

The variations of sentence structure in various question responses based on basic sentence patterns

Siti Ainim Liusti^{a, 1, *}, Zulfikarni^{a, 2}, Ishak Bagea^{b, 3}, Ridha Hasnul Ulya^{a, 4}

^a Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

^b Universitas Muhammadiyah Kendari, Kendari, Indonesia

¹ sitiainim@fbs.unp.ac.id; ² zulfikarni@fbs.unp.ac.id; ³ ishak.bagea@umkendari.ac.id;

⁴ ridhasnulya@fbs.unp.ac.id

* Correspondent author

Received: March 18, 2026

Revised: May 8, 2026

Accepted: May 10, 2026

KEYWORDS

Basic Sentence
Patterns
Sentence
Structure
Question Words

ABSTRACT

Syntactic competence is foundational to children's literacy development; however, empirical research on how elementary learners construct sentences in response to specific interrogative prompts remains limited in Indonesian linguistic scholarship. Although prior studies have normatively described basic sentence patterns or assessed general syntactic complexity, few have investigated the structural variations elicited by different question words. This study describes and analyzes the syntactic variations produced by fourth-grade students in response to five Indonesian interrogatives (*where, how, who, why, what*) and maps these responses onto the six basic sentence patterns of Indonesian. Using a qualitative descriptive design and content analysis, the study examined students' written responses to a narrative reading comprehension task. Each answer was parsed for syntactic function and evaluated against the framework of *Standard Indonesian Grammar*. Trustworthiness was ensured through thick description and inter-analyst triangulation. The findings reveal that each interrogative elicits a distinct range of syntactic realizations: full, elliptical, and compound with *why* producing the most elaborate, multi-clausal constructions. All observed variations align systematically with the six basic sentence patterns, indicating that ellipsis functions as a pragmatically motivated strategy rather than a syntactic deficiency. This study enriches the descriptive understanding of Indonesian child syntax and provides a diagnostic tool for elementary language instruction.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

Syntactic competence is not only a fundamental dimension of children's literacy development but also serves as an indicator of their cognitive-linguistic maturity. Children who can construct syntactic structures effectively tend to be more skilled at understanding texts, constructing arguments, and expressing ideas in writing (Liusti & Ratna, 2021). Several recent studies confirm the close relationship between syntactic skills and literacy achievement. Buckalew et al. (2024) demonstrated that syntactic abilities contribute significantly to reading comprehension, while Marjokorpi & van Rijt (2025) emphasized the role of syntax in the development of children's argumentative abilities. These findings reinforce the view that syntax is not merely a formal aspect of language, but rather a cognitive instrument that supports academic thinking and communication processes.

Syntactically, a sentence consists of functionally hierarchical components namely, subject (S), predicate (P), object (O), complement (Comp), and adverb (Adv) which collectively determine its grammatical correctness (Putrayasa & Ramendra, 2021; Naini & Ulya, 2025; Al-Obaydi et al., 2025). These elements do not stand alone but rather function relationally, so that the realization of one function automatically conditions the other (Markhamah & Sabardila, 2014). In Indonesian syntax, there are six of basic sentence patterns have been widely recognized in the literature: (1) S-P, (2) S-P-O, (3) S-P-Comp, (4) S-P-Adv, (5) S-P-O-Comp, and (6) S-P-O-Adv (Alwi et al., 2017). These six limited of basis sentence patterns produce an infinite number of sentence structure variations. This is crucial to research.

Syntactic competence is crucial for text comprehension and communication. Wu et al. (2019) emphasize syntactic complexity as an indicator of writing proficiency, while Bahari (2025) emphasizes its relevance in AI-based academic writing. Neurocognitive evidence from Biondo et al. (2024) suggests that sentence comprehension is directly mediated by syntactic capacity, and in the Indonesian educational context, Munirah & Hardian (2016) emphasize mastery of sentence structure as a prerequisite for productive writing skills. These findings emphasize that sentence structure is not simply a grammatical construction but has significant pedagogical implications, particularly at the elementary level when fundamental linguistic competence is consolidated.

