

Indonesian Interrogative Sentences: a Study of Forms and Functions

Lindawati

Universitas Andalas

Email: lindawatisaun@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines Indonesian interrogative sentence problems by focusing on issues of forms and functions. The data used in this analysis are interrogative sentences in Indonesian language that are currently used in oral and in interethnic communication. This study used a pragmatic approach. Listening while observing (*metode simak*) is used at the stage of data collection. In the analysis phase, a structural analysis is used for the discussion of issues related to the form, and a contextual analysis method is used for the discussion of issues related to the function of interrogative sentence. The report was presented verbally. From the research, it can be formulated that interrogative sentences forming elements are either supra-segmental elements or segmental elements. Supra-segmental elements are intonation, and segmental elements are words, phrases, and particles. The elements were added to a clause to be the base of an interrogative sentence. Based on the response form provided by what the opponents said, interrogative sentences are grouped on the yes-no and information interrogative sentences. Yes-no interrogative sentences require an answer that contains a justification or denial of what is stated on the clause that is the basis for the formation of interrogative sentences. Information interrogative sentences require an answer in the form of explanation. In communications, interrogative sentences are uttered not only to ask something, but they are also used to express a variety of speech act. Speech act that can be expressed by the interrogative sentences of Indonesian language are representative, directive, commissive, and expressive. Interrogative sentences are sometimes used in order to speak indirectly (indirect speech) to maintain politeness or otherwise stated expressive rudely.

Keywords: *context, form, functions, interrogative, variation*

INTRODUCTION

Human beings are restless creatures who always ask about anything. We ask many things, not only about ourselves, but also about the environment surrounding us. That anxiety has led us to a progress in various fields of science. Daily communication generally takes place in the form of dialogs, and the interrogative and declarative sentences are the dominant forms of sentences in the dialogs. In terms of this, interrogative sentences hold a very important function in the language and communication system.

The term of the interrogative-sentence results from sentence categorization based on meaning. Based on the meaning, sentences can be classified into declarative, command, question, exclamation, and emphatic ones (Moeliono et al., 1988:284). The main function of interrogative sentence is to ask about someone or something. If people want to know the answer to a problem or situation, then they ask and use interrogative sentences (Moeliono et al., 1988:288).

There is a variety of forms in Indonesian, including the question form. There are some forms

of question that can be used to ask about one thing. Taking into account extra-linguistic aspects, a competent user of Indonesian will be able to choose one of the appropriate alternatives of forms available.

In Indonesian, the interrogative-sentence issue has received a great deal of attention from researchers. The study of the interrogative sentences is sometimes cursory or lacking depth. This is due to the fact that a discussion of interrogative sentences becomes part of a broader range of other topics. Those who addressed the issue of Indonesian interrogative sentence include Slametmuljana (1957), Fokker (1979), Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana (1983), Ramlan (1983), Sudaryanto (1983), Halim (1984), Samsuri (1985), Kridalaksana (1985, 1994), Moeliono et al (1988), Lapoliwa (1990), Sudaryono, (1992), Djajasudarma (1999), Wijana (1981) in the form of Bachelor Degree paper, and Tarmini (2008) in the form of dissertation.

There is a variety of forms and communicative functions of interrogative sentences in Indonesian. So far, the classification of interrogative sentences is usually based on the form and content of the answers (Lindawati, 2013:10). If interrogative sentences are solely classified based on the answers, we are not able yet to understand the function of the interrogative sentences asked by the speakers. Presumably, interrogative sentences should also be reviewed and categorized based on their functions. Explanation of the interrogative sentences should be based on the nature of the interrogative sentences themselves, when and for what each of the various forms of the interrogative sentence is spoken. Interrogative sentences should be classified based on the form, meaning, and function.

In pragmatics, the study of languages needs to talk about how sentences are used (Wijana, 1996:2). Study of interrogative sentences in Indonesian requires the researcher to explore how sentences are constructed and how they are used by speakers of Indonesian in actual communication. Hence, this study aims to describe and explain what the speakers mean, why someone asks, and what he wants to know using the interrogative sentences. Applying pragmatic approach, it is expected that the study of Indonesian interrogative sentences will become more comprehensive. In humanities,

the study of language must be intended to explore the speakers who use the language. Hence, the object of the language study in humanities is the language speakers themselves. A study of language is actually a study of the relationship between language, thought processes, and appropriate behaviours. Language is a unified form underlying humanity and humanness (Djawanai, 2009:4). It is in this framework that a study of interrogative sentences still needs to be conducted in order to obtain an in-depth understanding of the use of interrogative sentences in Indonesian by Indonesian people.

