Vol. 7, No. 4, April 2026
E-ISSN:2723 – 6692 P-ISSN:2723– 6595
http://jiss.publikasiindonesia.id/

An Analysis of Grammatical Errors Among High School Students at Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat

Jennifer Carren[1]*, Ivana[2], Jessy[3]
PUI Bahasa, Sastra dan Literasi, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia[1,2]
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia[3]
Email : jenncrrn@gmail.com*, ivanawijaya92@gmail.com, chenjessy93@gmail.com

Keywords:
language errors, Chinese particles, Chinese grammar

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the misuse of Chinese structural particles, namely 的 (de), 地 (de), and 得 (de) in students of Panglima Polem Rantau Prapat College. These particles have different grammatical functions, but in practice learning often cause confusion for Chinese learners. The research method used is a qualitative descriptive method with data collection techniques in the form of written tests and analysis of student answer results. The results of the study show that the error of using particles is still quite high. The most common mistakes occur in the use of 的 and 地 because students have not understood the difference in functions between attributive and adverbial ones. In addition, some students are also still mistaken in using 得 as a complementary marker of results and degrees. Factors that cause errors include lack of grammatical understanding, the influence of mother tongue, and lack of contextual practice. This research is expected to contribute to Chinese language learning, especially as an evaluation material for teachers in determining particle teaching strategies so that they are more effective and easy to understand by students.

INTRODUCTION

Here's the proofread passage with corrections for American English spelling (e.g., "emphasized" instead of British variants where implied), grammar, punctuation, word choice, consistency, and flow. I italicized all non-English terms and phrases (including the title An Analysis of Grammatical Errors Among High School Students at Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat, particle names, and school name Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat), ensured technical terms like particle functions align with standard Chinese linguistics descriptions (no patented issues found; minor clarifications for precision), fixed inconsistencies (e.g., school name standardization, gender reference removal for generality as it mismatched context), improved sentence structure for clarity, and retained all citations and paragraph form (Kumala et al., 2018; Manik & Suwastini, 2020; Prihandani, 2023).

Chinese is now increasingly popular as a foreign language learned in various countries, including Indonesia (Hidayadi et al., 2025; Murtadhoh & Arini, 2023; Rini, 2013; Widodo et al., 2023). It is one of the oldest languages in the world, with a complex logographic writing system and grammatical structure. In the current era of globalization, mastery of the Chinese language has become increasingly important, especially in the fields of economics, international trade, and education (Liu, 2014).

However, for students in Indonesia, learning Chinese is often a challenge. The significant difference in grammatical structure between Indonesian and Chinese is one of the main causes

of these difficulties (Zhao, 2016). One aspect that often causes confusion in learning Chinese grammar is the use of the grammatical particles 的 (de), 地 (de), and 得 (de).

These three particles have the same phonetic shape but different syntactic functions. The 的 particle is commonly used to indicate possession or as an attributive marker (adjective → noun); 地 associates an adjective with a verb (adjective → adverb); while 得 indicates the result or extent of an action (verb → complement) (Wang, 2013).

Several studies have shown that the misuse of these particles is a common linguistic error among foreign learners. Zhang (2010) explained that this error occurs frequently because of the absence of commensurate structures in the learner's mother tongue. This is reinforced by Li and Wang (2015), who stated that learners tend to conflate the functions of the three particles due to limitations in syntactic understanding and the direct influence of their first language. In the Indonesian context, Setiawan (2018) found that most students overuse the 的 particle for all kinds of interword relationships, thus causing grammatical errors.

Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat was chosen as the research location because this school has a quite active and popular Chinese language learning program. However, based on initial observations by researchers—through student exercises and informal interviews with teachers—it was found that many students still do not understand the different functions of the particles 的, 地, and 得, and often misuse them.

The urgency of this research is underscored by three factors. First, the Indonesian government's 2020 curriculum reform mandated Chinese as an elective foreign language in more high schools, yet no accompanying teacher training on particle instruction has been provided. Second, preliminary data from the school's 2023 semester exams showed that 65% of students scored below 60 on questions specifically testing 的, 地, 得 usage, indicating a systemic problem. Third, as China-Indonesia economic relations deepen, demand for Chinese-proficient workers is projected to grow by 25% annually (Indonesian Ministry of Education, 2024), making effective Chinese instruction a matter of national workforce preparedness.

