errors reflect a knowledge gap, and mistakes occur when learners fail to use what they know. Similarly, Strazny (2005, p. 6, as cited in Maree, 2022, p. 12) described errors as consistent deviations during language development.

To sum up these views, Harmer (2002, p. 137) categorized language problems into two groups: those that can be corrected once the learner is made aware, and those that require guidance and explanation. This classification helps teachers better support learners by identifying whether the issue is a correctable slip or a deeper misunderstanding.

### **Definitions of Error Analysis and Errors**

The term “*error*” was defined differently by many experts. According to Corder (1981), EA is a method used to understand how first language (L1) influences second language (L2) learning and to explore the mental processes involved in learning a new language. Brown (2007) defines EA as a systematic way to identify, analyze, and describe learner errors based on the rules of the target language (TL), aiming to reveal the learner's internal language system.

Richards and Schmidt (2002) describe EA as the study of errors made by second and foreign language learners, which helps improve teaching and learning strategies. Crystal (2008) sees EA as a method for identifying, classifying, and analyzing incorrect language forms using linguistic tools. Selinker (2008) emphasizes that EA focuses on learner errors to better understand second language acquisition (SLA).

Regarding the term “*error*”, Norrish (1983) defines it as a consistent deviation from the correct form due to incomplete learning. Ismail (2019) also describes EA as a systematic way to understand the common mistakes made by L2 learners. Dulay et al. (1982) define errors as parts of speech or writing that differ from mature language norms, viewing them as a natural part of the learning process.

### **2.2.3 Sources of Errors**

Understanding the sources of errors is crucial for identifying why they occur and how they form in second language learning. According to Brown (2007), errors mainly come from two sources:

- Interlingual errors, caused by interference from the learner's native language (L1).
- Intralingual errors, caused by incorrect application or misunderstanding of the target language (TL) rules.

Richards (1971) expands this by adding developmental errors, which occur naturally as learners build their understanding of the new language. He further divides intralingual errors into four types:

1. Overgeneralization: Applying a TL rule too broadly (e.g., "He gived the meat" instead of "He gave the meat").
2. Incomplete Application: Not fully applying TL rules (e.g., using declarative word order in questions).
3. False Concepts Hypothesized: Misunderstanding language distinctions (e.g., "One day it was happened").
4. Ignorance of Rule Restrictions: Using rules in wrong contexts (e.g., "He made me to laugh").

Developmental errors reflect learners' progress and are similar to mistakes made by children learning their first language.

Norrish (1983) identifies three other sources:

- Carelessness, due to lack of attention or motivation.
- L1 Interference, from native language habits.
- Literal Translation of Idioms, translating idioms word-for-word from L1.

Brown (2007) also highlights additional sources:

- Learning Context, where teachers or materials might mislead learners.
- Communication Strategies, where learners' attempts to convey meaning can cause errors.

### **8.3 Overview of Electronic Learning**

The Internet has become an indispensable part of modern life, transforming communication, work, and information access through devices like laptops and smartphones (Abdul-Qawy et al., 2015). In education, the Internet offers diverse tools that facilitate knowledge sharing and collaboration between teachers and students, significantly enhancing learning experiences (Richard & Haya, 2009). Social media platforms further enable interactive communication, fostering content creation and exchange in the digital space (Chu, 2024). The Internet supports unique educational opportunities through E-learning, which provides flexible, innovative teaching methods that transcend time and place constraints, making learning more accessible and collaborative (Burbules & Callister, 2000).

E-learning has evolved from fully online courses to include blended and hybrid models that integrate digital technologies to enhance learning quality and accessibility (Oblinger & Hawkins, 2005; Maltz & DeBlois, 2005; Abbad et al., 2009). The advancement of information and communication technologies has opened new educational opportunities, emphasizing digital literacy and communication skills (Shetzer & Warschauer, 1999, as cited in Padmavathi, 2013). E-learning is now recognized as a rapidly growing and effective form of education, especially in language teaching, where online platforms enable real-time interaction and personalized learning experiences, despite pedagogical challenges (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2013; Chapelle, 2003). Overall, E-learning bridges traditional and distance education, offering interactive, individualized learning accessible to more students (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2013).