The result is a complete description of how the formation and the use of the interrogative sentences in Indonesian are. Theoretically, it is expected that the result will provide the theory of Indonesian pragmatics, particularly the theory of function of Indonesian interrogative sentences. Practically, the results of this study may be used as a comparison by the researchers for the subsequent research projects and as a consideration for preparing teaching materials for the subject of Indonesian in the educational field.

It is expected that knowledge about the diversity of the forms and functions of Indonesian interrogative sentences make us aware that Indonesian is not a monolithic system, but rather a social phenomenon that intrinsically contains variations to reflect on the diversity of human nature and the speakers of Indonesian. The research result is also expected to be used as consideration in the process of formulating and preparing Indonesian teaching materials regarding sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects in order to build and maintain the nation harmony and integration within the framework of the unity of the Republic of Indonesia.

Typically in carrying out language research, there are three kinds of interrelated and sequential research methods, in which each method is a strategic step of handling the problem to make the study complete. These methods include methods for data collection, methods for data analysis, and methods for presenting the results of data analysis (Sudaryanto 1988:57). Listening while observing (*metode simak*) is used at the stage of data collection. The data are interrogative sentences and answers. In the analysis phase, a structural

analysis is used for the discussion of issues related to the form, and a contextual analysis method is used for the discussion of issues related to the function of interrogative sentence (Djajasudarma, 1993:57–59). The report was presented verbally.

The term of interrogative sentences arises as a result of sentence categorization based on the kind of responses given by hearer shortly after a sentence is uttered. Based on the kind of responses given by hearer, sentences are classified into declarative, interrogative and imperative (Lindawati, 2013:49). Interrogative sentences are basically uttered in the hopes that the hearer will respond with an answer (Lindawati, 2013:49). When someone utters an interrogative sentence, simultaneously he also delivers a speech act. Speech acts expressed in Indonesian interrogative sentences can vary. Speech acts in pragmatics are the issues which have received greater interests by linguists nowadays. The study of speech acts focuses on the meanings of utterance. This theory views semantic in a broader context of communication and forms speech acts rather than words or clauses as the basic unit of human communication. Speech acts theory was popularized by Searle (1976:23). Searle's theory is based on the view that language activities are activities of doing something. Searle argues that when people utter a sentence, they are acting three kinds of speech acts, namely (1) locutionary act, (2) illocutionary act, and (3) perlocutionary act. He classified illocutionary act into five groups, namely Representatives or Assertives, Directives, Commissive, Expressives and Declaration. The description of the purpose of the five kinds of illocutionary acts is as follows:

1. Representative acts – acts that represent something, for example the statement, description, affirmation, etc.
2. Directive acts – acts that have the intent to get someone do something things, for example: command, request, instruction, etc.
3. Commissive acts – acts that make the speakers perform actions to happen in the future, for example: promise, offer, threat, etc.
4. Expressive acts – acts that reveal the attitudes of the speakers about something,

for example: apology, expression of gratitude, an expression for welcoming someone, etc.

5. Declarative acts – acts which lead to a deal with things that are being mentioned, for example: state of war, marriage ceremony, dismissal, etc.

Wijana (1981) in his thesis entitled 'Kalimat Tanya dalam Bahasa Indonesia', discusses characteristics, process of formation and classification of interrogative sentences. The classification of interrogative sentences is not only based on the answer of the question but also on the attitude of the speaker in asking question. Interrogative sentence is considered not separated from its answer; they are in unity. Every element of the sentence can be object of question. However, in communication, not all of the elements are usually asked.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In interrogative sentences, there are three elements that must exist which will determine the form and function of interrogative sentences, which in turn will determine the form of the appropriate response given by the hearer. The three elements are: what is stated, what is asked, and the elements for forming the interrogative sentence. The following examples (1) of Indonesian interrogative sentences derived from a clause of *X is sick* are demonstrated to explain the three elements. This proposition derives several interrogative sentences as shown below.

