

LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN ECUATELETANDEM SPOKEN INTERACTIONS

ERRORES LÉXICOS Y GRAMATICALES EN INTERACCIONES ORALES DE ECUATELETANDEM

Danny Roberto Burbano Chanatasig^{1*}

¹ Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi-Extensión Pujilí. Ecuador. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5559-3151>. Correo: danny.burbano0770@utc.edu.ec

Fabiola Soledad Cando Guanoluisa²

² Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi-Extensión Pujilí. Ecuador. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6170-5325>. Correo: fabiola.cando@utc.edu.ec

* Autor para correspondencia: danny.burbano0770@utc.edu.ec

Abstract

This quantitative research aims at analysing lexical and grammatical errors made by fifth-semester students from the National and Foreign Languages Pedagogy program at Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi during ECUATELETANDEM (teletandem) spoken interactions with partners from the University of Miami. Data from nine students were categorized through an error analysis procedure based on transcription online recorded sessions. Errors were classified using different taxonomies. The results showed that the most common grammatical error committed was misinformation, followed by omission, addition and misordering. Regarding lexical errors, the most recurrent category was distortions, followed by formal miselection errors and misformations. Concerning sources, grammatical errors were mainly intralingua, whereas lexical errors were mostly interlingua. Findings highlight that students need focused language preparation and systematic corrective feedback to reduce grammatical and lexical errors and improve accuracy in spoken interactions.

Keywords: grammatical errors; lexical errors; intralingua errors; interlingua errors; ecuateletandem

Resumen

Esta investigación cuantitativa tiene como objetivo analizar los errores léxicos y gramaticales cometidos por estudiantes de quinto semestre de la carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros de la Universidad Técnica Cotopaxi durante interacciones orales en ECUATELETANDEM con pares de la Universidad de Miami. Los datos de nueve estudiantes se categorizaron mediante un procedimiento de



Esta obra está bajo una licencia Creative Commons de tipo (CC-BY-NC-SA).

Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Investigación Científica. E-mail: revistaalcon@gmail.com

análisis de errores a partir de transcripciones de sesiones en línea grabadas. Los errores se categorizaron utilizando diferentes taxonomías. Los resultados mostraron que el error gramatical más frecuente fue la información incorrecta, seguido de omisión, adición y desorden. En cuanto a los errores léxicos, la categoría más recurrente fue distorsiones, seguida de selección formal inadecuada y malformaciones. Respecto al origen, los errores gramaticales fueron principalmente intralingüales, en cambio, los errores léxicos fueron mayormente interlingüales. Los hallazgos resaltan la necesidad de una preparación lingüística focalizada y de retroalimentación correctiva sistemática para reducir los errores gramaticales y léxicos y mejorar la precisión en las interacciones orales.

Palabras clave: errores gramaticales; errores léxicos; errores intralingüales; errores interlingüales; ecuateletandem

Fecha de recibido: 14/11/2025

Fecha de aceptado: 23/01/2026

Fecha de publicado: 09/02/2026

Introduction

Teletandem and other forms of cultural and communicative exchange have become increasingly relevant in EFL contexts. They offer the opportunity to speak in real contexts with native speakers. According to Zhou (2023) online language exchanges can improve learner's speaking skills. In addition, telecollaboration emphasizes that these exchanges need pedagogical support because learners commonly have to handle challenges related to task implementation and the overall telecollaborative process (Emir & Yangin-Ekşi, 2024). In this study, these exchanges were carried out through ECUATELETANDEM, a virtual teletandem program that connects EFL learners from Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi with English-speaking partners from the University of Miami through scheduled online meetings. From this perspective, analyzing lexical and grammatical errors that learners commit during teletandem interactions becomes important because it provides valuable insights about linguistic errors.

According to Castillo (2018), teletandem methodology is a conversation-based teaching method that pairs foreign language learners with native speakers in a virtual environment. Students have the chance to learn the language and discover new traditions through teletandem projects. Teletandem consists of three principles to ensure an effective interaction. According to Brammerts (1996) the first principle is reciprocity, which means that both partners should use the same period of time for each language to have a free and mutual exchange of language and cultural knowledge. Second, autonomy, which refers to how each participant sets their own objectives in teletandem and decides when focusing on them. Finally, Vasallo & Telles (2006) states that languages must not be mixed, this helps partners to get a fair opportunity to interact in the target language and in the language that they know well.

Cando & Tovar (2021) highlight the advantages of teletandem in language learning, for example, improving in different language skills, including vocabulary, grammar, fluency, pronunciation, stress, intonation and the use of communication strategies. Furthermore, students who participated in these sessions reported noticeable



Esta obra está bajo una licencia *Creative Commons* de tipo (CC-BY-NC-SA).

Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Investigación Científica. E-mail: revistaalcon@gmail.com

improvement in their English, mainly due to the opportunity to have oral interaction in real communicative contexts. Erkaboyeva (2022) mentions that this methodology is based on mutual support, so both participants benefit equally by teaching and learning by each other, while a coordinator can guide them to cooperate effectively.

Teletandem can also present important challenges that may affect participation and learning. Cando & Tovar (2021) identified several disadvantages, including that the lack of monitoring of progress reduces the effectiveness of the sessions. and states that interaction problems are very common in teletandem such as speaking too fast, the use of advanced target language, showing low interest in having a real conversation or focusing only on completing a questionnaire, all these enhanced by anxiety and speaking mostly in the mother tongue during conversations.

Effective communication in teletandem contexts may be hindered by both grammatical and lexical challenges. According to Dewi et al. (2021) effective oral communication depends on the appropriate grammatical use of language, due to accuracy allowing learners to understand speaker's ideas and help with the transmission of meaning. In addition, lexical limitations also complicate real life communication, Cando & Tovar (2021), states that insufficient vocabulary knowledge can affect how learners communicate successfully.

Errors commonly appear in the process of learning. Error refers to a language deviation from precision or correctness (Ellis, 1997), which treats grammatical errors as systematic deviations in learner language. James (1998) treats grammatical errors as systematic derivations in the learner's language. Dulay. et al, (1982) categorized errors into:

Table 1. Types of grammatical errors

1.- Misinformation.- It occurs when the learners use a wrong form or structure.

1.1.- Regulation.- A regular marker is used instead of an irregular one. e.g runned instead of run

1.2.- Archi-form- the selection of one number of a class of forms to represent others in the class. e.g. Her danced with my brother. (Her instead of She)

1.3. Alternating forms- using a grammar form instead of another.

How much this pen costs? instead of How much does this pen cost?

2.- Misordering.- It occurs when the learners place elements in the wrong order in utterances. e.g . What she is doing?" instead of the correct form, "What is she doing?"

3.- Addition.- It occurs when the learners add an element in a well-formed utterance.

3.1 Regulation- a type of error in which a marker that is typically added to a linguistic item is erroneously added to exceptional items of the given class that do not take a marker. e.g. sheeps instead of sheep.

3.2 Double marking.- This error is caused by the failure to delete certain items that are required in some linguistic constructions. e.g. She didn't went/goed back



3.3 Simple addition- an item which should not appear in well-formed utterances. e.g.

The dogs doesn't live in the water. (dogs instead of dog)

4.- Omission.- It occurs when the learners omit an element in a well-formed utterance. Example noun and verb inflection (-s, ed. ing) the articles (a, an, the), verb auxiliaries (is, will, can, may)

Recent studies in EFL contexts have reported recurring patterns in grammatical errors during spoken interactions. Dewi et al. (2021) conducted a to analyze the grammatical errors of EFL students from the fourth term in Indonesia Institute of Technology and Business. The data were collected by observation in student's conversation practice. The results showed that omission was the most common error followed by misinformation, addition and misordering

Similarly, in a study made by Susilowati et al (2024) researchers examined grammatical errors in the oral presentations of sixteen Indonesian adult EFL learners from non-English majors. The most common error was omission, followed by misinformation, addition and misordering, the source of these problems and concluded that errors were intralingual interference.

In a study carried out in Lambung Mangkurat University, Hidayat & Krismanti (2022) investigated grammatical errors in student's speaking. The results showed that omission was the most common error followed by misinformation, addition and misordering.

Other research has examined grammatical errors by distinguishing between Interlingua and intralingua. Damaiyanti (2021) observed, interviewed and analyzed documents of speaking performance of first semester students in the English Department in Indonesia. The findings showed that intralingual errors were the most committed errors.

Ogul & Sekmen (2022) analyzed the oral and written interlanguage performance of five pre-service English teachers, authors examined written tasks and spoken interviews. The results showed that 54.16% of errors were interlingual and 45.76% were intralingual.

Long & Hatcho (2018) investigated grammatical accuracy in the spoken English of Japanese students, results were classified into grammatical errors and then they asked a group of teachers to judge each error as interlingual or intralingual. The findings indicate that 51% of errors were considered as interlingual, the 35% intralingual and the 12.5% undetermined.

According to Hidayat & Krismanti (2022), grammatical errors made in speaking activities do not significantly interfere with the student's meaning in their conversations. From a pedagogical perspective, Spratt et al. (2011) state that committing errors is a natural part of language acquisition, but feedback is important to support learning. In teletandem learning context, Vasallo & Telles (2006) explain that learner autonomy reduces teacher monitoring making feedback an essential part to correct grammatical errors. Therefore, feedback occurs at the end of the interactions and provides guided oral practice, pedagogical support and teacher support (Telles, 2015).