### **8.3.1 History of Electronic Learning**

E-learning has evolved through several stages aligned with technological advances and educational needs. Initially starting in the 1960s with the introduction of computers into education (Yamani, 1426 AH, as cited in Salih, 2022), its development can be divided into phases: before 1983 focused on traditional classroom teaching; 1984–1993 saw multimedia tools like CD-ROMs; 1993–2000 experienced the rise of the Internet enabling video and email use; and from 2001 onward, Web 2.0 technologies enhanced e-teaching with interactive e-books and improved communication (Salem, 2004).

Similarly, Taylor (2001) describes five generations of e-learning: the first with printed correspondence materials; the second adding multimedia like audio and video; the third using IT for distance learning through broadcasts and conferencing; the fourth integrating the Internet as the main teaching platform; and the fifth establishing fully online education via virtual universities.

### **8.3.2 Types of Electronic Learning**

E-learning is a vital component of modern education, offering flexible and accessible learning through digital platforms. Hrastinski (2008) identifies two main types: asynchronous and synchronous learning. Asynchronous E-learning allows learners to study at their own pace using tools like emails and forums, supporting flexibility and self-regulation. In contrast, synchronous E-learning involves real-time interaction via video conferencing and live chats, fostering engagement and a stronger sense of community.

### **8.3.3 Aim of Electronic Learning**

E-learning aims to enhance modern education by leveraging technology to create interactive and flexible learning environments. According to Salem (2004), its goals include promoting collaboration, improving teachers' digital skills, teaching students effective use of technology, and supporting personalized education across age groups.

Additionally, Al-Kanaan (1429 AH, as cited in Salih, 2022, p. 11) highlights objectives such as meeting individual learning needs, promoting self-education, addressing shortages in teachers and lab resources, and fostering global communication.

### **8.3.3 The Advantages and Disadvantages of Electronic Learning**

Alsayed and Althaqafi (2024, p. 124) discussed several advantages and disadvantages of E-learning. The advantages include:

- Access to online materials.
- Learning at an individual pace.
- The convenience of studying from home.
- Interactive online classes.
- The ability to record sessions for future reference.
- Studying in a comfortable environment.

The disadvantages identified are:

- Limited interaction with instructors.
- Technical issues.
- Reduced collaboration with peers.

- Suboptimal learning conditions at home.
- A lack of self-discipline.
- Feelings of social isolation.

#### **8.4 Previous Studies**

Hamza (2016) examined Iraqi EFL learners' difficulties with semantic roles of the subject. Using a 100-item diagnostic test on 100 fourth-year students from Al-Qadissiya and Babylon Universities, the study found that students performed better in recognition (69.7%) than production (28.7%). Common errors included confusing agentive and affected roles, overgeneralizing agent roles, and failing to identify correct roles. The study emphasized the need for targeted teaching strategies to improve learners' grasp of semantic roles.

Maree (2022) analyzed common grammatical errors in spoken English among Iraqi EFL learners at the University of Mosul. Using interviews and spot-the-difference tasks with 60 students, the study compared first- and third-year students, finding that verb tense errors were the most frequent. Third-year students showed greater accuracy in verb tense, prepositions, verb agreement, and sentence structure. Errors were linked to both interlingual and intralingual factors. The study recommended enhancing instruction on verb tenses and grammar rules to reduce language interference and improve speaking skills.

Alodail (2016) examined male and female instructors' attitudes toward e-learning at Albaha University in Saudi Arabia. The study considered factors like gender, perceived computer qualities, computer competency, and educational culture. Findings showed that female instructors had more positive attitudes toward e-learning than males, identifying gender as a key factor in the adoption of e-learning in higher education.

The reviewed studies provide important insights but have notable limitations. Hamza (2016) and Maree (2022) focus on traditional classroom settings and spoken grammar, overlooking how errors may differ in online environments. Alodail (2016) examines attitudes toward e-learning but not actual instructional performance, especially in grammar. These gaps highlight the need for research that explores gender differences in grammatical performance within online English instruction, an area not yet addressed by previous studies.

## **9. Methodology**

This section summarizes the study's methodology, covering six key areas: the overall research design, data collection methods, a structured file-naming system, data analysis procedures, ethical considerations, and the theoretical framework guiding the study.

