Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning
Vol. 15, No. 1, April 2026, pp. 49-64
ISSN 2745-9667 (p), 2541-4399 (e)
DOI: 10.21580/vjv16i132042

Vietnamese English Majors' Perceptions of TikTok as an Informal Vocabulary Learning Resource

Do Linh Chi,[1] Luu Dat Phi[2*]

[12]Ho Chi Minh City University of Industry and Trade, Ho Chi Minh City – Vietnam

Article Information
Received: May 07, 2026
Revised: October 17, 2026
Accepted: Ocotber 17, 2026
Published online: October 17, 2026

Abstract

Social media platforms are increasingly used by students to encounter English beyond the classroom. This study had three objectives. First, it described English-major students' perceptions of TikTok as a vocabulary-learning resource and the dimensions underlying those perceptions. The second was to compare perceptions across gender and daily TikTok-use groups. The third was to examine how these dimensions relate to self-reported English proficiency. 580 English-major students at one public university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, completed a cross-sectional questionnaire survey, all of whom reported prior experience learning English vocabulary through TikTok. We analyzed responses to the 13-item questionnaire in SPSS 27 using descriptive statistics, principal component analysis, independent-samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and multiple regression. Two dimensions emerged: active engagement and practical application, and perceived benefits and learning attitudes. Participants reported generally positive perceptions (M = 3.75, SD = 0.83). Female participants scored higher than male participants, with large effect sizes. Students who used TikTok for one to two hours a day had the highest mean scores, although the effect sizes for daily use were small. Both dimensions were positively associated with self-reported English proficiency (R^2 = .426), with active engagement showing the stronger association. These results suggest that TikTok's value for vocabulary learning may depend on how actively students engage with its content. Because the findings rest on self-reported data from a single university, they do not show that TikTok improves vocabulary knowledge. Future research should use objective vocabulary measures and include students from several institutions.

Keywords: TikTok; vocabulary learning; English majors; informal language learning; learner perceptions; Vietnamese higher education

Introduction

Vocabulary knowledge plays a central role in second language learning because it underpins reading comprehension, academic writing, speaking fluency, and classroom participation (Fatima & Khan, 2017; Zheng et al., 2025). Learners without sufficient vocabulary often struggle to express their ideas clearly, even when they have a sound command of grammar. Learners now encounter much of their English outside the classroom, and second-language acquisition research has turned its attention to the digital and multimodal environments where

*Corresponding Author: Luu Dat Phi (datphi19030@gmail.com) 140 Lê Trọng Tấn, Tây Thạnh, Hồ Chí Minh, Vietnam, 700000

©2026 by the Authors, published by Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning
https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/vision

this happens. Combining visual and auditory input can strengthen memory and word retention because learners process information through more than one cognitive channel (Wilson & Anam, 2024). As a result, social media platforms such as Facebook and YouTube have drawn interest in language education. However, their educational value often depends on how learners balance entertainment with focused learning (Pham et al., 2023).

Among these platforms, TikTok has become one of the most influential among young learners. Its short-video format, visual effects, subtitles, music, and algorithm-driven content produce a highly engaging environment. Viewed through the Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning (CTML), the platform illustrates the principle that learners process verbal and visual information simultaneously (Mayer, 2021, 2024). Such conditions may favor vocabulary learning because a single video can provide repeated exposure to pronunciation, contextual use, captions, and visual representations of meaning. Several studies have reported that TikTok can increase motivation, confidence, and pronunciation practice among English learners (Tran, 2023; Yang, 2020). The platform also supports social interaction through comments, duets, and content sharing, which may lower anxiety and encourage participation (Afidah et al., 2021; Jah et al., 2024).

These potential benefits come with theoretical and pedagogical concerns. TikTok was designed for entertainment rather than structured learning, and its rapid content flow and endless scrolling may encourage passive viewing instead of deep processing. CTML holds that meaningful learning requires learners to actively select, organize, and integrate information. Fast transitions, background music, and visually crowded content may disrupt these processes and increase distraction (Laili, 2023). Learners may also absorb non-standard vocabulary, slang, and inaccurate language forms through unregulated exposure (Alharthy, 2025; Choo & Khalid, 2024). TikTok may therefore function as both a learning opportunity and a cognitive risk, a tension that current research has yet to examine closely.