Corrective feedback is seen as a vital part of language learning that allows learners to respond to their errors and improve it (Sari et al., 2021). Regarding feedback strategies, Tang et al. (2021) states that explicit



correction is one of the most used approaches. Similarly, Susilowati et al. (2024) argue that teachers should pay attention to learner's errors and provide explanations, activities and extensive practice to improve grammatical accuracy.

Hemchua (2006) notes that lexical errors involve inappropriate word choices that can affect meaning, consequently, these errors may cause significant misunderstanding and increase the difficulty of interpretation, James (1998) categorized lexical errors into:

Table 2. Types of lexical errors

A. FORMAL ERRORS

1. Formal misselection: Similar visual and sound similarity.
 - 1.1. Suffix type: Same root but different suffixes (eg. considerable/considerate)
 - 1.2. Prefix type: Same root but different prefixes (eg. reserve/preserve)
 - 1.3. The vowel based type: (eg. seat/set)
 - 1.4. The consonant based type: (eg. save/safe)
 - 1.5. False friend: When a word looks or have a similar meaning in two different languages (eg. carpet/folder)
2. Misformations: Words that do not exist in L2 (source: mother tongue).
 - 2.1. Borrowing: L1 words used in the target language without any change (eg. receta)
 - 2.2. Coinage: Inventing a word from L1 (eg. preocupate/worried)
 - 2.3 Calque: Literal translation (Loss the bus/ Miss the bus)
3. Distortions: Words that do not exist in L2 (source: missaplication of target language without L1 interference)
 - 3.1. Omission: . (e.g., *intresting* → *interesting*)
 - 3.2. Overinclusion: . (e.g., *dinning* → *dining*)
 - 3.3. Misselection: (e.g., *taste* → *tasty*)
 - 3.4. Misordering: (e.g., *kettle from supermarket* → *from supermarket kettle*)

B. SEMANTIC ERRORS

1. Confusion of sense relations: Caused by confusion between related meanings.
 - 1.1. Superonym for Hyponym: Using a general word instead of a specific one. (e.g., *craftsman* → *electrician*)
 - 1.2. Hyponym for Superonym: Using a specific word instead of a general one. (e.g., *smash* → *break*)

1.3. Inappropriate Co-Hyponyms: Using the wrong word from the same category. (e.g., *vermilion* → *scarlet*)

1.4. Wrong Near Synonym: Using a similar word with a different meaning. (e.g., *excellent* → *brilliant*)

2. Collocation errors: Incorrect word combinations that sound unnatural.

2.1. Semantic Word Selection: Choosing a word that doesn't match semantically. (e.g., *crooked stick* → *crooked year*)

2.2. Statistically Weighted Preferences: Using a less common combination. (e.g., *big losses* → *heavy losses*)

2.3. Arbitrary Combinations: Creating unnatural word pairings. (e.g., *hikehitch* → *hitchhike*)

2.4. Preposition partners: When a verb, noun, or adjective is used with the wrong preposition. (e.g., *she is married with a doctor* → *she is married to a doctor*)

In a research conducted by Aghoulid (2023), 50 university students of Business English from 18 to 25 years old were subjected to a writing and a speaking, the results showed that distortions (46%) was the most committed error, followed by misformation (33%) and confusion of sense relation (18%). Therefore, the authors concluded that these errors were due to the influence of the first language.

Aghoulid & Trimasse (2023) presented a research where a group of third year university students from department of English were exposed to a writing and speaking test to analyze lexical errors, the findings indicated that misformations and distortions had the highest percentage of errors. Furthermore, interlingual errors were the source of these lexical errors.

As stated by Aghoulid (2023) lexical errors treatment should focus on instructions in specialized vocabulary, word choice and spelling, supported by feedback and practice in real communicative contexts. Likewise, Aghoulid & Trimasse (2023) argue that raising learners' awareness through vocabulary learning strategies and contextualized instruction can improve lexical competence and reduce lexical errors.

Richards (1971) proposes differences between learners based on their source, differentiating interlingual and intralingual errors. Interlingual errors refers to the influence of the learner's first language above the target language; it happens when linguistic features from the mother tongue are transferred into the second language. It is common to see this type of errors in early stages of language acquisition. In contrast, intralingual errors are characterized by not being referable to the first language, it emerges from the learner's incomplete developing knowledge of the target language.

Errors in spoken language can be better understood through important theories of SLA. From the perspective of Interlanguage theory, Selinker (1972) explains that errors are natural indicators of some stages of development because learners construct a dynamic linguistic system that changes over time. Additionally, learners may transfer patterns from previously learned languages (cross-linguistic transfer), which can result in linguistic errors (Odlin, 1989). In communicative contexts learners are pushed to produce language, which



align with Swain (1995) who states the Output Hypothesis, regarding that language production encourages learners to notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge and try more target-like forms. However, during real interactions, learners face limitations.