### **9.1 Research Design**

This study adopts a qualitative research design to explore grammatical errors in second language instruction, focusing on their nature and causes rather than statistical measurement. While basic percentages are used, the emphasis remains on interpretation and contextual analysis. Data is collected through systematic online observations of English instructors' publicly available teaching content on platforms like YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok.

### **9.2 Data Collection Procedures**

The study uses a systematic and ethical approach to data collection by observing and analyzing 5 samples from popular social media platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube. These platforms are chosen for their wide reach and influence on learners. The researcher focuses on accounts with large followings to ensure the content reflects real-world engagement and educational impact. This method ensures the data is authentic, relevant, and aligned with the study’s objectives, thereby enhancing its credibility and validity.

**Table 1**

Data population

NO.	Code	Initials of Instructors	Platform	Followers No.	Error Type	Date	Sociolinguistic Variables	
							Gender	Regional Background
1	<M.H.Ins.Gr.NOV.24>	HA	Instagram	29.4k	Grammar	24-Nov	Male	Baghdad
2	<M.T.Y.Gr.FEB.25>	TM	YouTube	83k	Grammar	25-Feb	Male	Mosul
3	<M.A.Y.Gr.FEB.25>	AK	YouTube	83k	Grammar	25-Feb	Male	Mosul
4	<F.H.T.Gr.JAN.25>	HA	TikTok	1.3k	Grammar	25-Jan	Female	Baghdad
5	<M.B.T.Pr.MAR.25>	BN	TikTok	28.5k	Grammar	25-Mar	Male	Basra

### 9.3 Data File Naming

The study uses a structured file-naming system based on Abdullah (2014), labeling each sample with:

**<M.H.Ins.Gr.NOV.24>**

- Instructor’s gender (e.g., M for Male).
- Instructor’s name (e.g., H).
- Platform where the error occurs (e.g., Ins for Instagram).
- Type of error (e.g., Gr for grammar).
- Date of video collection (e.g., 24-Nov for November 2024).

### 9.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis follows a combined model integrating Corder’s (1973) five-stage error analysis with classifications from Norrish (1983) and Dulay & Burt (1974). The stages include:

1. Collection of high-engagement instructor samples from social media platforms.
2. Identification of errors by transcribing and interpreting instructors’ intended meanings.
3. Description of errors, categorizing them as omission, addition, selection, or misordering.
4. Explanation of errors by analyzing their sources, including transfer, overgeneralization, carelessness, and interference.
5. Evaluation of errors based on their effect on communication and learning.

### 9.5 Ethics

The researcher ensures ethical integrity by collecting data solely from public sources without direct interaction, protecting participants' privacy. Instructor identities are anonymized using initials, and the data is presented honestly and accurately to avoid any distortion or misuse.

### 9.6 Model of Analysis

This study uses an integrated error analysis model combining Corder's (1973) five-stage framework with the error source classifications of Norrish (1983) and Dulay and Burt (1974). While Corder's model provides a structured method to identify and analyze errors, its explanation stage lacks detail, especially for errors in online English instruction. The additional classifications from Norrish and Dulay and Burt address this gap by offering a more comprehensive understanding of error origins, enhancing the analysis of language errors in digital learning contexts.

The data analysis follows Corder's (1973) five-stage error analysis model, enhanced by insights from Dulay and Burt (1974) and Norrish (1983).

1. Collection of the Sample: Data are systematically gathered from high-engagement content on social media platforms like Instagram, TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube to ensure representativeness and relevance.
2. Identification of Error: Errors are identified by interpreting instructors' intended meanings, distinguishing between overt (clearly wrong) and covert (contextually incorrect) errors.
3. Description of Error: Errors are categorized into four types: omission (missing elements), addition (unnecessary elements), selection (incorrect choices), and misordering (wrong arrangement).
4. Explanation of Error: This stage explores the cognitive and linguistic causes behind errors, including transfer from the first language, overgeneralization of rules, and teaching-induced mistakes. Dulay and Burt classify errors as developmental, interference, or unique, while Norrish adds causes like carelessness, L1 interference, and literal translation of idioms.
5. Evaluation of Error: Errors are assessed based on their impact on communication and learning, helping prioritize which errors require immediate correction and inform teaching strategies.