Little is known about how learners themselves weigh this tension, particularly English-major students at Vietnamese public universities. Previous studies have examined social-media-supported vocabulary learning or other English-learning outcomes, such as pronunciation and general communication (Le, 2023; Pham et al., 2023; Tu & Minh, 2025). Few studies have examined how English majors in this setting perceive TikTok specifically as a vocabulary resource. This study does not assume that English majors differ from non-English majors. Instead, it focuses on them because their coursework may involve sustained attention to vocabulary and formal language use, which could shape how they judge informal online input. A narrower question concerns whether reported engagement and perceived benefits vary by gender category, as recorded in the questionnaire, and by self-reported daily-use groups. The study addresses these questions descriptively and comparatively within one institution. It cannot determine whether these patterns extend to other universities or whether gender itself accounts for the observed differences.

Studying perceptions also requires separating students' attitudes toward TikTok from their reported engagement with

vocabulary-related content. A student may value educational videos without regularly using the new words they encounter. At the same time, another may report saving, repeating, or applying vocabulary. The questionnaire captures these perceptions and self-reported practices. However, it does not observe learners' behavior directly or measure vocabulary gains. The two dimensions identified in the analysis are therefore treated as exploratory summaries of questionnaire responses rather than as independently validated constructs. The study does not test TikTok's causal effectiveness or the specific principles of CTML. Instead, CTML serves as an interpretive lens for the findings.

Within these boundaries, the study examines English-major students' self-reported perceptions of TikTok for vocabulary learning at one public university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. It pursues three objectives. First, it describes participants' overall perceptions and the response dimensions that emerged from the questionnaire. Second, it compares perception scores across reported gender categories and four groups based on self-reported daily TikTok use duration. The third is to examine the association between the two dimensions, active engagement and practical application, and perceived benefits, learning attitudes, and participants' self-reported English proficiency level. Proficiency was recorded in ordered, self-reported categories rather than measured with an objective test, so this final analysis is interpreted with caution.

Method

Research design

This study used a quantitative cross-sectional survey to describe students' perceptions and examine differences and associations among questionnaire variables at one period of data collection. This design suits summarizing self-reported patterns, but it cannot establish temporal order or causal effects. The study was not designed to test CTML predictions about modality, redundancy, coherence, or segmenting; therefore, the authors used CTML only as a cautious interpretive lens in the discussion, not as a theory directly tested by the data.

Participants

This study involved 580 English majors at a public university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The university mainly follows a traditional teaching approach, where grammar instruction is strongly emphasized. At the same time, digital vocabulary learning tools are rarely integrated into classroom practice. Applications such as TikTok are not commonly used for formal learning activities. This context mattered because it allowed the study to examine how students used social media independently for vocabulary development outside the classroom.

Participants were recruited through purposive sampling. Eligible participants were English-major students at the selected public university who actively used TikTok and had prior experience encountering or using TikTok content to learn English vocabulary. The manuscript reports a final sample of 580 participants. To make the recruitment process fully reproducible, the authors should add the number of students invited, the number of questionnaires distributed and returned, the number excluded because of incomplete or ineligible responses, and the final response rate. These counts are not available in the current manuscript and should be supplied from the

study records rather than estimated. Because purposive sampling was used at one university, the sample should not be treated as representative of all Vietnamese university students.

As shown in Table 1, 56.0% of participants were female and 44.0% male; 40.2% reported an intermediate English level. Daily TikTok use varied, with 34.0% reporting more than two hours and 7.2% reporting less than 30 minutes. These figures describe the sample only. The original questionnaire recorded gender in two categories, so the study cannot report experiences of participants outside those response options or infer that the categories capture the full range of gender identities.

Table 1

Demographic information of the participants (N = 580)

	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	255	44.0%
Female	325	56.0%
Academic year		
First-year	194	33.4%
Second-year	115	19.8%
Third-year	137	23.6%
Fourth-year and above	134	23.1%
English Proficiency		
Basic	109	18.8%
Pre-intermediate	124	21.4%
Intermediate	233	40.2%
Advanced	114	19.7%
Tiktok Usage Frequency		
Under 30 minutes	42	7.2%
30 minutes – 1 hour	153	26.4%
1-2 hours	188	32.4%
Over 2 hours	197	34.0%

Instruments

The study used a structured 13-item questionnaire adapted from the instrument attributed in the reference list to Rezaei, Mai, and Pesaranghader (2014). The in-text citation should be corrected to match that reference unless the authors can verify that a different 2019 publication was used. Items were adapted to the TikTok and Vietnamese EFL context. They addressed vocabulary-related practices, pronunciation, captions, communication, and

learning attitudes. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire was translated into Vietnamese and reviewed by three TESOL lecturers; a pilot involving 30 English-major students was also reported. The final manuscript should briefly describe the translation and review procedure and clarify whether pilot participants were excluded from the main sample.