(1) *Tanya*. a. *Siapa yang sakit?*

'Who is sick?'

b. *Apakah Anda sakit?*

'Are you sick?/Do you feel ill?' Do you feel sick?

c. *Apakah Anda tidak sakit?*

'Are you not sick?'

It is stated What is stated:

(1) a. someone is sick

b. you are sick

c. you are not sick

It asks What is asked:

(1) a. the identity or the name of the person who is sick

b. whether the second person is sick or not

c. whether the second person is sick or not

Elements forming interrogative sentences:

- (1) a. question words and intonation
- b. intonation
- c. question words and intonation

Elements that form Indonesian interrogative sentences can be either supra-segmental elements or segmental elements. Supra-segmental elements are intonation, and segmental elements are words, phrases, and particles. Element forming an interrogative sentence may be only intonation, or the combination of intonation and question word or particle.

Based on what is stated, what is asked and how they are formed, Indonesian interrogative sentences can be classified into six groups, namely:

- (2) *Tn.* a. *Siapa yang sakit?*
 ‘Who is sick?’
- b. *Yang sakit siapa?*
 ‘Who is sick?’
- c. *Anda sakit apa?*
 ‘What illness do you suffer from?’
- (3) *Tn.* a. *Anda sakit atau tidak?*
 ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?
- b. *Anda sakit perut atau kepala?*
 ‘You get a stomachache or headache?’
 Do you get a stomachache or a headache?
- c. *Anda sakit perut atau kepala, atau yang lain?*
 ‘You get stomachache, headache, or something else?’ Do you get a stomachache, a headache or other illness?
- (4) *Tn.* a. *Sakit?*
 ‘Sick?’
- b. *Anda sakit?*
 ‘You are sick?’ Are you sick?
- c. *Apa Anda sakit?*
 ‘Are you sick?’
- d. *Apakah Anda sakit?*
 ‘Are you sick?’
- e. *Sakitkah Anda?*
 ‘Are you sick?’
- f. *Andakah yang sakit?*
 ‘Is it you that are sick?’ Is it you who are sick?

- (5) *Tn.* a. *Anda sakit ya?*
 ‘You are sick, are you?’
 You are sick, aren’t you?
- b. *Anda sakit kan?*
 ‘You are sick, right?’ or
 You are sick, aren’t you?
- c. *Anda sakit to?*
 ‘You are sick’ You are sick, aren’t you?
- d. *Anda sakit bukan?*
 ‘You are sick, aren’t you?’
- e. *Anda sakit nggak?*
 ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?
- f. *Anda sakit tidak?*
 ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?
- g. *Anda sakit atau tidak?*
 ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?
- i. *Bukankah Anda sakit?*
 ‘Aren’t you sick?’
- j. *Bukannya Anda sakit?*
 ‘Aren’t you sick?’
- k. *Katanya Anda sakit?*
 ‘Someone says you are sick?’ Someone says that you are sick. Are you?
- (6) *Tn.* a. *Siapa yang mau sakit?*
 ‘Who wants to get sick?’
 Who wants to be sick?
- b. *Siapa yang tidak mau sehat?*
 ‘Who does not want to be healthy?’
- (7) *Tn.* a. *Siapa yang tidak sakit?*
 ‘Who is not sick?’
- b. *Apakah Anda tidak sakit?*
 ‘Are you not sick?’
- c. *Anda tidak sakit kan?*
 ‘You are not sick, are you?’
- d. *Anda tidak sakit ya?*
 ‘You are not sick huh?’ or
 You are not sick, are you?
- e. *Anda tidak sakit to?*
 ‘You are not sick, are you?’
- f. *Bukankah Anda tidak sakit?*
 ‘Aren’t you not sick?’
- g. **Bukannya Anda tidak sakit?*
 *‘Aren’t you not sick?’
- h. *Katanya Anda tidak sakit*

‘Someone says you are not sick?’
Someone says that you are not sick.
Aren’t you?

The Indonesian interrogative sentences can be divided broadly into six groups. The first five groups of the questions are interrogative sentence information, choice, yes-no, tag question, and rhetorical. The last group (sixth) is different from the other groups because it contains an element of negation. Therefore, interrogative sentences containing elements of negation is called negative interrogative sentences (Lindawati, 2013:100). The six groups of the above questions (2–7) differ in terms of what is stated, what is asked, and the manner of its formation. From the same proposition there may be interrogative sentence that can be derived.