According to Trade-off Hypothesis (Skehan, 1998), learners tend to prioritize meaning and fluency over accuracy, which can increase the errors during spoken interaction. Additionally, Schmidt (1990) notes in the Noticing hypothesis where emphasize that learners must consciously notice linguistic features to acquire them. This process is supported by the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), which argues that the exchange of meaning and feedback during interactions facilitate language development. From an input perspective, Krashen (1985) argues that acquisition depends on understanding, comprehensible input, so, without enough easy to understand input, learners may keep committing errors. Finally, the focus-on-form approach (Long, 1991) incorporates correctness awareness into meaning-focused communication, describing correcting mistakes as they happen during participation promotes language growth and overall communicative efficacy.

Even though grammatical and lexical errors in speaking skill have been widely analyzed, there is no study in teletandem context, with Spanish speakers, on both grammar and lexical errors, and their causes. Thus this research aims at analyzing lexical and grammatical errors made by fifth-semester students from Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi during ECUATELETANDEM (teletandem) interactions with partners from the University of Miami. This study was guided by four research questions:

1. What are the most common types of grammatical errors?
2. What are the causes of grammatical errors?
3. What are the most common types of lexical errors?
4. What are the causes of lexical errors?

Materials and Methods

The research was conducted by using quantitative descriptive methodology with an error analysis process (Corder, 1981) encompassing four stages: identification, description, explanation, and classification of errors. As for the classification of grammatical errors, we used Dulay et al. taxonomy (1982) and for classifying lexical errors, we used Jame's taxonomy (1998). For error-source explanation, we followed James (1998) classifying errors as Interlingua.

Recordings of 25 students interacting in teletandem were collected. They are around 20 to 24 years old, with A2 to B2 level. Data was collected through ECUATELETANDEM recorded sessions via Zoom. The recordings, ranging from 15 to 20 minutes, covered topics such as daily routines, hobbies, and cultural differences. The conversations were transcribed, and then analyzed. First, 5 participants were eliminated because they did not comply with the agreed time and other 11 participants were eliminated because they were not establishing a good conversation with their partners and they just made questions but did not get long answers. In the end, the study was conducted with 9 students.

Results and Discussion

The results were presented in descriptive tables showing frequencies and percentages in relation to the research questions.



Research question 1: What are the most common types of grammatical errors?

Table 3. Number, percentage, and example of grammatical errors committed

Type	Subtype	f	%
Misinformation	Regulation	5	1,6
	Archi-forms <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 1</i> <i>Incorrect: Do you country have</i> <i>Correct: Does your country have</i>	44	14,2
	Alternating forms <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 2</i> <i>Incorrect: I forgot</i> <i>Correct: I forget</i>	84	27,1
	Total	133	42,9
Misordering	-	16	5,2
Addition	Regulation	0	0,0
	Double marking	5	1,6
	Simple Addition <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 6</i> <i>Incorrect: I have a family in Denver</i> <i>Correct: I have family in Denver</i>	55	17,7
	Total	60	19,3
Omission	<i>Example:</i> <i>Student 6</i> <i>Incorrect: Is the same photo</i> <i>Correct: It is the same photo</i>	101	32,6
Total		310	100,0

The most common type of error is misinformation (42.9%) which happens by the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or the structure; learners supply something, although it is incorrect (Dulay et al., 1982). The most frequent subtype was alternating forms followed by archi form errors.

An alternating form error is when the learner alternates two or more different grammatical forms (Dulay et al., 1982). For example, in the sentence *I forgot* instead of *I forget*, the learner uses the past tense instead of the present tense, showing confusion between time references. On the other hand, an archi-form error happens when a learner selects one member of a class of forms to represent others in the class. For instance, in *Do your country have* instead of *Does your country have*, the learner applies *do* to all subjects without distinguishing that *does* should be used with third-person singular subjects. While the alternative form error involves choosing the wrong word form, the archi-form error involves using one form as a substitute for all others.



The second most frequent error was omission (32,6%). According to Dulay et al. (1982) omission refers to the lack of an element that must be present in a well-formed statement. In the sentence *Is the same photo* instead of *It is the same photo*, the subject pronoun *it* is omitted, resulting in an incomplete construction of an affirmative statement.

Addition was the third most frequent error (19,3%), which is opposite of omission; it refers to the inclusion of an element that should not be in a well-formed statement. Simple addition error was the most common. For instance, *I have a family in Denver* instead of *I have family in Denver*, the learner adds an unnecessary article, producing a nonstandard expression.

This study shows that the participants of ECUATELETANDEM spoken interactions had 310 grammatical errors distributed as misinformation (42.9%), omission (32.6%), addition (19.3%) and misordering (5.2%). These results are similar to Dewi et al. (2021), who found that, in a conversation practice, students of fourth-term at the Indonesia Institute of Technology and Business committed most omission (41,30%) errors, followed by misinformation (28,26%), addition (21,73%) and misordering (8,69%).