The reported Cronbach's alpha values were .948 for the full set of items, .931 for the first dimension, and .887 for the second. These coefficients indicate high internal consistency in this sample, although the full-scale value may also reflect overlapping item content. The two dimensions were derived empirically from the current item set and should not be described as confirmed constructs. The manuscript does not report item-total correlations, alpha-if-item-deleted, McDonald's omega, or confirmatory factor analysis; these analyses should not be implied. The factor structure and reliability estimates require verification against the original SPSS output before publication.

Data collection

Data were collected between August 2025 and January 2026 using paper questionnaires distributed in classrooms after lecturers and faculty administrators granted permission. The manuscript describes the survey as cross-sectional, although data collection spanned approximately six months. The authors should clarify whether the same questionnaire and procedures were used throughout this period and whether any changes occurred. The authors should also report the number of questionnaires distributed, returned, excluded, and analyzed so the response rate can be evaluated. Participants were informed of the study purpose, participation was voluntary, and written informed consent was obtained. The manuscript states that no personal identifying information was collected and that responses were anonymized and stored securely.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 27. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize item and scale responses, and internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The manuscript reports an exploratory component analysis with Varimax rotation; this is more accurately described as principal component analysis (PCA), not exploratory common-factor analysis. The authors should verify and report the KMO statistic, Bartlett's test, extraction and rotation settings, factor-retention rationale, and any relevant cross-loadings from the original output. The authors reported independent-samples t-tests and one-way ANOVAs for group comparisons, followed by Tukey HSD comparisons. Before retaining these tests, the authors should verify their assumptions, including homogeneity of variance, and report an appropriate robust alternative if the assumptions are not met. The manuscript also reports a regression using a four-category self-reported proficiency variable. Because this outcome is ordinal, ordinary multiple linear regression is not automatically appropriate; the analysis should be rerun using a method suitable for ordinal outcomes or reframed as exploratory and reported only after statistical review. No causal interpretation is warranted from these cross-sectional self-report data.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

Overall Perceptions of TikTok for Vocabulary Learning and the Emerging Response Dimensions

We ran a principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation on the 13 questionnaire items to examine how responses grouped. Sampling adequacy was acceptable (KMO = [value]), and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant (χ^2([df]) = [value], $p < .001$). Two components had eigenvalues above 1. Together they explained 71.99% of the variance: 37.49% for the first component and 34.50% for the second.

The first component, active engagement and practical application, includes six items (P3, P4, P5, P6, P10, and P12) about using vocabulary met on TikTok. The second component, perceived benefits and learning attitudes, includes seven items (P1, P2, P7, P8, P9, P11, and P13) about students' views of TikTok's usefulness. Items P3, P12, P7, and P11 loaded moderately on both components, so the two dimensions overlap to some degree. Because no factor structure was set in advance and no confirmatory analysis was run, we treat both dimensions as exploratory summaries of the responses rather than validated constructs.

Table 2

Summary of factor loadings

Items	Factor 1: Active engagement and practical application	Factor 2: Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	Communalities (h2)
P10	**.959**	.160	.944
P5	**.942**	.169	.915
P4	**.924**	.213	.899
P6	**.921**	.187	.883
P3	**.664**	.470	.661
P12	**.641**	.542	.705
P13	.009*	**.895**	.801
P2	.088*	**.799**	.644
P8	.308	**.783**	.708
P9	.212	**.769**	.637
P1	.217	**.665**	.489
P11	.400	**.613**	.536
P7	.403	**.612**	.537
Eigenvalues	4.874	4.485	
% of Variance	37.49%	34.50%	
Cumulative %	37.49%	71.99%	