The six types of interrogative sentences are derived from the same basic idea or from the same proposition that there is someone who is sick. The diversity of the question forms suggests the different levels of knowledge of the speaker about what is asked. In the first type of the interrogative sentence (2), the speaker has the basic knowledge that there is someone who is sick, but he does not know who is actually sick. To find out who is sick, he asks a question with an information interrogative sentence. The second type of question shown in example (3) is used to inquire the type of illness someone suffers from or what part of his body that gets a health problem. The speaker provides an alternative which should be selected by the hearer.

The third type of question shown in example (4) seems to be based on the assumption that the speaker has knowledge about X’s illness. The knowledge could be gained by hearing the news from someone else. To ascertain whether what he knows is right or wrong, then he asks him by using a yes-no interrogative sentence. If it is asked directly to X, then the questioner will get an answer in the form of certainty in the form of answers that affirm or deny what he knows. However, if it is asked to another person (not X), then the possible answers that can be obtained are three kinds, namely an affirmative answer, a rejection and a dubious reply. The dubious answer arises because

the person being questioned does not know for sure what is being asked.

The fourth type of question shown in example (5) seems to be based on the assumption that the speaker knows that X is sick and he confidently believes that what he knows is true. He asks the questions to confirm the truth about what he knows. The speaker basically expects that the person being asked will justify what he states (what he believes is the same as what he states). Unlike the four previous groups of interrogative sentences, the interrogative sentence of the fifth group demonstrated in example (6) is commonly called the rhetorical interrogative sentence which is uttered to convince the hearer that what is stated in the question is true. If we refer to question (6a), what is actually stated by the speaker is that nobody wants to be sick.

The sixth group of questions shown in examples (7) is different from the other groups because there is an element of negation. The presence of this negation causes what is stated in the negative interrogative sentence different from what is stated in the positive interrogative sentence. In the positive interrogative sentence, what is stated is in the form of affirmative clause, while in the negative interrogative sentence, what is stated is expressed in the form of negative clauses.

An interrogative sentence is a sentence asked by the speaker in the hope that the hearer gives a response to what is asked (Moeliono, et al 1988:288). In connection with their functions to ask something, based on the response form provided by the hearers, interrogative sentences are grouped into the information and yes-no interrogative sentences. Yes-no interrogative sentences require an answer that contains a justification or a denial of what is stated in the clause as the basis for the formation of interrogative sentences. Yes-no interrogative sentences are formed by giving only a certain tone or intonation or by giving a certain tone or intonation plus a word or phrases, and/or by giving particles in the clause. Information interrogative sentences require an answer in the form of explanation. Information interrogative sentences are usually formed by adding certain words and intonation question in clause. The question word replaces one of the constructing

elements of the basic clause or replaces the elements that the speaker wants to know. In Indonesian there are some basic question words, namely *apa* (what), *siapa* (who, whom), *kapan* (when), *dimana* (where), *berapa* (how much, how many), and *bagaimana* (how).

In addition to inquiring about something, an interrogative sentence also serves to express various things. Previous research demonstrate that Indonesian interrogative sentences can go into various classes or types of speech acts. An interrogative sentence can sometimes express more than one kind of function. For example, a sentence may not only function to disallow someone to do something, but may also function to order someone to do something, which ultimately shows that the speaker intends to express a disappointment to what is done by the hearer. The variety of the speech functions of interrogative sentences demonstrate that languages do not only hold informative functions, but also expressive functions, as can be observed in the following examples:

- (8) Jam berapa ini?
'What time is it?'

Interrogative sentence (8) serves to ask the hearer what the time is when the speakers are not looking at the clock or watch. But if the question is asked by someone who is holding or looking at the clock, then the interrogative sentence is uttered for other functions. When an interrogative sentence is spoken in different contexts, it will have different functions. The interrogative sentence in example (8) at least can have five speech functions, namely, to express a warning, to ask someone to leave, to ask someone to hurry up, to ask the reason for the delay, and to express anger at someone because she comes very late.

