

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of some subchapters. They are background of the study, research problems, objectives of the study, significances of the study, scope and limitation of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

As we know, interrogative sentence is a question that ends with a question mark and commonly used in everyday life. Its function is to ask someone about something to get the information needed. Otherwise, in the oral speech, interrogative sentences may be indicated by the speaker's intonation, then, particle- *kah* clarifies the sentence as an interrogative sentence. 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).

Alwi (2003) stated that as for several forms of interrogative sentences, namely negative sentences, positive sentences and informative sentences which have their own criteria as the questioner wanted. As the same as Lindawati (2017) stated that in relation to 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. In a judiciary, the interrogative sentence cannot be separated from the law, because it can provide a lot of information related to the case being studied. In revealing a case, many ways are needed to dig up a lot of evidence, one of which is using questions and answers during the judiciary, so that an interrogative sentence is needed to identify the lies of someone concerned in a case which will be reviewed by Forensic linguistics.

According to Moeliono cited in Lindawati(2017)an interrogative sentence is a sentence asked by the speaker in hope that the hearer gives a response to what is asked. Comparing with Umami (2016) Interrogative sentence or question is a part of speaking skill and has an essential function in dialogues and each kind of sentence has different pattern based on the purpose of the sentence.From the discussion above, we know that interrogative sentence necessary whether in daily life or judiciary.

Forensic linguistics is a field of science used to help scientifically answer evidence related to law enforcement. In its broadest sense we may say that Forensic Linguistics is the interface between language, crime and law, where law includes law enforcement, judicial matters, legislation, disputes or proceedings in law, and even disputes which only potentially involve some infraction of the law or some necessity to seek a legal remedy Olsson (2008). Not only in the form of non-verbal evidence to revealing a case, but also leave verbal evidence. Koide (2003) stated that verbal communication encompasses both our words and our verbal fillers (e.g, um, like). Verbal messages are created through language.

The evidence analysed and presented by the witness becomes valid evidence in court, as stated in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) article 184 paragraph (1) which states that one of the valid evidence in a criminal court is an expert statement.

According to Min,Park(2007) classification of representative of Interrogative sentences are : First, when it is utilized for the emphasis it contains regretful-ness. Second, it is a marker for surprise by the unexpected information. Third, when the speaker does not accept the current situation emotionally, it served as a marker for disappointment or abandonment. Seeing the Language developments so far, it can be said that international law is a consequence of the current language of law which is very important. As for the formula used in the Indonesian language, interrogative sentences contains of *siapa* (who), *kapan* (when), *apa* (what), *bagaimana* (how), *dimana* (where) and *mengapa* (why), there are many more that we need to know, for example, word *benarkah* (is it true), *jelaskan* (explain) and etc. that will be discussed in this study. Sometimes, using the intonation of the interrogative sentence even the content of the question does not contain a formula for the interrogative sentence.

The differences in this research are: a. Interrogation techniques from the perspective of the symbolic meaning of legal language; and b. Conversational implicature during interrogation in the court. By Forensic Linguistics, we can easily identify the meaning of the message of criminal case using oral data or written data as well.

Therefore, the interrogative sentences in Jessica's judiciary are very important to be examined, because it was found that judges and prosecutors used various forms of interrogative sentences to support the effectiveness of the communication during the judiciary. For example *“Benarkah?”* (*is it true?*), *“Kamu sudah periksa kebenarannya?”* (*have you checked the truth*) and etc.

According to Correa (2013) forensic linguistic evidence is any type of text (spoken, signed or written) that can be used in a criminal investigation or as evidence in a court. These texts include emergency calls, ransom notes, anonymous letters/calls, suicide letters, text messages, police records, confession statements, etc. Although the most well-known task that forensic linguists undertake as expert witnesses might be author identification, they also deal with other crimes of language, such as threats, bribes, conspiracy, or perjury, and more. For example *“Coba jelaskan,”* (*Explain*) *“tidak pernahkah anda mengganti nomor telepon?”* (*“Don't you ever changed your phone number?”*).

Comparing with Sinar(2020) stated that In terms of Mood structure, five types appeared – namely: interrogative, declarative, elliptical declarative, minor, and imperative as far as this study is concerned, it can be inferred that the courtroom interaction involves the high demand of information due to the high existence of question and response statement to question, which are realised in the interrogative and declarative Mood. According to (Eggins, 1994: 173) cited in Zaenul Fikri(2015) The structure rule of the interrogative Mood, Finite always precedes the Subject. In selecting Mood system in expressing interpersonal meaning to the responders i.e. in giving information, in asking a question, in

demanding the responders to do something, and in offering something to the responders Zaenul Fikri(2015).

As we know, communication which occurs between people is very important in a court. The data can be used as evidence to identify one of the cases currently being handled. Many people think that the legal language in court sounds very formal, even though what is found in this research is precisely the language used in everyday life. Therefore, this study interesting to do the research. Spoken and written texts taken from the video of the court of Jessica Wongso on YouTube can be identified. As for several sentences found in this case, one of them is the interrogative sentence. However, when the interrogation was carried out, it could be concluded from the language used by Jessica and the Forensic Linguistics expert found evidence that Jessica had planned the death of her friend Mirna for a long time. It is very important to use the interrogative sentence in reveal a case.

1.2 Research Problems

Based on the background of the study, the researcher focuses on the following problems:

1. What kind of formula question of Indonesian interrogative sentences found in the CourtTrial of Jessica Wongso?
2. What are the functions of Indonesian interrogative sentences found in the CourtTrial of Jessica Wongso?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the research problems, several objectives have to be fulfilled:

1. To explain the kind of formula in Indonesian interrogative sentences found in the Court Trial of Jessica Wongso
2. To explain the function of the Indonesian interrogative sentences found in the Court Trial of Jessica Wongso.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The result of this study a great benefit for the reader to enrich their knowledge about the language used in the court. They be able to identify the formula of interrogative sentences found in the court of Jessica Wongso and be able to explain the function of the interrogative sentences in the Trial Court of Jessica Wongso.

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study entitled “Interrogative Sentences During the Court of Jessica Wongso in YouTube” belongs to the study of Discourse-Forensic Linguistics because the researcher focuses on the spoken and written data of interrogative sentences during the processes of Jessica Wongso case in the court. In this study, the researcher limits the discussion of this research on the kind of legal language and the kind of interrogative sentences used in the court. The researcher also limits the video, in the case of the alleged murder of Jessica Wongso's best friend after

drinking the coffee given by Jessica because the data collection is easily accessible.