Participants generally viewed TikTok positively as a vocabulary-learning resource (M = 3.75, SD = 0.83). Perceived benefits and learning attitudes scored slightly higher (M = 3.81, SD = 0.82) than active engagement and practical application (M = 3.70, SD = 1.05). The larger standard deviation for active engagement shows that students differed more in how often they reported acting on new words, for example, by repeating them, saving videos, or using the words in context. In short, most students saw value in TikTok, but fewer reported using what they learned. These scores are self-reported perceptions. They do not measure vocabulary gains or observed learning behavior.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Overall perception of TikTok vocabulary learning	580	1.31	5.00	3.75	0.83
Active engagement and practical application	580	1.00	5.00	3.70	1.05
Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	580	1.57	5.00	3.81	0.82

Differences in Perceptions by Gender and Daily TikTok Use

Gender

An independent-samples t-test compared the scores of participants recorded as male (n = [value]) and female (n = [value]). Levene's test showed [equal/unequal] variances, so the [standard / Welch-corrected] t-test is reported. Female participants scored higher on overall perception (M = 4.21 vs. 3.17), t(578) = −19.10, p < .001, d = −1.60. They also scored higher on active engagement and practical application (M = 4.21 vs. 3.04), t(578) = −15.93, p < .001, d = −1.33, and on perceived benefits and learning attitudes (M = 4.21 vs. 3.29), t(578) = −16.25, p < .001, d = −1.36. All three effect sizes are large.

These differences describe one sample at one institution. The questionnaire did not measure learning motives, content preferences, or time spent on vocabulary tasks, so it cannot explain why the groups differed—the gender item offered only two options, which we note as a limitation.

Table 4

Independent t-test

Variable	Male	Female	t	p	Cohen's d
Overall perception of TikTok vocabulary learning	3.17	4.21	-19.10	.000	-1.60
Active engagement and practical application	3.04	4.21	-15.93	.000	-1.33
Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	3.29	4.21	-16.25	.000	-1.36

Daily TikTok Use

Participants who used TikTok for one to two hours a day had the highest mean scores on overall perception (M = 3.97, SD = 0.68), active engagement and practical application (M = 3.96, SD = 0.83), and perceived benefits and learning attitudes (M = 3.97, SD = 0.71). The under-30-minute group, the smallest group (n = 42), had the lowest overall mean (M = 3.49, SD = 0.76). Those using TikTok for more than two hours scored lower than the one-to-two-hour group on all three measures.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics of TikTok usage duration

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Overall perception of TikTok vocabulary learning	Under 30 minutes	42	3.4945	.76380	.11786	1.46	5.00
	30 minutes-1 hour	153	3.6420	.81103	.06557	1.85	5.00
	1 hour-2 hours	188	3.9677	.68451	.04992	2.31	5.00
	Over 2 hours	197	3.6950	.93236	.06643	1.31	5.00
	Total	580	3.7549	.82692	.03434	1.31	5.00
Active engagement and practical application	Under 30 minutes	42	3.5317	.87593	.13516	1.00	5.00
	30 minutes-1 hour	153	3.4270	1.24719	.10083	1.00	5.00
	1 hour-2 hous	188	3.9637	.83218	.06069	1.50	5.00
	Over 2 hours	197	3.6853	1.05916	.07546	1.00	5.00
	Total	580	3.6963	1.05379	.04376	1.00	5.00
Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	Under 30 minutes	42	3.4626	.75383	.11632	1.86	5.00
	30 minutes-1 hour	153	3.8263	.65300	.05279	2.14	5.00
	1 hour-2 hous	188	3.9711	.71316	.05201	1.86	5.00
	Over 2 hours	197	3.7034	.98340	.07006	1.57	5.00
	Total	580	3.8052	.81542	.03386	1.57	5.00

A one-way ANOVA found significant differences among the four groups for overall perception, $F(3, 576) = 7.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .035$; active engagement and practical application, $F(3, 576) = 7.99$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .040$; and perceived benefits and learning attitudes, $F(3, 576) = 6.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .032$. Levene's test [was/was not] significant, so [Tukey HSD / Games-Howell] was used for post hoc comparisons. Daily use accounted for only a small share of the variation in scores.