The interrogative sentences that ask the hearer what the time is, normally spoken by a mother to her son to ask him to get up, or to remind him that it is time for him to do something else. If the interrogative sentence is spoken by a husband to his wife who is still making up, it is spoken to ask his wife to hurry up. If the interrogative sentence is spoken by a parent in his house to his daughter's boyfriend, the interrogative sentence is to ask the boy to leave soon. If the interrogative sentence is spoken by a professor or a teacher to a student

who comes late to the class, then the speech is usually responded by the student by giving the reason of why he/she comes late. In other context, when the same sentence is spoken by a mother to her son who comes home very late at night, the question functions as an expression of anger. There are so many and varied contents of interrogative sentences and their speech functions in Indonesian. Interrogative sentences are basically used to ask something. In addition, the interrogative sentences are also used to express a variety of speech acts such as acts of representative, directive, commissive, and expressive.

A. Representative Acts

Representative speech act is the act of representing something, for example the statement, description, affirmation, etc. Interrogative sentences which are spoken to represent something can simultaneously serve phatic functions such as to greet someone, to express sympathy or concern, to curse, to suspect, to accuse, and to deny. The following examples of Indonesian interrogative sentences illustrate the category of representative speech act.

- (9) a. Berangkat Buk?
'Go to..., Madame?' Are you leaving, Madam?
b. Sakit ya?
'Sick, huh?' You are sick, aren't you?
c. Sakit kan?
'Sick, is not it?' You are sick, aren't you?

The utterance of question (9a) is not really spoken to inquire about something, but is used only to express friendliness by greeting someone. With such a function that appears to be a response stating yes-no answer. With such a function, the response may be yes-no answer. The most frequent response is in the form of yes answer, since what is asked is related to the habitual action that can be seen from the clothes the hearer is wearing, or from some other features. Interrogative sentence (9b) is spoken to express the speaker's sympathy of other people's condition. This question is spoken to express the speaker's concern when he or she notices that other people, especially children or lovable persons, experience something unpleasant. The type of particle that appears at the

end of interrogative sentence leads to changes in the function of speech. It can be seen in example (9c) which ends with the *kan* particle. Question (9c) states anger. The sentence like this is usually addressed to a child who does not listen to the warning spoken by his parent which finally makes him get injured.

B. Directive Acts

Directive acts are acts that have an intention to get someone to do something, for example: invitation, command, request, instruction, etc. Indonesian interrogative sentences expressing directives acts are intended to offer, to recommend, to remind, etc. The examples of interrogative sentences which demonstrate directive acts are illustrated below:

- (10) a. Mau masuk?
 ‘Want to go in?’ Do you want to go in?
 b. Kenapa kue nya tidak dimakan?
 ‘Why is the cake not eaten?’
 c. Sudahkah Anda membayar pajak?
 ‘Have you paid the taxes?’

Offering means showing something to someone in order to make the thing shown is purchased, contracted, taken, or used. The interrogative sentence (10a) is spoken to invite the hearers to enter a room or a place. Similarly, the interrogative sentence (10b) also serves to express an offer. The word *inviting* means asking the hearer to do something that does not cause any harm to the speakers, while *offering* suggests meanings that can cause harm to the speakers. The interrogative sentence (10b) is usually spoken when the cake has been served but it has not been eaten. It is asked by the speaker to repeat the offer. It is part of the cultural norms that the guests do not eat the cake right after it is being served and being offered to them. To ensure that what has been served is allowed to be eaten by the guests, then the speaker repeats the invitation by uttering the interrogative sentence as in example (10b).

Some interrogative sentences are used to remind the hearer of a duty or an obligation. One of the meanings of the word “to remind” is to give someone advice or to warn to make him remember to do something as her/his obligations. The interrogative sentence (10c) is an example

of an interrogative sentence with the intention of reminding someone to carry out obligations. Interrogative sentences as in group (10c) above are usually found in public places as a reminder. The writers or speakers of the reminder who may represent a particular group of people or institutions are anonymous. The groups of persons or institutions have to remind the readers to do something because there is an obligation for the readers to perform or act as stated in the interrogative sentence.

C. Commissive Acts

Commissive acts are acts that make the speakers perform actions in the future, for example: promise, offer, threat, etc. Commissive acts which can be expressed in interrogative sentences include: to invite, to offer a help, and to challenge. The following examples of interrogative sentences demonstrate each of the sub-functions of the speech acts.