**Figure 1**

**Figure 1**

*Summary of Corder's Eclectic Model of Error Analysis (1974)*

1. Collection of the Sample		
2. Identification of Error		
3. Description of Error		
4. Explanation of Error		
Corder's Procedures (1973)	Dulay and Burt's Procedures (1974)	Norrish's Procedures (1983)
1. Transfer	1. Developmental Error	1. Carelessness
2. Overgeneralization	2. Interference Error	2. L1 Interference
3. Teaching-Induced Methods	3. Unique Error	3. Literal Translation
5. Evaluation of Error		

## 10. Data Analysis

This section addresses the analytical dimension of the research, concentrating on the examination of linguistic errors. The analysis is informed by Corder’s eclectic model (1974) and utilizes observation as the principal methodological approach. In pursuit of this objective, a quantitative analysis is carried out on the selected dataset.

### 10.1 <M.H.Ins.Gr.NOV.24>

#### 1. Collection of the Sample:

The sample is taken from HA’s viral Instagram video on English grammar.

#### 2. Identification of Error:

Grammatical/syntactic			error		in		the		sentence:
/messi	get	əʊld,	səʊ	ai	θɪŋk	hi:	wɪl	wɪl	rɪˈtaɪəsu:n/
Messi	get	old,	so	I	think	he	will	retire	soon.

Correct: *Messi is getting old, so I think he will retire soon.*

#### 3. Description of Error:

A **selection error**, the present simple “get” is used instead of the present continuous “is getting” to express a gradual change.

#### 4. Explanation of Error:

Attributed to **carelessness** (Norrish, 1983), likely due to a lack of attention during instruction.

#### 5. Evaluation of Error:

With over 124,000 likes, the error may mislead learners and promote incorrect tense usage.

### 10.2 <M.H.Ins.Gr.NOV.24>

#### 1. Collection of the Sample:

The sample is taken from an interview on TM’s YouTube channel, where he teaches English.

#### 2. Identification of Error:

/həʊ ˈmeni ˈpi:pl ɪn ðə kɔ:s wɪð ju:/  
*How many people in this course with you?*

Correct: *How many people are in this course with you?*

The sentence is missing the auxiliary verb "are," making it grammatically incorrect.

The sentence is missing the auxiliary verb "are," making it grammatically incorrect.

#### 3. Description of Error:

This is an omission and misordering error. The lack of “are” disrupts the proper Wh-question structure in English.

#### 4. Explanation of Error:

The mistake likely results from negative transfer from Arabic (L1), where auxiliary verbs are not required in question formation (Corder, 1973).

#### 5. Evaluation of Error:

With 82,000 subscribers, the error may mislead many learners, reinforcing incorrect sentence patterns and affecting their overall English fluency.

### 10.3 <M.A.Y.Gr.FEB.25>

#### 1. Collection of the Sample:

The sample is from an interview on TM's YouTube channel, featuring a conversation with AK, a schoolteacher.

2. **Identification of Error:**

/aɪ pʊt ə fʊl 'kɒnfɪdntɪn mɑɪ 'self/

*I put a full confident in myself.*

*Correct form: I put full confidence in myself.*

The adjective "confident" is incorrectly used instead of the noun "confidence".

3. **Description of Error:**

This is a selection and misordering error. The wrong word form is chosen, and the phrase structure (article + adjective + noun) is disrupted.

4. **Explanation of Error:**

Attributed to carelessness (Norris, 1983), due to the lack of attention or overconfidence during speech.

5. **Evaluation of Error:**

With 82,000 subscribers, this error risks reinforcing incorrect word usage and sentence patterns, potentially leading to fossilization among learners.

**10.4 <F.H.T.Gr.JAN.25>**

1. **Collection of the Sample:**

The sample is taken from a TikTok video by Hana Khlaif, a professor and English instructor, in her lecture titled "صناعة المترجم." She says: "Why they choose this day to celebrate the Arabic language?"

2. **Identification of Error:**

The grammatical error is in the interrogative structure.  
/waɪ ðeɪ tʃuːz ðɪs deɪ/

Incorrect: Why they choose this day?

Correct: Why do they choose this day?

This is an omission of the auxiliary verb "do", which is essential in present simple questions.

3. **Description of Error:**

The error is syntactic and falls under the omission category. The auxiliary verb "do" is missing, resulting in an ungrammatical question form.