Table 6
One-way ANOVA

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall perception of TikTok vocabulary learning	Between Groups	14.014	3	4.671	7.046	.000
	Within Groups	381.902	576	.663		
	Total	395.917	579			
Active engagement and practical application	Between Groups	25.694	3	8.565	7.992	.000
	Within Groups	617.270	576	1.072		
	Total	642.964	579			
Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	Between Groups	12.216	3	4.072	6.292	.000
	Within Groups	372.769	576	.647		
	Total	384.984	579			

Post hoc tests showed that, on overall perception, the one-to-two-hour group scored higher than the under-30-minute group (mean difference = .47, $p = .004$), the 30-minute-to-one-hour group (mean difference = .33, $p = .001$), and the over-two-hour group (mean difference = .27, $p = .006$). On active engagement, it scored higher than the 30-minute-to-one-hour group (.54, $p < .001$) and the over-two-hour group (.28, $p = .043$), but not the under-30-minute group. On perceived benefits, it scored higher than the under-30-minute group (.51, $p = .001$) and the over-two-hour group (.27, $p = .006$). The 30-minute-to-one-hour group also scored higher than the under-30-minute group on this dimension (.36, $p = .048$).

Taken together, moderate daily use went with somewhat more positive perceptions, but the effects were small. Because the design is cross-sectional and duration was self-reported, these results do not show that moderate use improves learning or that heavier use is harmful. Prior proficiency, content choices, motivation, and self-regulation may also play a part.

Table 7

ANOVA effect sizes and multiple comparisons

Variable	Effect Size (η2)	Significant Group Comparisons (I vs J)	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Sig.
Overall perception of TikTok vocabulary learning	.035	1-2 hours vs. Under 30 mins	.473*	.004
		1-2 hours vs. 30 mins - 1 hour	.325*	.001
		1-2 hours vs. Over 2 hours	.272*	.006
Active engagement and practical application	.040	1-2 hours vs. 30 mins - 1 hour	.536*	.000
		1-2 hours vs. Over 2 hours	.278*	.043
Perceived benefits and learning attitudes	.032	1-2 hours vs. Under 30 mins	.508*	.001
		1-2 hours vs. Over 2 hours	..267*	.006
		30 mins - 1 hour vs. Under 30 mins	.363*	.048

Note. η2= Eta-squared (Fixed-effect). Mean differences are based on Tukey HSD post-hoc tests. Only significant comparisons (p < .05) are displayed for brevity.

Predictive Association Between the Perception Dimensions and Self-Reported English Proficiency

Table 8

Multiple regression results for English proficiency

Predictor Variable	B	SE	β	t	p	VIF
(Constant)	-.333	.154		-2.160	.031	
Active Engagement	.392	.037	.411	10.464	.000	1.550
Perceived Benefits	.392	.048	.318	8.098	.000	1.550

Note. η2= .426; Adjusted η2= .424. Dependent Variable: English Proficiency.

A multiple regression examined how the two dimensions were associated with self-reported English proficiency. The model was significant, $F(2, 577) = 213.98$, $p < .001$, with $R^2 = .426$ (adjusted $R^2 = .424$). Both dimensions were positively associated with proficiency. Active engagement and practical application had the stronger association ($B = 0.39$, $SE = 0.04$, $\beta = .41$, $t = 10.46$, $p < .001$), and perceived benefits and learning attitudes had a smaller one ($B = 0.39$, $SE = 0.05$, $\beta = .32$, $t = 8.10$, $p < .001$). Multicollinearity was not a concern (VIF = 1.55).

Students who reported more active use of TikTok vocabulary, and to a lesser extent more

positive attitudes, also tended to rate their proficiency higher. We interpret this as an exploratory association, not a predictive or causal effect, for three reasons. First, proficiency was recorded in four ordered categories rather than measured with a test. Second, all variables came from the same self-report questionnaire, which may inflate their relationship. Third, the cross-sectional design means more proficient students may engage more with English content on TikTok.

Discussion

Overall, participants reported positive perceptions of TikTok as a possible resource for vocabulary learning. The mean for perceived benefits and learning attitudes was slightly higher than the mean for active engagement and practical application, suggesting that valuing a platform and reporting learning-related practices are not identical. This pattern aligns with previous studies describing TikTok as engaging for language learners (Afidah et al., 2021; Tran, 2023), but the present study did not test actual vocabulary gains or observe learners using the platform. It therefore adds a context-specific account of students' reported perceptions rather than evidence that TikTok improves vocabulary learning. CTML offers a useful way to discuss the possible role of verbal and visual input. However, the questionnaire did not operationalize its principles, so they cannot be claimed as empirically tested here.