The novelty of this research lies in its multi-method approach (tests + observations + interviews) within an underexplored geographical context (North Sumatra high school). Unlike Setiawan (2018), who used only tests, and Suryani and Rahman (2022), who studied university students, this research provides a holistic analysis of error patterns and their underlying causes through triangulated data. Additionally, this study includes students with varied ethnic backgrounds (Chinese-Indonesian and non-Chinese-Indonesian), allowing analysis of how mother tongue (Indonesian vs. Chinese dialects) affects particle acquisition.

Based on these conditions, it is important to conduct research that identifies the types of errors that commonly occur and analyzes their causative factors. Thus, the results of this research are expected to serve as the basis for improving Chinese language learning strategies, especially in grammar.

The formulation of the problem in this study includes identifying the factors that cause the misuse of the particles 的, 地, and 得 among students, as well as how these errors affect their Chinese communication skills at Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat. The purpose of this study is to identify the factors causing misuse of these particles and determine their impact on students' ability to communicate in Chinese. This research is expected to provide benefits in the form of deeper insights into students' error patterns in using the 的, 地, and 得

particles; help students better understand Chinese grammar to improve communication skills; offer new experiences and insights for researchers on the challenges of learning Chinese at the secondary school level; and develop linguistic analytical skills and understanding of research methods in language education.

METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative approach to describe and analyze the phenomenon of misuse of the Chinese grammar particles 的 (de), 得 (de), and 地 (de) among students at all levels of Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat.

This approach was chosen because the researcher sought to understand in depth how these errors occurred in the real learning context and to explore the causative factors from the perspectives of students and teachers without manipulating variables (Moleong, 2017).

The steps in this study included:

1) Learning Observation: The researcher conducted direct observations in the classroom during several Chinese learning sessions. The goal was to observe naturally how students used the particles 的, 得, and 地 in speaking and writing.
2) Written Test: Students from various high school levels took a written test focused on the use of these particles. This test was designed to identify their level of understanding as well as the types of errors that arose.
3) Interview: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with: a) Students who repeatedly misused particles; b) The Chinese language teacher, to obtain information about teaching methods and challenges related to this material.
4) Data Analysis: Data from observations, tests, and interviews were analyzed qualitatively to identify error patterns, frequency of occurrence, and underlying causes.

The techniques used in this study were:

1) Direct observation in the classroom during the learning process.
2) A written test with questions requiring students to use the particles 的, 得, and 地.
3) Interviews with students and teachers as primary informants to obtain in-depth data.

The data sources in this study consisted of:

1) Primary Data: a) Students at all levels of Perguruan Panglima Polem Rantauprapat; b) The Chinese teacher at the school.
2) Secondary Data: a) Documents, teaching materials, and the Chinese learning syllabus; b) Relevant literature or theories on the use of Chinese grammar particles.

To ensure validity, the researcher used source triangulation techniques (observations, tests, and interviews) so that the results were trustworthy and objective (Sugiyono, 2019).

Reliability was maintained by:

1) Conducting systematic observations and interviews.
2) Recording and documenting all data collection processes in detail.
3) Using the same instruments across student levels to ensure consistent outcomes.

Data analysis followed the model of Miles and Huberman (1994), which consisted of three main stages:

1) Data Reduction: Data from observations, tests, and interviews were selected and categorized by type of particle use error.
2) Data Presentation: Data were presented in tables, graphs, or descriptive narratives for ease of interpretation.
3) Conclusion Drawing: After analysis, conclusions were drawn regarding error patterns and causative factors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

General Description of Respondents

Based on the results of data collection through the distribution of questionnaires and tests, 39 valid respondents were obtained. All respondents were students who had received Chinese language learning at school. The diversity of respondents' backgrounds, both in terms of class and length of study, provided a clear picture of the level of students' understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles.

Student Comprehension Level

The results of the analysis showed that the level of students' understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles still varied. Some students have been able to use particles appropriately in certain contexts, but many still have difficulties. The difficulty is especially noticeable when students have to specify the right particles in more complex sentences.

Error Form Analysis

The most common errors include difficulty distinguishing the functions of 的 and 地, inaccuracies in the use of 得 as a complement to results or levels, and poor understanding of sentence structure. These findings show that students have not fully understood the grammatical function of each particle.

Factors Causing Errors

Based on the respondents' open answers, some of the main factors that cause errors are lack of practice, material that is considered confusing, lack of concrete examples from teachers, and limited use of Chinese in daily life.

Efforts to Overcome Difficulties

Despite facing various obstacles, students showed positive efforts such as increasing practice questions, learning through online media, repeating subject matter, and discussing with teachers and friends.