- (11) a. Bagaimana kalau kita menonton *ketoprak* nanti malam?
 ‘How about if we watch *ketoprak* tonight?’
 ‘What/How about watching *ketoprak* tonight?’
 b. Ada yang bisa saya bantu?
 ‘What can I do for you?’
 c. Sepeda ini masih bisa dipakai nggak?
 ‘This bike can still be used or not?’ Can this bike still be used or not?’
 d. Kalau saya tidak mau bayar kamu mau apa?
 ‘If I do not want to pay, what will you do?’

Inviting is asking, offering and allowing someone to be involved or to participate in the activity done by the speaker. The interrogative sentence (11a) can belong to the group of commissive speech act because the speaker invites the listener to perform activities together with the speaker. The interrogative sentence (11b) states an offer. It is usually uttered by someone to offer an assistance to someone else. The interrogative sentence (11c) is spoken to find out about the condition of something, the feeling or the state of mind of someone. The function of the interrogative sentence in (11c) is to find out whether the hearer allows the speaker to do something stated in the

interrogative sentence, in this case, using the bike belonging to the hearer. An interrogative sentence that serves to express the challenge is an interrogative sentence spoken to declare a challenge to the hearer, which may be fighting, playing, competing or facing problems. The interrogative sentence as shown in (11d) actually contains a statement that the speaker does not want to pay for something although it is what he should do.

D. Expressive Acts

Expressive acts are acts which express the speaker's attitude towards something, for example: an expression of apology, an expression of gratitude, an expression to greet someone, etc. Indonesian interrogative sentences can be used to express the attitude of speakers reflected in a variety of their psychological conditions such as surprise (shock), doubts, worries, disappointment, regret, resentment, complaint, and anger. Basically, all these words are within the same domain of vocabulary that states a person's negative attitude about something. The meanings of the words are interconnected and grade by quantity and quality. The following examples demonstrate the emotive function of Indonesian interrogative sentences.

- (12) a. Siapa sangka dia yang membunuh istrinya?
'Who would have thought that he killed his wife?'
- b. Begitu ya? atau Begitu kah?
'Is it so? or Is it so, right?'
- c. Banyak nyamuk ya?
'Many mosquitoes, are they?' There are many mosquitoes, aren't there?
- d. Kok kalian sampai hati membiarkan dia pulang sendiri?
'How come you guys have the heart to let her go home alone?'

The interrogative sentence (12a) is usually told to express extreme surprise. The word *heran* (*surprise, astonished*) means feeling odd when seeing or hearing something. Utterance of question (12a) expresses some surprised acts committed by a person. The speaker believes that someone, in this case a third person, is not likely to kill his wife because in his view he is a good person and the relationship with his wife is fine. The

word *menyangsikan* (to doubt) means wavering, hesitant. The interrogative sentence illustrated in (12b) is spoken to express a doubt about the correctness of description, the truth of the message passed by someone. Almost similar to the word *menyangsikan*, in Indonesian there is the word *khawatir* that means afraid of something happen, worried, anxious, about a thing that is not known with certainty. The interrogative sentence (12c) is spoken by the speaker to express his concerns over the unpleasant circumstances or events experienced by the hearer. It is spoken when he sees that the hearer feels uncomfortable due to being bitten by mosquitoes. Simultaneously, the interrogative sentence is used to express the speaker's sympathy for the inconvenience experienced by the hearer. One of the words expressing a person's mood is the use of the word *kecewa* (disappointed). Being disappointed is being unpleasant, or being unsatisfied due to the wish or hope not fulfilled. Utterance (12d) is an example of interrogative sentences which expresses a mood or feeling of disappointment. This interrogative sentence is spoken to express the speaker's regret or disappointment of the actions or attitudes of the hearer or the third party. According to the speaker, it is not appropriate that the hearer does something or behaves as stated in the interrogative sentence.