The gender comparison showed higher reported scores for females than for males. This result differs from studies reporting limited or inconsistent gender differences in vocabulary learning (Llach & Gallego, 2012; Fernández-Fontecha, 2014), although comparisons across studies should be made cautiously because the participants, instruments, and outcomes may differ. The present data do not indicate why the group means differed. In particular, they do not support claims that one group is more reflective, more willing to explore learning resources, or more likely to use TikTok for entertainment. Such explanations would require direct measures of learning strategies, motives, and content use. The unusually large reported effect sizes also make it essential to verify the underlying statistics before drawing substantive conclusions.

Daily-use groups differed statistically on the three reported perception measures, and the one-to-two-hour group had the highest means. However, the effect sizes were small, and the data were collected at a single time point. These results should not be interpreted as showing that moderate use improves vocabulary learning or that longer use reduces concentration. Students with different proficiency levels or learning goals may choose different usage patterns, and these factors were not controlled. The finding is best treated as a descriptive association that could inform a future longitudinal or experimental study.

The study's contribution is limited but useful: it describes how English majors at one Vietnamese public university responded to a questionnaire about TikTok and vocabulary learning. The two dimensions reported in the analysis may help organize these responses, but they remain exploratory and require further validation. The study does not establish that English majors have fundamentally different perceptions from non-English majors because no direct comparison group was included. Nor does it test CTML predictions. These boundaries should guide how the contribution is presented.

For teaching practice, the findings support a cautious, low-cost approach to using short videos as supplementary material rather than treating TikTok as a substitute for planned vocabulary instruction. For example, a teacher could ask students to select one short video, identify two or three target words, check their meaning and usage in a reliable dictionary, record pronunciation, and write original sentences using the words. A brief follow-up task could ask students to explain which context clues helped them understand each word. These activities are practical suggestions, not interventions tested by this study. They should be evaluated before claims about their effectiveness are made.

At the curriculum level, digital literacy instruction could include checking the credibility of language-learning creators, distinguishing standard usage from slang, and reflecting on how recommendations and scrolling shape content exposure. These recommendations follow from the risks discussed in the literature rather than from direct measures of digital literacy in this survey. Future research should include objective vocabulary tests, measures of content type and learning motivation, and samples from multiple institutions. A longitudinal or experimental design would be needed to examine whether specific TikTok activities contribute to vocabulary retention over time.

Conclusion

This study described English-major students' self-reported perceptions of TikTok for vocabulary learning at one Vietnamese public university. Participants reported generally positive perceptions, with slightly higher mean scores for perceived benefits and learning attitudes than for active engagement and practical application. Differences were reported across the gender categories and daily-use groups recorded in the questionnaire, with the one-to-two-hour group showing the highest mean perception scores. These findings reflect associations in self-report data, not evidence that TikTok improves vocabulary achievement or that a particular duration is optimal. The two dimensions are exploratory, and the reported inferential statistics—especially the gender comparisons and regression model—need to be checked against the original data and output before firm conclusions are drawn.

Several limitations should be considered. The sample came from one university and was selected purposively. Hence, the findings are not statistically generalizable to all Vietnamese university students. The questionnaire relied on self-report and recorded gender in only two categories. English proficiency was represented by a single ordinal self-report item rather than an objective language test. The study did not measure actual vocabulary gains, content type, attention, digital literacy, or learning motivation, and the cross-sectional design cannot establish causal direction. In addition, the manuscript does not report how many questionnaires were distributed and returned, and several statistical tables and values require verification. Future studies should use validated measures, report recruitment and response rates, include objective vocabulary assessments, check model assumptions, and recruit participants from more than one institution. Experimental or longitudinal research would better suit investigating whether and how specific TikTok activities support vocabulary development.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Generative AI Statement

The authors used Grammarly solely for language editing and proofreading to improve the clarity and readability of the manuscript. All AI-assisted output was critically reviewed and revised by the authors, who take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and final content of the manuscript.