4. **Explanation of Error:**

The error likely results from L1 (Arabic) transfer, as Arabic question formation does not use auxiliary verbs like English does. This reflects interlingual interference, as described by Corder (1973).

5. **Evaluation of Error:**

- **Impact on Social Media Audience:** With over 1,200 followers, the instructor's incorrect usage may lead to the spread of this error among English learners.
- **Impact on University Students:** As a university professor, she holds a responsibility to model correct language use. Such errors risk fossilization among students and undermine academic and professional language standards.

**10.5 <M.B.T.Pr.MAR.25>**

1. **Collection of the Sample:**

The sample is from a TikTok video by English instructor NB.

2. **Identification of Error:**

The error in the sample is a grammatical/syntactic error.

/hi: nəʊ 'evriθɪŋ ænd wɪl 'nevə skæp ðɪs fɔ: ju: /

He know everything and will never skip this for you.

Correct: He knows everything and will never skip this for you.

### **3. Description of Error:**

This is an omission error, as the required grammatical marker “-s” for third-person singular subjects in the present simple tense is missing from the verb “know”.

### **4. Explanation of Error:**

The error is due to overgeneralization, where the speaker incorrectly applies the base verb form to all subjects, ignoring the specific rule for third-person singular agreement, as explained by Corder (1973).

### **5. Evaluation of Error:**

Given the instructor’s wide reach on social media, this error risks being adopted by many learners. It can lead to the fossilization of incorrect grammar and negatively influence both informal learners and university students who view the instructor as a credible language model.

## **11. Findings and Discussion**

The grammatical and syntactic errors observed across all five samples fall into four main categories: tense misuse, incorrect interrogative structure, word choice and ordering, and subject-verb agreement. In Sample 1, the instructor incorrectly uses the simple present tense (“Messi get old”) instead of the present continuous (“Messi is getting old”), distorting the intended meaning of gradual change. This error is attributed to carelessness. Samples 2 and 4 reveal a shared issue in question formation, where auxiliary verbs are omitted (“How many people in the course with you?” and “Why they choose this day?”). These errors result from negative transfer from Arabic, which does not require auxiliaries in questions. Sample 3 features both lexical and structural issues, with the instructor saying “I put a full confident in myself” instead of “full confidence,” demonstrating confusion between adjective and noun forms, as well as improper word order. Again, this is linked to inattention rather than a lack of grammatical knowledge. In Sample 5, the instructor omits the third-person singular “-s” in “he know everything,” an error caused by overgeneralization of the base verb form. While these instructors likely intended to use correct grammar, their errors broadcast to large audiences pose a risk of spreading misinformation and reinforcing incorrect language patterns among learners.

The analysis reveals a gender imbalance among the sample instructors, with four out of five being male. This suggests male dominance in English language instruction on platforms like TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube. Factors such as cultural norms, educational access, and gendered communication styles may contribute to this disparity. The limited presence of female instructors raises concerns about diversity and the range of teaching perspectives available to learners. Additionally, the study’s findings strongly support the researcher’s original hypotheses, confirming their accuracy through consistent data alignment.

## **12. Conclusion**

In the 21st century, technology, especially the internet, has revolutionized language learning, offering broad access to diverse instructional resources. However, the unregulated and uncensored nature of digital platforms presents significant challenges. Many informal content creators now act as language instructors, often without formal qualifications or oversight. Despite their popularity, reflected in thousands

of followers, millions of likes, and high engagement, these creators frequently disseminate inaccurate or misleading information, which can seriously impact learners' understanding and progress.

The following points aim to address the three research questions posed in the current study.

1. The analysis reveals a notable gender imbalance, with 4 out of 5 samples produced by male instructors and only 1 by female instructors. This overrepresentation suggests that male instructors have greater visibility in online English language teaching. Cultural, social, and technological factors may contribute to this disparity, which could limit the diversity of teaching approaches and linguistic input available to learners.
2. The grammatical errors observed across the samples fall into four main categories: tense misuse, incorrect interrogative structure, word choice and ordering, and subject-verb agreement. These recurring issues indicate gaps in grammatical accuracy among instructors, which may mislead learners and impact the overall quality of language instruction on digital platforms.