Among the various elicitation modes used to assess children's syntactic abilities, question-answer configurations provide a particularly unique analytical basis. The question words *where*, *how*, *who*, *why*, and *what*, each place different syntactic demands on respondents, effectively serving as syntactic triggers that shape the structural composition of the resulting answers (Chaer, 2014; Pandean, 2018; Ulya, 2024). Cross-linguistic studies have shown that the syntactic complexity of children's answers increases with age and cognitive maturity, and that different types of questions elicit structures of varying complexity (Lemen et al., 2024; Pancarrani et al., 2018; Liusti et al., 2024). Existing research tends to be at the secondary school level and addresses syntactic complexity separately from the interrogative stimulus that triggers it.

Although basic Indonesian sentence patterns have a strong theoretical foundation, empirical studies that systematically map variations in elementary school students' sentence structures in response to interrogatives are still limited. Previous research has focused more on the typology of normative sentence patterns (Andayani & Jupriono, 2025) or the syntactic complexity of children's writing in general (Pancarrani & Mukhlas, 2025; Malik et al., 2026; Liusti & Ratna, 2020). What has not been widely studied is how fourth-grade students, at the crucial stage of syntactic consolidation, produce structural variations that deviate from basic sentence patterns but remain grammatical. Phenomena such as ellipsis, constituent shifts, and the emergence of compound clauses due to causal interrogatives deserve further investigation within the descriptive framework of Indonesian syntax.

This study aims to describe variations in the sentence structure of fourth-grade students' answers to five question words (*where*, *how*, *who*, *why*, and *what*) and analyze them based on basic Indonesian sentence patterns. These variations are explored based on six basic patterns by viewing sentence structure as a context-free internal-relational configuration (Karomani, 2009; Noveria et al., 2026). Students' answers are treated as a diagnostic window into developing syntactic competence. The findings are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the description of variations in Indonesian sentence patterns in children's language, as well as practical benefits for the development of diagnostic instruments and language learning strategies in elementary schools.

Method

This study applies a descriptive qualitative approach using the content analysis method as the basis of the study. The data source comes from students' answer sheets obtained after they read the text entitled "The Fruit of Carelessness". The data analyzed are sentences containing students' answers to questions using the question words "where, how, who, why, and what." The data collection process is carried out by identifying sentences containing students' answers, then grouping them according to the type of relevant question words.

Syntactic analysis in the next stage is carried out by describing the syntactic functions in each student's sentence, then determining the basic sentence pattern that refers to Standard Indonesian Grammar, namely (Alwi et al., 2017) as well as syntactic theories from Indonesian language experts, such as Ramlan (2005), Chaer (2014), and Putrayasa (2019). This theoretical support strengthens the analytical basis of the research because the basic sentence patterns, syntactic functions, and structural rules used align with the standard syntactic framework in Indonesian linguistic studies.

Data analysis was conducted through three interrelated stages adapted from standard qualitative procedures: (i) data reduction, which involved identifying and isolating response sentences relevant to each question category; (ii) data display, in which sentences were systematically tabulated and parsed according

to their syntactic function (*subject=S, predicate=P, object=O, complement=Comp, adverb=Adv*); and (iii) conclusion drawing, in which recurring structural patterns and variations were interpreted based on a framework of basic Indonesian sentence patterns.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the analysis, thick description (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) was employed throughout the analytical process, whereby each syntactic interpretation was documented with its linguistic evidence and contextual rationale. In addition, inter-analyst verification was conducted by triangulating the parsing decisions across the three authors, ensuring consistency in the application of the analytical framework and minimising interpretive bias.

Results and Discussion

This study used a qualitative-descriptive research design with content analysis techniques aimed at describing and interpreting the structural variations of sentences produced by elementary school students in response to various interrogative stimuli. Furthermore, students' responses were examined based on basic Indonesian sentence patterns (Alwi et al., 2017).

Primary data consists of fourth-grade elementary school students' answer sentences after reading a narrative text entitled "The Fruit of Carelessness" which tells the story of a mouse deer family and a young mouse deer named Nano. The text was deliberately selected from an Indonesian textbook for the following reasons: (a) it is appropriate to the reading competencies of fourth-grade students, (b) it provides a narrative context rich enough to accommodate a variety of questions.

After the reading activity, students answered seven open-ended comprehension questions using five question words: *where, how, who, why, and what*. These five question words were chosen because they each describe a variation in the syntactic structure of a sentence. This allows for a wide variety of structural answers. Figure 1 is the reading text and its seven questions.