A similar tendency is observed in Susilowati et al. 's (2024) study, which examined college students majoring non-English departments and came from different majors, the results showed that oral presentation where omission again accounts for almost half of all errors (47,06%) followed by misinformation (33,82%), addition (14,71%) and misordering (4.41%). Finally, the results of Hidayat & Krismanti's (2022) study show that students of the English language Education Study Program, matriculated in the second series of speaking classes offered in an Indonesian university committed more omission errors (56,6%) followed by misinformation (33,7%), addition (7,2%) and misordering (2,4%).

Participants of these three Indonesian studies committed most omission errors, followed by misinformation, addition, and misordering. In contrast, data from ECUATELETANDEM participants show that misinformation (42.9%) is the most frequent error, followed by omission (32.6%), addition (19.3%) and misordering (5.2%). This indicates that Indonesian learners in classroom speaking tasks regularly omit obligatory forms while Ecuadorian learners participating in teletandem sessions with USA partners are more likely to use incorrect forms. According to interlanguage theory, omission errors reflect students' earlier developmental stage whereas misinformation errors suggest a more advanced but unstable language system. This may be because our students are pre-service teachers and are in higher levels (Selinker, 1972).

In addition, these results may suggest that errors can depend on the communication task. ECUATELETANDEM participants interact in a real-time conversation with native speakers. In line with the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995), interaction with native speakers may push learners to attempt target-like forms, resulting in a higher incidence of incorrect form selection rather than omission. Additionally, the trade-off hypothesis (Skehan, 1998) suggests that the real-time communicative demands of teletandem interaction lead learners to prioritize meaning and fluency over grammatical accuracy, which may account for the prevalence of misinformation errors.

Grammatical errors in speaking do not significantly disturb meaning making (Hidayat & Krismantis, 2022), and students participating in teletandem sessions can have positive attitudes towards their ability to communicate in spite of grammatical errors (Cando & Tovar, 2021). In addition, Spratt et al. (2011) state that errors with appropriate feedback are a powerful tool for language learning. From the perspective of the



Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), corrective feedback is essential because it helps learners consciously notice the gap between their interlanguage forms and the target language. Therefore, participants of ecuateletandem must receive feedback on their mistakes by recalling their own grammar mistakes and applying corrective feedback strategies.

This process is also supported by the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995), which argues that reflecting on one's own output and attempting to reformulate it promotes deeper grammatical processing. Corrective feedback is seen as an integrated activity in learning that aims to help students correct learning errors and respond to student learning outcomes. According to Tang et al. (2021), the most-used strategy to correct grammatical errors is explicit correction, which is an easier and less time-consuming strategy to correct mistakes. In addition, it is highly recommended to encourage teletandem partners to provide feedback to each other. Among other roles, the teletandem partner must help their partners improve their grammar by providing some sort of feedback (Telles, 2015).

This recommendation aligns with the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), which emphasizes that interaction and feedback during communicative exchanges facilitate second language development. Also, teachers can identify mistakes during the preparation sessions. There must be some type of pedagogical control or follow-up, some directive procedures, some sort of assessment, and a teacher counselor (Vasallo & Telles, 2006). From a sociocultural perspective (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), teacher guidance and peer feedback function as scaffolding that supports learners' grammatical development within their zone of proximal development. Last but not least, Susilowati et al. (2024) explain that teachers should pay greater attention to students' speaking errors and provide additional explanations, activities for common mistakes, and extensive practice. Such practices are consistent with a focus-on-form approach (Long, 1991), in which attention to grammatical accuracy is embedded within meaning-focused communicative activities.

Research question 2: What are the causes of grammatical errors?

Table 4. Number, percentage and example of causes of grammatical errors.

Causes of errors	f	%
Interlingua	90	29,03
Intralingua Example: Student 5 Incorrect: <i>Do you like go?</i> Correct: <i>Do you like to go?</i>	220	70,97
Total	310	100,00

In this research, Intralingua is the most frequent cause of grammatical error (70.97%). According to Richards (1971), intralingual errors are those that occur due to generalization, partial application of rules, or the incapacity of applying the conditions rules.

In the sentence, *Do you like go* instead of *Do you like to go*, the participant omits the infinitive marker *to*; the learner has not fully acquired the rule of verb complementation. These findings align with the results observed by Damaiyanti (2021) who carried out research in which first semester students did a speaking performance during the final test in the English Department in Takengon, Indonesia. The data showed that



intralingual errors were the most common.