References

Afidah, N., Sari, N. K., & Hanifah, H. (2021). Investigating students' perspectives on the use of TikTok as an instructional media in distance learning during pandemic era. *Dinamika: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan dan Keislaman, 6*(2), 47–68. https://doi.org/10.32764/dinamika.v6i2.1872

Agustín Llach, M. P., & Terrazas Gallego, M. (2012). Vocabulary knowledge development and gender differences in a second language. *ELIA: Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada, 12*, 45–75. https://investigacion.unirioja.es/documentos/5bbc5ce0b7506047d09b5887/f/6788e737f3d0f955d3a84ed3.pdf

Alharthy, F. (2025). Exploring the impact of TikTok on second-language vocabulary acquisition: Benefits, challenges, and learner perceptions. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies, 7*(3), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2025.7.3.2

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Choo, L. Y., & Khalid, F. (2024). Year 6 students' perceptions towards the usage of TikTok and its effectiveness on their vocabulary learning. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 14*(7), 1155–1180. https://doi.org/10.46886/IJARBSS/v14-i7/10958

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fatima, B., & Khan, I. A. (2017). Crucial importance of vocabulary in the process of second language learning: An exploratory study. *European Journal of Education Studies, 3*(6), 501–517. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.767

Fernández-Fontecha, A. (2014). Motivation and gender effect in receptive vocabulary learning: An exploratory analysis in CLIL primary education. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 7*(2), 27–49. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2014.7.2.2

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Jah, N. J. A., Tahreb, N. S., Ibrahim, Q., Hamzah, I. F. A., & Abd Halim, H. (2024). TikTok as pedagogical tool for English language learning. *Gading Journal for the Social*

Sciences, 27, 101–111. https://doi.org/10.24191/gading.v27i0.548

Laili, R. N. (2023). Students' perspectives on using TikTok videos as a medium for learning English. *Lunar, 7*(2), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.36526/ln.v7i2.3098

Le, A. T. (2023). *TikTok and its influence on the English competence of Vietnamese students* [Master's thesis, University of Alberta]. [Repository URL]

Mayer, R. E. (2021). *Multimedia learning* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, R. E. (2024). The past, present, and future of the cognitive theory of multimedia learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 36*(1), Article 8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09842-1

Nguyen, T. T. T., & Nguyen, T. H. M. (2025). Using videos on TikTok to enhance English majors' pronunciation at a university in Thai Nguyen province. *European Journal of English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 88–100. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v10i3.6339

Nikolovska, A. (2011). Gender and vocabulary learning in EFL: A case study from Macedonia. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies, 3*(1), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.18485/bells.2011.3.5

Okyar, H. (2021). Vocabulary learning strategies of Turkish EFL learners: A focus on gender. *Journal of English Teaching, 7*(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v7i1.2289

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117452

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Pham, M. T., Nguyen, V. T. T., & Cao, T. X. T. (2023). Vietnamese students' perceptions of utilizing social media to enhance English vocabulary: A case study at Van Lang University. *International Journal of TESOL & Education, 3*(1), 79–111. https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23316

Rezaei, A., Mai, N., & Pesaranghader, A. (2014). The effect of mobile applications on English vocabulary acquisition. *Jurnal Teknologi (Sciences & Engineering), 68*(2), 77–83. https://doi.org/10.11113/jt.v68.2912

Simanungkalit, J. R. M., & Katemba, C. V. (2023). Utilizing English TikTok as a media in learning English vocabulary: University students' perspective. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development, 6*(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v6i2.2331

Sujariati, S., Wanci, R., & Arianti, W. (2022). Investigating learning strategies of male and female students on mastering vocabulary. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature, 9*(2), 764–772. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.449

Tran, D. T. (2023). TikTok's effect on English vocabulary learning: An empirical study of English major curriculum. *Revista de Gestão e Secretariado (Management and Administrative Professional Review), 14*(10), 18576–18592. https://doi.org/10.7769/gesec.v14i10.2869

Wilson, A., & Anam, S. U. (2024). Exploring the impact of social media use on English vocabulary learning among non-English major university students. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching, 9*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v9i1.22463

Yang, H. (2020). Secondary-school students' perspectives of utilizing Tik Tok for English

learning in and beyond the EFL classroom. In *Proceedings of the 2020 3rd International Conference on Education Technology and Social Science (ETSS 2020)* (pp. 162–183). Francis Academic Press.