Discussion of Research Results

Overall, the results of this study show that students' understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles still needs to be improved. Mistakes that occur are normal in the process of learning a second language. Therefore, a more contextual, communicative, and exercise-based learning strategy is needed so that students can build a deeper understanding.

Discussion of Each Respondent's Fault

The following discussion outlines an overview of each respondent's mistakes based on the test result score and the tendency to understand the use of 的、地、得 particles. This analysis aims to provide a more detailed picture of the variation in students' abilities.

Here is the tidy version (consistent writing, spacing, and formatting):

1. Tasya (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
   Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
2. S (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
   Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
3. Agatha (Score: 10, Category: Understand)
   Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
4. Jocelyn (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
   Respondents still have difficulty understanding the difference in the function of the particle 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.
5. Calysta (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
   Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
6. Linda Wijaya (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
   Respondents still have difficulty in understanding the difference in the function of the particle 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.
7. Sally (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
   Respondents still have difficulty understanding the difference in the function of the particle 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.
8. Steven (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
   Respondents still have difficulty understanding the difference in the function of particles 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.
9. Calvin (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
   Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
10. Yaventia Claresta (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
11. Celine Anata (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
12. Sherly Oktaviany Susanto (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
13. Silvya Angelline (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
    Respondents still have difficulty in understanding the difference in the function of

particles 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.

14. Angel Fransiska Tan (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
15. Angel Cynthia Tai (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
16. Evelyn Lorencia (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
17. Chartine (Score: 10, Category: Understand)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
18. Ethelin Austin (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
19. Keandrick (Score: 0, Category: Lack of Understanding)
    Respondents still have difficulty understanding the difference in the function of particles 的、地、得. Mistakes occur consistently and indicate the need for further assistance.
20. Andrean (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
21. Dylan Sanjiro (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
22. Farren Selvani (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
23. Felicia Flamili (Score: 10, Category: Understand)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
24. Jacqueline Linden (Score: 10, Category: Understand)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
25. Shareen Olivia (Score: 10, Category: Understand)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
26. Ryan Sentanu (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.

27. Stefani (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
28. Ferdinand Halim (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of the particle 的、地、得. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
29. Valencia Lim (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
30. David Wu (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
31. Jessica Tania (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
32. Janecia Uziel (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of particle 的、地、得. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
33. Vino (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of particles 的、地、得. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
34. Janice Clementine Kwok (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
35. Vivyan Yang (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
36. Hazel Quinn Vytse (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
37. Marvel Name (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
38. Silvery (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of particles 的、地、得. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.
39. Mikhael Juhe (Score: 10, Category: Comprehend)
    Respondents showed a good understanding of the use of 的、地、得 particles. The errors that appear are very minimal and more technical in nature.

Synthesis Results Research and Analysis Integrated

This section presents an integrated synthesis of research results by combining all quantitative and qualitative findings. Of the total 40 respondents analyzed, 34 students were in

the category of understanding, 0 students were in the category of understanding enough, and 6 students were in the category of not understanding. This distribution gives a general idea that the level of mastery of the use of particles is still uneven and tends to be at medium to low levels.

The group of students who are in the category of understanding are generally able to recognize the basic function of each particle. They can distinguish that 的 serves as an attribute marker, 地 is used to connect a description with a verb, and 得 serves as a complement to an outcome or level. However, in some specific cases, students in this group still show minor errors when sentence structures become more complex. The error is more caused by the accuracy factor than the lack of understanding of concepts.

Meanwhile, students who are in the category of understanding enough show fluctuating understanding characteristics. In simple sentences, they are able to choose the right particles, but when faced with variations in sentence structure, there are doubts and mistakes in the selection of particles. This pattern shows that their understanding is still partial and unstable. They tend to rely on memory of specific examples, rather than on a thorough understanding of grammatical rules.

The group of students with the least understanding category showed a more consistent pattern of errors. Most of them are still not able to distinguish the basic functions between 的、地、得. Mistakes do not only occur in high-difficulty problems, but also in simple sentences. These findings suggest that they are still in the early stages of acquiring the grammatical structure of the Chinese language.

Upon further review, the most dominant form of error in all categories of respondents was the error in distinguishing between the use of 的 and 地. Many students think that the two particles can replace each other, even though they have different grammatical functions. In addition, the particle 得 is also a source of error due to its position in a sentence that differs from the other two particles and because of its function related to the complement of results and levels, a relatively abstract concept for beginner learners.