On the other hand, the results are different from Ogul & Sekmen's work (2022) in which five randomly selected Turkish ELT program pre-service teachers at Yeditepe University in İstanbul had 54.16% of interlingual errors and 45.76% of intralingual errors. A similar tendency was seen in Long & Hatcho's research (2018) which examined errors coming from the Japanese University Student Corpus (JUSC); 35% of errors were intralingual, 51% were interlingual and 12,5% were undetermined. These differences may be explained by cross-linguistic influence, as the source and distribution of learner errors can partly depend on the grammatical structure of learners' first language (Odlin, 1989).

Developmental errors are a signal of progress (Corder, 1967; Selinker, 1972), but they can be managed pedagogically. For example through teletandem partners' feedback (Vassallo & Telles (2006). In this context, Tang et al. (2021) suggest that explicit corrective feedback is more effective and that participants uptake grammatical corrections successfully. On the other hand, they state that participants may benefit more if their partners are well-trained in error correction feedback. Thus, they suggest training them for giving feedback.

Research question 3: *What are the most common types of lexical errors?*

Table 5. Number, percentage, and example of lexical errors committed

			f	%
Formal Errors	Formal miselections	Suffix type	1	1,56
		False friend <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 6</i> <i>Incorrect: my career</i> <i>Correct: my major</i>	16	25,00
		Total	17	26,56
	Misinformations	Borrowing <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 1</i> <i>Incorrect: family receta</i> <i>Correct: family recipe</i>	6	9,38
		Coinage	1	1,56
		Calque <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 1</i> <i>Incorrect: the past Christmas</i> <i>Correct: the last Christmas</i>	10	15,63
		Total	17	26,56
	Distortions	Omission <i>Example:</i> <i>Student 2</i> <i>Incorrect: of the cost</i>	5	7,81



		Correct: of the coast		
		Overinclusion	2	3,13
		Misselection Example: Student 6 Incorrect: The food is variety Correct: The food is varied	8	12,50
		Misordering Example: Student 3 Incorrect: level high Correct: high level	8	12,50
		Total	23	35,94
Semantic Errors	Confusion of sense relations	Superonym for Hyponim	2	3,13
		Hyponym for Superonym	1	1,56
		Wrong near synonym	1	1,56
	Total		4	6,25
	Collocation error	Semantic word selection	1	1,56
		Arbitrary Combinations	1	1,56
		Preposition partners	1	1,56
	Total		3	4,68
Total			64	100,00

Note: This classification corresponds to James (1998), the type of errors that our participants did not commit were omitted from the table: Formal misselections (prefix type, the vowel based type, the consonant based type). Confusion of sense relations (Inappropriate Co-Hyponyms). Collocation errors (Statistically weighted preferences).

The most common type of error is distortions (35.94%). This type of error is when students use words that do not exist in English; they are the result of the misapplication without Spanish interference or misspelling (Hemchua, 2006). Within this type of error, students committed more misselection and misordering (equal) followed by omissions errors. The use of *variety* instead of *varied* in the sentence *The food is variety* is an example of misselection error. The phrase “*level high*” is an example of misordering error because the participant places the adjective after the noun. An example of omission error is the expression “*of the cost*”; the participant omits the letter “*a*”, changing the meaning of the word.

Participants also committed formal misselection errors (26,56%) “they involve similar lexical forms (visual and sound similarity). They are “the malapropism type. Synforms share some phonemes/graphemes.” (James, 1998, as cited in Hemchua, 2006, p. 9). False friend is a subtype of misselection error. The phrase *my major* to refer to a field of study is incorrectly substituted by *career*, which in English refers to a profession, but it sounds similar to career in Spanish.

Finally, Misformations, which are words that do not exist in the L2, represent the same percentage (26,56%). These errors come from the student's mother tongue. Borrowing and calque errors were observed. The phrase *family receta* is an example of borrowing; the participant borrowed a word from Spanish to mean *recipe* in



English. The word *past* in *past Christmas* is literally translated. Thus, a calque error occurred.

This research shows that participants of ECUATELETANDEM spoken interactions had 64 lexical errors distributed as distortions (35,94%) followed by **formal miselection** (26,56%) and misformations (26,56%). Errors in other lexical categories were observed at a low frequency. These results are consistent with Aghoulid 's (2023) research, who found that students of Business English in Morocco, in a writing and speaking task, committed most distortions errors (46%), misformation (33%) and confusion of sense relation (18%); the rest of the lexical errors were rarely observed. This pattern is also observed in Aghoulid & Trimasse's work (2023) which reported errors in a written and speaking test of third year university students from the department of English, Indonesia. Similar to this research, the participants of the studies mentioned above speak a language that is different from English, and they study it as a foreign language.