The Fruit of Carelessness

In the forest, there lives a family of mouse deer. They have very naughty children. Nano is the name of the baby mouse deer. Actually, Nano is a very intelligent and agile mouse deer, but Nano has bad habits. Nano likes to steal food. One day, Nano went to the farmer's cucumber garden and ate as much as he could. Suddenly Nano had a stomach ache.

The mother mouse deer was very confused. Nano wouldn't eat. He had a fever and was vomiting. The mother mouse deer looked for medicine. On the way, she met a tiger. The tiger gave her medicine for her stomach ache. The tiger also gave her a message: Nano shouldn't steal food anymore. The mother mouse deer thanked her and immediately went home.

Upon arriving home, the mouse deer's mother gave Nano medicine. Nano drank the medicine. His mother also advised Nano to stop stealing. Nano promised not to steal again. Finally, Nano recovered from his illness. The mouse deer's family was very happy. They immediately went to meet the tiger and thanked him. The tiger was very kind.

Questions:

1) Where does the mouse deer family live? 2) What is the nature of the mouse deer's child? 3) What is the name of the mouse deer's child? 4) Why is the mouse deer's mother so confused? 5) Why does Nano have a stomach ache? 6) What does the tiger say to Nano? 7) What do Nano's mother and Nano do after they recover?

Fig. 1. The Reading Text and its Seven Questions

Documentation techniques were used for data collection, collecting students' written answer sheets and then analyzing them. Each answer was then coded according to the associated question, resulting in five thematic categories of data (*one per question type*). This categorization served as the basis for subsequent syntactic analysis.

1. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "Where"

Table 1 is the interrogative "where" elicited three structural variations anchored in a single basic pattern S-P-Adv. Syntactically, "where" demands an adverbial of place, and accordingly every student response converged on the adverbial "in the forest" regardless of the variation in constituent ordering. This convergence confirms the proposition that interrogative words function as syntactic triggers, constraining the functional element required in the response (Mansur & Nisa, 2022; Supriyadi et al., 2023; Pradestania et al., 2022).

Table 1. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P-Adv Pattern for the Question "Where does the mouse deer family live?"

No.	Answer	Syntactic Function
1.	The mouse deer family lives in the forest	Subject + Predicate + Adverb
2.	In the forest	Adverb
3.	Mouse deer live in the forest	Subject + Predicate + Adverb
4.	In the forest lives a family of mouse deer	Adverb + Predicate + Subject
5.	Living in the forest	Predicate + Adverb

Two observations merit further attention. First, the presence of adverb-initial constructions (*In the forest lives a family of mouse deer*) indicates that students are capable of manipulating constituent order for rhetorical or stylistic effect, without violating grammatical acceptability. Second, the elliptical response "In the forest" demonstrates that students already recognise the pragmatic permissibility of subject omission when the referent is recoverable from context (Supriyadi, 2014). This dual capacity structural completeness on one hand, contextual economy on the other is consistent with Andayani & Jupriono's (2025) observation that each of the six basic Indonesian sentence patterns admits positional variations of its adverbial element across speech contexts.

2. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "How"

Table 2 is the question word "how" functions to inquire about a state, quality, or manner, thus highlighting the predicate as the expected response element (Chaer, 2014; Verhaar, 2010). There are four variations in the sentence structure of students' answers: a complete S-P construction (*answer 1*), a predicate-only ellipsis (*answers 2 and 3*), and P-O variant (*answer 4*), which omits the subject while expanding the predicate's argument.

Table 2. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P Pattern for the Question "How: what is the nature of the mouse deer's child?"

No.	Answer	Sentence Structure
1.	The nature of mouse deer is very naughty	Subject + Predicate
2.	Likes to steal	Predicate
3.	Naughty and likes to steal	Predicate
4.	Likes to steal Pak Tani's cucumbers	Predicate + Object

The prevalence of predicate-only answers is theoretically significant. As Pandean (2018) observed, Indonesian distinguishes between informative and confirmatory question words, with "how" falling into the first category and therefore requiring descriptive content rather than a polar response. Therefore, students' elliptical predicates do not represent a grammatical flaw but rather a communication, in which the subject can be recovered from the interrogative stimulus itself. Such ellipsis-based is considered a hallmark of syntactic competence development, where learners progressively master the S-P before progressing to more complex configurations such as S-P-Adv or S-P-O (Pancarrani & Mukhlis, 2025).