**Table 2**

*Summary of gender percentages*

#	Gender	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male	4	80%
2	Female	1	20%

**Reference:**

1. Abbad, M. M., Morris, D., & De Nahlik, C. (2009). Looking under the bonnet: Factors affecting student adoption of e-learning systems in Jordan. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 10(2), 1-25. DOI: [10.19173/irrodl.v10i2.596](https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i2.596)
2. Abdullah, A. R. A. (2014). *An Ethnographic Sociolinguistic Study of Virtual Identity in Second Life*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leeds].
3. Abdul-Qawy, A. S., Pramod, P., Magesh, E., & Srinivasulu, T. (2015). The Internet of Things (IoT): An overview. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, 5(12), 71-82.
4. Afrin, N., & Afrin, A. (2024). Language and its Relationship with Gender: A Study on Sociolinguistics Perspectives. *UITS Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 133-140.
5. Alodail, A. (2016). The instructors' attitudes toward the use of E-learning in classroom in college of education at albaha university. *15(1)*, 126-135.
6. Alsayed, R. A., & Althaqafi, A. (2024). Online Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Benefits and Challenges for EFL Students. *International Education Studies*, 15(3), 122-122. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v15n3p122>
7. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th Ed.). New York: Longman
8. Burbules, N., & Callister, T. (2000). Universities in Transition: The Promise and the Challenge of New Technologies. *Teachers College Record - Teach Coll Rec*, 102(2), 271-293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00056>

9. Chapelle, C. (2003). *English language learning and technology*. John Benjamins.
10. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT press.
11. Chu, S. (2024). A Review on the Impact of Social Media and the Internet on Consumer Purchasing Decisions. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, 109(1), 169-174. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/109/2024BJ0153>
12. Coates, J. (2015). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Routledge.
13. Corder, S. (1967). *The significance of learners' errors*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5, (1-4), 160-170. doi:10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161
14. \_\_\_\_\_ (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Baltimore: Penguin.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ (1974). Error Analysis and Remedial Teaching. *IATEFL Conference*. 1-15.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ (1981). *Error analysis and interlingual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776>
18. Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and Strategies in Child Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 8(2). 129-136 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585536>
19. Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
20. Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Gunawardena, C. N., & McIsaac, M. S. (2013). Distance education. *In Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*. 361-401. Routledge.
22. Hall, K., Borba, R., & Hiramoto, M. (2021). Language and gender. *The international encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology*, 9(1), 892-912.
23. Hamza, S. (2016). The Use of English Adjectival Affixes by Iraqi EFL Learners: An Error Analysis. *English Linguistics Research*, 9(1), 14-31. doi:10.5430/elr.v5n1p14
24. Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed.)*. Harlow: Longman.
25. Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th ed.)*. Routledge.
26. Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. *Educause Quarterly*, 31(4), 51-55.
27. James, C. (1994). Don't Shoot My Dodo: On The Resilience of Contrastive And Error Analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 32(3), 179-200. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1994.32.3.179>
28. Maltz, L., & DeBlois, P. D. (2005). Top-ten IT issues, 2005. *Educause review*, 40(3), 15-16.
29. Maree, R. (2022). *Iraqi EFL Learners' Grammatical Errors in Conversation: An Error Analysis Study*. [Master's Thesis, University of Mosul].
30. Maruti, P. T. (2023). Error Analysis: An Overview. *UGC-CARE. (RTI)*, 9(7). 15-26.
31. Norrish, J. (1983). *Language Learning and their Errors*. Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
32. Oblinger, D. G., & Hawkins, B. L. (2005). The myth about students. *Educause review*, 40(5), 12-13.
33. Padmavathi, G. (2013). English teaching and learning in the digital age. *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research*, 3(1), 116-118.
34. Richard, H., & Haya, A. (2009). Examining student decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 21(3), 183-198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-009-9023-6>
35. Richards, J. C. (1971). *A non-contrastive approach to error analysis English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
36. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.

37. Salem, Ahmad (2004): *Education and e-learning technology*. Riyadh: Al-Rushd Library.
38. Salih, A. (2022). *Using E-Teaching for EFL Courses: Problems and Solutions from Teachers' Perspective*. [Master's Thesis, University of Mosul].
39. Selinker, G. & Susan M. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Routledge.
40. Taylor, J. C. (2001). Fifth generation distance education. *Instructional Science and Technology*, 4(1), 1-14.