Lexical errors in teletandem interactions are normal since students are using English actively and negotiating meaning in real time. The Swain's Output Hypothesis (1995) suggests that producing language in spoken interactions, as in ECUATELETANDEM, allows learners to test their lexical knowledge, notice errors, and gradually restructure their interlanguage. In fact, it is a good scenario to acquire vocabulary more effectively because students are exposed to meaningful and comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985). In this line, Al-Ta'ani (2019) mentioned that students can improve their lexis if they are given the opportunity to produce situational English. However, it requires some pedagogical actions. Thus, in the teletandem preparation sessions, participants must be prepared in vocabulary activities according to the most common topics (Vasallo & Telles, 2006). From the perspective of Noticing Hypothesis, feedback on students' mistakes is also needed. The lexical uptake depends on learners consciously noticing gaps in their knowledge, such as incorrect collocations or word forms, during interaction (Schmidt, 1990, 2001).

Research question 1: *What are the causes of lexical errors?*

Table 6. Number, percentage, and example of causes of lexical errors.

Causes of errors	f	%
Interlingua Example: Student 3 Incorrect: <i>Other persons</i> Correct: <i>Other people</i>	42	65,63
Intralingua	22	34,38
Total	64	100,00

In this research, Interlingua is the most frequent cause of lexical errors (65.63%). According to Richards (1971), interlingua errors are those caused by the interference of the learner's mother tongue.

In the expression *other persons* instead of *other people*, the participant incorrectly uses the pluralization rule of Spanish. This research shows that participants made 64 errors, 65,63% were interlingual and 34,38% were intralingual. This tendency corroborates the evidence provided by Aghoulid (2023) who conducted research with undergraduate students from a business school at the University of Ibn Zohr, Morocco; and concluded that all the errors committed by students were due to the influence of the mother tongue. Comparable results



were observed in Aghoulid & Trimasse (2023) who performed an investigation in Morocco, which suggests that the major factor contributing to the cause of lexical errors made by their participants is the L1 transfer. Another study conducted in Prince of Songkla University with four-year students shows that interlingual errors predominate in Thailand students' writing (Suetae and Yok, 2018).

According to the Interlanguage Theory (Selinker, 1972), students' L1 influences the L2 system. Because of the lack of vocabulary to express their ideas, students compensate with L1 words to keep the conversation going on. Ecuateletandem interactions give students opportunities to produce language in real time and real context, but if they do not receive feedback on their errors, they will persist because the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) suggests that learners may fail to notice by themselves. Moreover, Aghoulid (2023) supports the importance of explicit instruction on lexical items, feedback on errors, and the use of technology as effective strategies for improving learners' lexical accuracy.

Aghoulid & Trimasse (2023) also suggest to teach vocabulary learning strategies and to include in their curriculum the teaching of lexical competence which may include learners' awareness of differences between languages and also become aware of the target language they intend to acquire and, more precisely, the target lexical choices. Aghoulid & Trimasse (2023) propose a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced by learners in the teaching context, so we suggest a more comprehensive understanding of this issue in the teletandem exchanges context; the preparation and feedback stages must raise students' awareness of this issue.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, misinformation (42.9%) appeared as the most frequent type of grammatical error in ecuateletandem spoken sessions, followed by omission (32.6%), addition (19.3%) and misordering (5.2%). The predominance of misinformation errors demonstrates that participants tried to speak using correct grammatical structures but very frequently they selected incorrect forms rather than omit elements. Furthermore, the communicative and autonomous steps of teletandem encourage learners to prioritize a fluent conversation, even at the cost of grammatical accuracy. From an SLA perspective, these results align with interlanguage development, the Output Hypothesis and the trade-off hypothesis, indicating that learners are pushed by communication effort to try measurable forms. Additionally, grammatical errors in this context should be interpreted as signs of active language development rather than failure, highlighting the necessity of systematic corrective feedback and pedagogical monitoring to consolidate grammatical accuracy in spoken English.

Grammatical errors in spoken interactions were primarily caused by intralingua interference (70.97%), rather than Interlingua errors (29.03%). This pattern shows participants efforts to apply target language during spoken interactions. Although, cross-linguistic influence may explain differences with other contexts. From a pedagogical standpoint, teletandem interactions offer opportunities to address these errors through explicit corrective feedback, especially when partners are taught to provide effective grammar-focused support.

Lexical errors also were present in ECUATELENTANDEM spoken interactions, with distortions (35.94%) appearing as the most frequent type, followed by formal miselections (26.56%) and misformations (26.56%). Other types of lexical problems appeared less frequently. From a theoretical perspective, the occurrence of





these errors supports the Output Hypothesis and the Noticing Hypothesis, as learners actively test hypotheses about vocabulary use during interactions. Therefore, teletandem contexts give a valuable space for lexical development, just if they are complemented with targeted vocabulary preparation and systematic feedback to foster noticing and lexical growth.