The P-O construction in answer 4 (*I like to steal Pak Tani's cucumbers*) expands the predicate's domain by including a direct object. Within the framework of basic sentence patterns, this response can be analyzed as a simplified form of the full S-P-O pattern. Even though it is not stated explicitly (Nurhadi, 2010).

3. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "Who"

The question "what is the name of the little boy?" yielded three variations of student answers with two basic sentence patterns. The two sentences were patterned; (1) subject + predicate, and (2) subject + predicate + complement. The question word "who" is specifically used to ask about human nouns or a person's identity. In syntactic studies, the question word "who" refers to God and humans, while the question word "what" refers to objects, animals, and plants (Pandean, 2018). Variations in answer sentences for the question word "who" can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P-Comp Pattern for the Question "What is the name of the baby mouse deer?"

<i>No.</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
1.	The name of the mouse deer is Nano	Subject + Predicate + Complement
2.	Nano is the name of the mouse deer's child	Subject + Predicate
3.	Nano	Subject

The question word "who" refers to a living object, usually a human, although in a literary context it can be extended to an anthropomorphic entity such as the mouse deer Nano (Pandean, 2018). There are three variations sentence structures: S-P-Comp (*answer 1*) and S-P (*answer 2*), with a single constituent ellipsis (*answer 3*) representing the simplest form.

Answer 1 uses the copula to connect the subject with the nominal complement "Nano," forming S-P-Comp construction where the complement functions as an identifier (Herpindo et al., 2022; Ramadhani et al., 2025). In contrast, answer 2 reverses the order of information and omits the copula, resulting in an S-P-Comp-Adv construction with "Nano" as the subject and the referential descriptor as the predicate. This omission of the copula is permissible in Indonesian when the subject is a simple noun phrase and the subject-predicate boundary remains resolvable (Afrianto et al., 2020; Suhandano, 2020). Pragmatically, nominal-predicate constructions function to identify or categorize the referent (Thompson & Ono, 2025). Answer 3 (*Nano*) constitutes maximal ellipsis, but is still adequate because the interrogative stimulus provides the remaining propositional content.

4. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "Why" (1)

The question word "why" is used to ask the reason or cause of an event. Formally, interrogative sentences are characterized by the presence of the question word. Pragmatically, sentences with the conjunction "because" express a cause-and-effect relationship in the real world, where the following clause states the reason for the event mentioned in the main clause (Syaripuddin & Rahman, 2019; Furey, 2021; Toba et al., 2019). The question word "why" to ask why Mrs. Kancil is confused produces compound sentences with the conjunction "because" as a link between the clause and the reason clause. Students' answers to the question "Why is Mrs. Kancil so confused?" were found in five variations, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Sentence Structure for the Question "Why is the mother mouse deer so confused?"

<i>No.</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
1.	Mother Kancil is confused because Nano has a stomach ache	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate
2.	The mother mouse deer was confused because Nano didn't want to eat but often stole food.	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Predicate + Object
3.	The mother mouse deer was confused because Nano didn't want to eat, his body was hot and he was vomiting.	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate
4.	Mother Kancil was very confused because Nano's body was hot and he was vomiting.	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate
5.	Because nano has bad habits	Subject + Predicate + Object

The interrogative "why" elicits the most complex response, generally a compound sentence with the causal conjunction "because". Pragmatically, this construction asserts a causal relationship between two propositions, where the subordinate clause provides a reason for the event stated in the main clause (Antari & Satyawati, 2017; Toba et al., 2019).

The variations in Table 4 show the development of subordinate clauses, from simple clauses to multi-clause embeddings with conjunctive predicates. This pattern aligns with the findings of Pancarrani et al. (2018) that upper elementary school students are able to produce a variety of basic sentence patterns and transformational constructions using nominal, verbal, adjectival, and pronominal lexicons. Sentence expansion through adverbial and causal clauses marks a milestone in syntactic development, namely the transition from simple propositional structures to complex argumentative constructions (Pancarrani & Mukhlas, 2025). This shows that the variation of causal clauses in elementary school students reflects a syntactic transition from simple patterns to complex argumentative constructions.

5. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "Why" (2)

The seven sentence structure in Table 5 demonstrate an even broader structural range, encompassing both full compound sentences (*answers 5–7*) and elliptical subordinate clauses (*answers 1–4*). Answers 5 and 6 in particular exhibit substantial complexity, integrating a main clause (*S-P*) with an expanded subordinate clause containing predicate, object, and adverb elements. Such multi-argument constructions are characteristic of advanced language development and are empirically associated with age-related increases in the use of coordinate and subordinate clauses among elementary-aged children (Buckalew et al., 2024).

Table 5. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P-O-Comp and S-P-O Patterns for the Question "Why does Nano have a stomach ache?"

<i>No.</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
1.	Because of eating as many cucumbers as possible	Predicate + Object + Adverb
2.	Because of eating cucumber	Predicate + Object
3.	Because stole the farmer's cucumber	Predicate + Object + Complement
4.	Stealing cucumbers then eating them	Predicate + Object + (Conjunction) Predicate
5.	Nano has a stomach ache because he ate too many cucumbers.	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate + Object + Adverb
6.	Nano has a stomach ache because he stole the farmer's cucumber and ate as much as he could.	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate + Object + (Conjunction) Predicate + Adverb
7.	Nano has a stomach ache because Nano likes to steal	Subject + Predicate + (Conjunction) Subject + Predicate

Nevertheless, answer 7 (*Nano has a stomach ache because Nano likes to steal*) illustrates a form of lexical redundancy, in which the subject Nano is repeated across both clauses despite coreferentiality. While such repetition is grammatically licit, it reduces stylistic efficiency, a phenomenon that Tikhonova et al. (2024) identifies as textual redundancy, wherein information duplication adds no propositional value and may impede communicative clarity, particularly in formal written contexts.

A second noteworthy pattern is the elevated cognitive demand imposed by "why". Interrogatives querying place, identity, or object (*where, who, what*) are typically mastered earlier than those querying cause or manner (*why, how*), because the latter necessitate more abstract reasoning and more complex clause embedding (Lemen et al., 2024). The structurally richer but occasionally redundant, responses to "why" in this dataset are therefore consistent with a developmental stage at which students are actively expanding their syntactic repertoire but have not yet fully consolidated pragmatic efficiency.

6. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "What" (1)

The four variations in Table 6 include one full construction (*answer 1*) and three elliptical negative imperatives (*answers 2–4*). The elliptical forms are marked by the particle "don't" or the modality "must not", both of which basic sentence patterns license subject omission in Indonesian imperative constructions (Mukram, 2024). Although these responses lack an overt subject, they remain syntactically complete within the imperative paradigm, because the understood addressee (*Nano*) is unambiguously recoverable from the interrogative stimulus.

Table 6. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P and S-P-O Patterns for the Question "What message did the tiger give to Nano?"

<i>No.</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
1.	Tiger told Nano not to steal	Subject + Predicate + Adverb + Complement
2.	Don't steal	Predicate
3.	Don't steal food	Predicate + Object
4.	No more stealing cucumbers	Predicate + Object + Adverb

Crucially, these elliptical answers should not be interpreted as indicators of impoverished syntactic competence. On the contrary, Han & Romero (2004) argue that such ellipses reflect the learner's capacity to isolate the core informational content of a question and respond with pragmatic precision, an ability that presupposes, rather than bypasses, syntactic understanding.

7. Sentence Structure with the Question Word "What" (2)

The final set of variations reveals two syntactically noteworthy constructions can be seen in Table 7. First, answers 2 and 3 exhibit a topicalisation structure in which a relative clause (*what mother and Nano did*) functions as the sentential subject, followed by the copula "is/was" and a nominalised predicate. This

construction serves an information-packaging function, foregrounding the subject referent as the topical element (Yohana & Mulyadi, 2025; Basaria & Dardanila, 2025). Such topicalisation strategies including left-dislocation of nominal phrases are widely attested in Austronesian languages, of which Indonesian is a member.

Table 7. Sentence Structure Based on the S-P-O Pattern for the Question "What did Mother and Nano do after they recovered?"