CONCLUSION

Basically interrogative sentences are uttered with the hope that the hearers will give a response in the form of verbal utterances. In communication, interrogative sentences are not only spoken to ask something, but they are also used to express a variety of things. In the functional view which typically uses a pragmatic approach, it is believed that when someone utters a sentence, she/he simultaneously does an act. Speech acts which can be expressed using Indonesian interrogative sentences are representative, directive, commissive, and expressive speech acts. Some interrogative sentences can sometimes be incorporated into more than one kind of speech acts. At the same time an interrogative sentence can belong to the classes of representative and expressive speech acts (to refuse and to protest). Interrogative sentences that serve to express offers (directive) can simultaneously (inherently) also state the hospitality to show

good manners or courtesy which belong to the expressive class in Searle's theory of speech acts. Interrogative sentences spoken in order to speak indirectly (indirect speech) are useful for maintaining politeness (reducing violence), and sometimes on the contrary, they are used for stating something assertively, rudely and even impolitely. Sentences function to express a wide range of illocutionary acts essentially have the same form as the interrogative sentences which are actually used to ask. With the addition of certain particles or being uttered with a particular intonation and stress, the information interrogative sentence or yes-no questions can become rhetorical sentences, and in terms of this, they have double functions which are communicative and expressive functions.

Interrogative sentences which are spoken not to ask but tend to state an action are generally found in oral communication and in informal situations. The use of interrogative sentences to express a wide range of speech acts results in a more expressive or emotive speech. The use of such language demonstrate that language does not only serve a communicative function, but also serves an expressive one. The use of interrogative speech to declare those various actions shows that there is a rhetorical feature in the Indonesian interrogative sentence. The acquisition of competence to understand and to use the rhetorical interrogative sentence usually happens naturally because of habit. Children over twelve years are usually able to utter and understand various forms of questions for a variety of speech functions. It occurs because they are accustomed to using the language in context. In the teaching process, it is necessary to formulate and prepare Indonesian teaching materials which are sociolinguistic and pragmatic-based in order to build and maintain the nation harmony and integration within the framework of the unity of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, a variety of forms and functions of interrogative sentences in Indonesian must be introduced.

REFERENCES

- Alisjahbana, Sutan Takdir (1983). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2002). *Syntax Structure* (2 nd Edition). Berlin: Mouton.
- Djawanai. Stephanus (2009). "Telaah Bahasa Telaah Manusia". *Pidato Pengukuhan Jabatan Guru Besar dalam Ilmu Linguistik pada Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Gajah Mada*, tidak diterbitkan Fakultas Ilmu Budaya UGM Yogyakarta.
- Djajusudarma T, Fatimah (1993). *Metode Linguistik: Ancangan Metode Penelitiandan Kajian*. Bandung: PT Eresco.
- (1999). *Penalaran Deduktif Induktif dalam Wacana Bahasa Indonesia*. Bandung: Cakrawala Baru Dunia Buku.
- (2003). *Analisis Bahasa Sintaksis dan Semantik*. Bandung: Uvula.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2003). *Analysing Discourse* . New York: Routledge.
- Fokker, A.A. (1979). *Pengantar Sintaksis Indonesia*. Terjemahan Jonhar. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.
- Halim, Amran (1974). *Intonation in Relation to Syntax in Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti (1982). *Fungsi Bahasa dan Sikap Bahasa*. Ende Flores: Nusa Indah.
- (1985). *Tata Bahasa Deskriptif Bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis*, Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Lapoliwa, Hans (1990). *Klausa Pemerlengkap dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lindawati (2013) "Kalimat Tanya Bahasa Indonesia: Analisis Bentuk dan Fungsi". *Doctoral Dissertation*. Program Pascasarjana Ilmu Linguistik. UGM.
- Moeliono, Anton M dan Soenjono Dardjowidjono (ed.) (1988). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Ramlan, M. (1983). *Sintaksis*. Yogyakarta: UP Karyono.
- Samsuri (1985). *Tata Kalimat Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sastra Hudaya.

- Searle, J. (1982). *What is a Speech Act*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Slametmuljana, R.B. 1957. *Kaidah Bahasa Indonesia I dan II*. Jakarta: Jambatan.
- Sudaryanto (1988). *Metode Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Tarmini, Wini (2008). “*Kata Tanya dalam Konstruksi Interogatif Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian Sintaksis dan Semantis*”. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Program Pascasarjana Ilmu Sastra Universitas Pajajaran Bandung.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu (1981). “*Kalimat Tanya dalam Bahasa Indonesia*”. *Bachelor Dissertation*. Fakultas Sastra dan Kebudayaan.UGM.