Interlingua factors were identified as the main cause of lexical errors (65.63%), the results show that the majority of lexical errors were caused due the influence of the mother tongue. The recurrence of lexical errors indicate that exposure alone is not enough, even when teletandem interactions offer significant opportunity for communication. Therefore, explicit lexical instruction and targeted feedback are essential to improve learner's lexical accuracy. Additionally, raising participant's awareness of linguistic differences can help reduce negative transfer. Finally, these findings emphasize the need for the structured pedagogical support in teletandem exchanges to address interlingua lexical errors effectively.

Limitations and further research

These results may be subjected to certain limitations: sample size and mistakes in error classification. Future research should focus on teletandem partners' feedback strategies in teletandem sessions and the effectiveness of vocabulary and grammar activities in the improvement of grammatical and lexical competence.

References

- Aghoulid, B. (2023). Investigating lexical errors in written and spoken productions among university students of Business English. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 6(5), 2751–2756. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i5-29>
- Aghoulid, B., & Trimasse, N. (2023). Sources of lexical cross-linguistic influence in English L3 production. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 5(3), 117–145. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v5i3.1373>
- Al-Ta'ani, M. H. (2019). An investigation of verb-forms errors in the spoken English of English-majors and non-English majors at Emirates Canadian University College/U.A.E. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v7i1.14342>
- Brammerts, H. (1996). Language learning in tandem using the Internet. In M. Warschauer (Ed.), *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning: Proceedings of the Hawai'i symposium* (pp. 121–130). Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Cando Guanoluisa, F. S., & Tovar Viera, V. R. (2021). Implementing a pilot e-tandem project at Technical University of Cotopaxi. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 45(2), 1–10. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1295059.pdf>
- Castillo-Scott, A. (2018). Teaching social issues through cinema and teletandem. *Revista do GEL*, 15(3), 257–278. <https://doi.org/10.21165/gel.v15i3.2409>
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1–4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.



- Damaiyanti, S. (2021). Grammatical errors made by students in speaking English. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLe)*, 2(2), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v2i2.11945>
- Dewi, R. C., Rangkuti, F. H., & Supriadi. (2021). Grammatical errors on EFL students' conversation practice: Surface strategy taxonomy. *Journal of Education and Teaching Learning (JETL)*, 3(3), 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.51178/jetl.v3i3.266>
- Dulay, H. C., Burt, M. K., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. New York, Oxford University Press, Inc.,
- Emir, G., & Yangın-Ekşi, G. (2024). The role of telecollaboration in English language teacher education: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00290-0>
- Hemchua, S. (2006). An analysis of lexical errors in the English compositions of Thai learners. https://www.academia.edu/69702546/An_analysis_of_lexical_errors_in_the_English_compositions_of_Thai_learners
- Hidayat, F., & Krismanti, N. (2022). Students' surface strategy taxonomy errors in narrating a story: A morpho-syntactical view. *Journal of English Educational Study (JEES)*, 5(1), 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v5i1.1488>
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Long, R., & Hatcho, Y. (2018). The first language's impact on L2: Investigating intralingual and interlingual errors. *English Language Teaching*, 11(11), 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n11p115>
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oğul, Ö., & Sekmen, S. (2022). Oral and written interlanguage performance analysis of Yeditepe University ELT pre-service teachers. *Edu 7: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(13), 54–69. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1478444>
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *ELT Journal*, 25(3), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/XXV.3.204>



- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1–4), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2011). *The TKT course: Modules 1, 2 and 3* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/tkt-course-modules-1-2-and-3/F8A99812DDDA86F936B5321B1D6D2DE8>
- Suetae, J., & Yok, C. K. (2018). Lexical errors in the written compositions of Thai EFL students: Neglectful instruction of vocabulary teaching. *Al-HIKMAH Journal*, 2(4), 1–15. <https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/HIKMAH/article/view/113401>
- Susilowati, E., Kusumaningtyas, E. D., & Wafa, Z. (2024). Surface strategy taxonomy on EFL learners' oral presentation: A study of grammatical error analysis. *English Education and Literature Journal (E-Jou)*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.51178/jetl.v3i3.266>
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press
- Tang, J., Qian, K., Wang, N., & Hu, X. (2021). Exploring language learning and corrective feedback in an eTandem project. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 1(1), 110–144. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2021-2005>
- Telles, J. A. (2015). Learning foreign languages in teletandem: Resources and strategies. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Linguística Teórica e Aplicada*, 31(3), 603–632. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4450226475643730772>
- Vassallo, M. L., & Telles, J. A. (2006). *Foreign language learning in-tandem: Theoretical principles and research perspectives*. *The ESPecialist*, 27(1), 83–118. <https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/esp/article/download/6117/4438/14921>
- Zhou, A. (2023). Investigating the impact of online language exchanges on second language speaking and willingness to communicate of Chinese EFL learners: A mixed methods study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1177922. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1177922>