<i>No.</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
1.	They immediately met the tiger and said thank you	Subject + Predicate+ Object + (Conjunction) Predicate + Object
2.	What mother and Nano did was meet the tiger	Subject + Predicate + Complement
3.	What mother and Nano did was meet the tiger and say thank you	Subject + Predicate + Complement + (Conjunction) Predicate + Object
4.	Went to meet the tiger	Predicate + Object

Second, answer 4 (*went to meet the tiger*) represents another instance of subject ellipsis, in which the coreferential subject "mother and Nano" is recovered anaphorically from the preceding discourse. This form of discourse-driven ellipsis is a pervasive feature of Indonesian connected speech and writing, maintaining cohesion even in the absence of overtly realised arguments (Rahmanto, 2017; Sutrisno & Denistia, 2024). More broadly, as Liusti (2016) note, syntactic analysis operates through a layered decomposition of the sentence into its constituent clauses, phrases, and words a hierarchical logic that the present dataset consistently exemplifies.

Conclusion

This study examined the structural variations of sentences produced by fourth-grade elementary school learners in response to five Indonesian interrogative words (*where, how, who, why, and what*) derived from written answers to a narrative comprehension task. The findings consistently show that all observed variations can be systematically traced to the six basic sentence patterns of Indonesian, with each interrogative word eliciting distinctive structural realizations. Variations appeared in constituent ordering, such as adverb-initial and adverb-final positions, as well as in constituent realization, including full constructions, ellipses, and compound sentences. Ellipsis emerged as a recurring and pragmatically motivated feature across all interrogative types, while responses to "why" demonstrated the highest level of syntactic complexity through the use of causal conjunctions and multi-clausal embeddings. Theoretically, these findings support the view that syntactic competence develops gradually along a continuum of abstraction, in which interrogatives related to place, identity, and objects are acquired earlier than those requiring causal or descriptive reasoning. The results also indicate that student responses should not be evaluated solely based on constituent completeness, but also as evidence of developing pragmatic and structural flexibility, as learners actively negotiate syntactic forms to fulfill communicative purposes. Practically, this study provides a diagnostic resource for elementary-level language educators, as the identified sentence structure typology can be used to assess students' syntactic mastery and design instructional scaffolds that encourage more complete and varied sentence production. In particular, teachers may benefit from targeted interventions focusing on interrogatives with higher cognitive demands, such as "why" and "how." Overall, the sentence structure variations produced by fourth-grade students reflect a gradual development from simple to more complex syntactic constructions, contributing both to theoretical understandings of children's language development and to practical approaches in Indonesian language instruction.

Declarations

- Author contribution** : Siti Ainim Liusti was responsible for the entire research project. She also led the writing of the manuscript and collaborated with the other authors. Zulfikarni participated in the data analysis and writing of the manuscript. Ishak Bagea participated in the data collection. Ridha Hasnul Ulya participated in revising the manuscript. The four authors approved the final manuscript.
- Funding statement** : This research did not receive any funding.
- Conflict of interest** : The four authors declare that they have no competing interests.
- Ethics Approval** : Information on Ethics Approval and informed consent statements are required for all articles published in BAHASTRA since 2026.
- Additional information** : No additional information is available for this paper.