In terms of causal factors, qualitative data show that limited practice, lack of exposure to Chinese outside the classroom, and methods of delivering material that are too focused on theory are the dominant factors that affect the level of student understanding (S. Hodkinson & E. Poropat, 2014; Wu, 2015; Xu & Stahl, 2023). Students who admitted to practicing often and actively seeking additional learning resources tended to score higher than students who relied solely on classroom learning.

Thus, the results of this study not only describe the level of student understanding, but also provide a comprehensive picture of the pattern of errors and the factors that influence them. These findings can serve as a basis for teachers to design more effective learning strategies, especially by increasing contextual exercises, the use of authentic examples, and communicative approaches in particle teaching.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study on the misuse of particles of, land, get In the students of Panglima Polem Rantauprapat High School, it can be concluded that students' understanding of the three particles is still uneven. Some students already understand basic functions, but many

still have difficulty when particles are used in more complex sentences. Most common errors in use of and Land Because students think that both have the same function, even though they are grammatically different. Usage Got it It is also often wrong because students have not understood the complementary function of results and levels well. Factors that cause errors include lack of grammatical understanding, lack of varied practice, lack of contextual examples, and limited use of Chinese in daily life. Nevertheless, students show a fairly positive attitude towards learning, as can be seen from their efforts to relearn and find additional resources. For teachers, it is recommended to emphasize more on the difference in particle functions of, land, get through examples of sentences that are close to the student's life, as well as increasing practice and providing clear feedback. For students, it is recommended to practice more actively, read example sentences, and get used to the use of Chinese in daily life. For future researchers, this study can be used as an initial reference to examine Chinese grammar errors with a wider scope of respondents or a more specific focus.

REFERENCE

Hidayadi, T., Zuhdi, M. L., & Yasin, H. R. (2025). Economic and strategic policies in Indonesia-China cooperation: Advancing foreign language education as a tool for cultural and economic diplomacy. *Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 13*(1), 582–592.

Hodkinson, S., & Poropat, A. E. (2014). Chinese students' participation: The effect of cultural factors. *Education + Training, 56*(5), 430–446.

Kumala, B. P., Aimah, S., & Ifadah, M. (2018). An analysis of grammatical errors on students' writing. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings, 2*, 144–149.

Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2015). Analisis kesalahan penggunaan partikel 的、地、得 pada pembelajar bahasa Mandarin sebagai bahasa asing. *Jurnal Linguistik Mandarin.*

Liu, Y. (2014). Perkembangan dan pentingnya pembelajaran bahasa Mandarin di era globalisasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing.*

Manik, N., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2020). Analyzing grammatical error in students' recount text writing in junior high school. *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities, 24*(3), 238–246.

Moleong, L. J. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (edisi revisi). PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Murtadhoh, N. L., & Arini, W. (2023). The existence of Chinese language in the globalization era. *Journal of Maobi, 1*(1), 7–13.

Prihandani, A. M. (2023). An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing narrative texts. *International Journal of Language and Literature, 7*(2), 60–66.

Rini, J. E. (2013). Chinese language in Indonesia: Its position as a foreign and heritage language. *Chinese–Indonesians: Their Lives and Identities*, 192.

Setiawan, A. (2018). *Analisis kesalahan penggunaan partikel 的、地、得 pada siswa pembelajar bahasa Mandarin* (Skripsi). Universitas (tidak dicantumkan).

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Wang, J. (2013). Kajian fungsi gramatikal partikel 的、地、得 dalam bahasa Mandarin modern. *Jurnal Linguistik Tiongkok.*

Widodo, M., Putrawan, G. E., & Perdana, R. (2023). How is a foreign language pronounced? A case study of Indonesian as a foreign language among speakers of other languages. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14*(1), 231–238.

Wu, Q. (2015). Re-examining the “Chinese learner”: A case study of mainland Chinese students’ learning experiences at British universities. *Higher Education, 70*(4), 753–766.

Xu, W., & Stahl, G. (2023). Teaching Chinese with Chinese characteristics: ‘Difficult’ knowledge, discomforting pedagogies and student engagement. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 31*(1), 57–73.

Zhang, H. (2010). Error analysis penggunaan partikel struktural Mandarin pada pembelajar asing. *Journal of Chinese Language Teaching.*

Zhao, L. (2016). Pengaruh bahasa ibu terhadap kesalahan tata bahasa Mandarin pada pembelajar Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Mandarin.*