References

- Afrianto, Sujatna, E. T. S., Darmayanti, N., Ariyani, F., & Cooke-Plagwitz, J. (2020). Clause and predicative constituents in an Austronesian language: Lampung language. *Topics in Linguistics*, 21(2), 62–79. <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2020-0010>
- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Moeliono, A. M., & Lapoliwa, H. (2017). *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia* (Edisi Keempat). Balai Pustaka.
- Al-Obaydi, L. H., Schams, M., & Köseoğlu, P. (2025). Balancing syntactic complexity and clarity: The role of AI in enhancing academic writing proficiency. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 5(4), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-10-2024-0062>
- Andayani, A., & Jupriyono, D. (2025). Fungsi dan kategori sintaksis kalimat dasar bahasa. *Jurnal Kajian Budaya, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 4(4), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.69957/tanda.v4i04.1847>
- Antari, W. Y., & Satyawati, M. S. (2017). Analisis penggunaan kalimat bahasa Indonesia pada karangan siswa kelas V Sekolah Dasar Negeri 10 Sanur, Denpasar. *Jurnal Humanus*, 21(1), 46–51.
- Bahari, A. (2025). Balancing syntactic complexity and clarity: The role of AI in enhancing academic writing proficiency. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 5(4), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-10-2024-0062>
- Basaria, I., & Dardanila, D. (2025). Clause structure and topicalization in Nias language: A typological analysis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 15(12), 3974–3983. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tppls.1512.17>
- Buckalew, G., Ramirez, A. G., & Schneider, J. M. (2024). Maternal question use relates to syntactic skills in 5- to 7-year-old children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 67(12), 4734–4747. https://doi.org/10.1044/2024_JSLHR-23-00426
- Biondo, N., Ivanova, M. V., Pracar, A. L., Baldo, J., & Dronkers, N. F. (2024). Mapping sentence comprehension and syntactic complexity: Evidence from 131 stroke survivors. *Brain Communications*, 6(6), fcae379. <https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcae379>
- Chaer, A. (2014). *Linguistik umum*. Rineka Cipta.
- Furey, J., Bourget, J. L., & Reno, E. A. (2021). *Explicit instruction in sentence combining for struggling writers: A practice guide*. US Departement Of Education, Office of Special Education.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2(163–194), 105.
- Han, C. H., & Romero, M. (2004). The syntax of whether/Q... or questions: Ellipsis combined with movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 22(3), 527–564. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:NALA.0000027674.87552.71>
- Herpindo, A. W., Wijayanti, I. S., Shalima, I., & Ngestrini, R. (2022). Kategori, fungsi, dan peran sintaksis bahasa Indonesia dengan PoS Tangging berbasis rule dan probability. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 8(1), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v8i1.18602>
- Karomani, K. (2009). Ulama, jawara, dan umaro: Studi tentang elite lokal di Banten. *Sosiohumaniora*, 11(2), 168. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v11i2.5417>
- Lemen, H. C. P., Lieven, E. V. M., & Theakston, A. L. (2024). The influence of pragmatic function on children's comprehension of complex because-and if-sentences. *Frontiers in Language Sciences*, 3, 1420237. <https://doi.org/10.3389/flang.2024.1420237>
- Liusti, S. A. (2016). Analisis kalimat berdasarkan pola kalimat dasar dan kalkulus predikat. *Adabiyat: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 15(2), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajbs.2016.15203>
- Liusti, S. A., & Ratna, E. (2020). Variations of sentence structure in 5th grade students' essays in Padang: Perspective of basic sentence patterns. *1st Progress in Social Science, Humanities, and Education Research Symposium (PSSHRS 2019)*, 126–128. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200824.031>
- _____. (2021). Sentence structure in the essays of grade IV students in elementary schools in Padang. *4th International Conference on Language, Literature, and Education (ICLLE-4 2021)*, 257–260. Atlantis Press.
- Liusti, S. A., Anggraini, D., Henanggil, M. D. F., & Ulya, R. H. (2024). Minangkabau women's resistance: A critical discourse analysis of Sara Mills. *Pascasarjana ISBI Bandung Conference Series*.
- Malik, A., Afnita, A., Ulya, R. H., & Triana, H. (2026). Analisis struktur dan kebahasaan teks laporan hasil observasi siswa kelas X MAN 4 Tanah Datar. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 14(1), 409–411. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jmp.v14i1.74>
- Mansur, A., & Nisa, L. A. (2022). Analisis sintaksis kalimat deklaratif dan kalimat interogatif dalam film Incredible Love tahun 2021. *Jurnal Peneroka: Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 48–66 <https://doi.org/10.30739/peneroka.v2i1.1365>

- Marjokorpi, J., & van Rijt, J. (2025). Grammatical understanding predicts reading comprehension in secondary-level students: Insights from a Finnish national survey. *Language and education*, 39(4), 924-943. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2376280>
- Markhamah, & Sabardila, A. (2014). *Analisis kesalahan karakteristik bentuk pasif*. Jagad Abjad.
- Mukram, P. T. (2024). Ragam kalimat interogatif pada antologi cerpen "Alona Ingin Menjadi Serangga" karya Mashdar Zainal berdasarkan frasa pengisi setiap fungsi sintaksis. *Prosodi*, 18(2), 236-251. <https://doi.org/10.21107/prosodi.v18i2.23634>
- Munirah, M., & Hardian, H. (2016). Pengaruh kemampuan kosakata dan struktur kalimat terhadap kemampuan menulis paragraf siswa SMA. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 16(1), 78-87. https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jbps.v16i1.3064
- Naini, I., & Ulya, R. H. (2025). Reasoning patterns and sentence construction errors in students' scholarly articles: A content analysis of academic writing in Padang City. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(2), 2786-2796. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7447>
- Noveria, E., Ulya, R. H., & Sukma, R. (2026). Integrating project-based learning with authentic news video production: A qualitative case study on news text literacy development in Indonesia's Merdeka Curriculum. *BAHASTRA*, 46(1), 81-91.
- Nurhadi. (2010). *Membaca cepat dan efektif: Teori dan latihan*. Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Pancarrani, B., Ghazali, A. S., Nurchasanah. (2018). Kompleksitas kalimat bahasa Indonesia siswa kelas IV—VI sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 3(9), 1216-1227. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/483962>
- Pancarrani, B., & Mukhlas, M. (2025). Kompleksitas struktur kalimat bahasa Indonesia siswa sekolah dasar inklusi. *Ghancaran: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(2), 266-277. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.v6i2.13973>
- Pandean, M. L. M. (2018). Kalimat tanya dalam bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Linguistik*, 5(3), 75-88. <https://doi.org/10.35796/kaling.5.3.2018.25030>
- Pradestania, K. A., Umami, S. A., & Sumarlam. (2022). Analisis sintaksis: Fungsi, kategori, dan peran pada karangan siswa kelas V SD dan XI SMA. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS)*, 4.
- Putrayasa, I. B., & Ramendra, D. P. (2021). Syntactic study based on character education values essays of fourth grade elementary school student in Bali Province. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 7(5), 396-404. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/411519>
- Putrayasa. (2019). *Tata kalimat bahasa Indonesia sekolah dasar*. Refika Aditama.
- Ramadhani, N. F., Hamzah, R. A., & Arief, R. (2025). Struktur kebahasaan bahasa Indonesia sebagai rujukan penggunaan bahasa (Sintaksis). *Kande*, 6(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.29103/jk.v6i1.21412>
- Rahmanto, S. N. (2017). Pelepasan fungsi sintaksis dalam kalimat majemuk bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1-6.
- Ramlan, M. (2005). *Ilmu bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis*. CV Karyono.
- Suhandano. (2020). Clause and predicative constituents in an Austronesian language: Lampung language. *Topics in Linguistics*, 21(2), 62-79. <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2020-0010>
- Supriyadi. (2014). *Sintaksis bahasa Indonesia*. Universitas Negeri Gorontalo Press.
- Supriyadi, Mayasari, D., & Djumadil, S. M. S. (2023). Fungsi, peran, dan kategori sintaksis bahasa Indonesia dalam kalimat. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar dan Sosial Humaniora*, 2(7), 725-740.
- Sutrisno, A., & Denistia, K. (2024). The use of English relative clauses by Indonesia authors: A case study in business, engineering, and science journal articles. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 24(2), 510-522. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v24i2.9097>
- Syaripuddin, R., & Rahman, F. (2019). The comparative study of Indonesian students writing ability on Indonesian language and English language. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 26(6.2), 1-20.
- Tikhonova, E., Mezentseva, D., & Kasatkin, P. (2024). Text redundancy in academic writing: A systematic scoping review. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(3), 128-160. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2024.23747>
- Thompson, S. A., & Ono, T. (2025). What do speakers do with predicate nominal construction? *Discourse & society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456251362412>
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Ulya, R. H. (2024). Transformasi makrolinguistik bahasa Indonesia dalam gamitan media digital: Analisis wacana kritis pada platform media sosial. *Jurnal Ilmiah Langue and Parole*, 8(1), 91-99. <https://doi.org/10.36057/jilp.v8i1.717>
- Verhaar, J. W. M. (2010). *Asas-asas linguistik umum*. Gajah Mada University Press.

- Wu, X., Mauranen, A., & Lei, L. (2019). Syntactic complexity in English as a lingua franca academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 42, 100798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100798>
- Yohana, F. R., & Mulyadi, M. (2025). clause struktur and topicalization in Nias language: A typological analysis. *Theory and Prakte in Language Studies*, 15(12), 3974-3983. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1512.17>