LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 26, No. 2, October 2023, pp. 680-695

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF CLOSED INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE IN KOREAN AND INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

Diyah Hayuning Pertiwi[1] and Putu Pramania Adnyana[2*]
[1,2]University of Indonesia, Indonesia
diyah.hayuning@ui.ac.id[1] and ppramania@ui.ac.id[2]
*correspondence: ppramania@ui.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i2.5270
received 20 October 2022; accepted 23 October 2023

Abstract
This study discusses Korean and Indonesian morphosyntactic characteristics of closed interrogative sentences. The method used is descriptive qualitative with literature review and contrastive analysis. The results showed that there were differences and similarities in terms of closed interrogative markers, sentence structure, and sentence negation. The first difference in closed interrogative markers is that the marker in Korean is an interrogative sentence-ending (*eomi*) at the end of a sentence rather than a question word, whereas the marker in Indonesian is the question word *apa* at the beginning of the sentence and particle -*kah* at the beginning, middle or end of the sentence. Second, there are differences and similarities in sentence construction. Subjects that refer to the second person are omitted in Korean, whereas in Indonesian, the subject is required. The parallels lie in the fact that the predicate is a necessary component of sentence structure and that the presence of the object depends on the kind of verb used as the predicate. Thirdly, there is a distinction between Korean and Indonesian sentence negation in that Korean has a wider range of negation forms.

Keywords: closed interrogative sentence, contrastive analysis, Indonesian language, Korean language, morphosyntax

Introduction
One of the crucial communication skills that students of foreign languages need to master is the ability to ask questions. This is in keeping with Kramsch's (1986, p. 366) assertion that the goal of foreign language learning is for students to have conversations in a foreign language that involves giving and requesting information. These skills allow foreign language learners to hold discussions. Interrogative sentences are sentences that are intended to elicit responses from the listener in the form of explanations of what the speaker meant when they posed the inquiry (Sihombing & Kentjono, 2009). This study focuses on Korean and Indonesian interrogative sentences. Due to the rising number of Korean language students in Indonesia, both languages were chosen as the study language of choice (Hasanah & Kharismawati, 2019; Megasari & Widyana, 2020).

In both Korean and Indonesian, there are different forms of interrogative sentences. In Indonesian, there are three different forms of interrogative sentences:

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

closed interrogatives, which only accept a yes-or-no response; open interrogatives, which accept information as an answer; and rhetorical interrogatives, which accept a rhetorical response (Tarmini, 2009, p. 80). In contrast, the classification of interrogative sentences in Korean is more intricate. According to Yang (1991, pp. 115–116), there were many titles for different types of interrogative sentences since prior research on the classification of interrogative sentences in Korean lacked a defined standard of classification. For instance, there are direct and indirect interrogatives (직접 의문과 간접 의문), confirmation interrogatives (확인 의문문), request interrogatives (요청 의문문), and others related on the communication function.

Gu (2015) further explained that there are five main categories of interrogative sentences in Korea, including closed interrogatives that only accept yes-or-no responses (*phanjeong euimunmun*, 판정 의문문), open interrogatives that ask for an explanation as well as a response (*seolmyeong euimunmun*, 설명 의문문), interrogative sentences that offer answer options (*seontaek euimunmun*, 선택 의문문), reflection interrogative sentences that repeat the opponent's talking points (*meari euimunmun*, 메아리 의문문), and self-interrogative sentences (*jamun*, 자문). This shows that the classification of interrogative phrases in both languages is done depending on the kind of response the questioner is looking for, such as replies in the form of explanations and answers in the form of quick yes-or-no decisions. However, because it features interrogative sentences designed expressly for asking options, interrogative sentences that repeat or mirror the speaker's queries, and interrogative sentences that ask questions for oneself, Korean has a more in-depth classification.

Closed interrogative sentences, which are prevalent in both languages, are the subject of this study. Closed interrogative sentences are relatively common in everyday communication. Closed interrogative sentences are those that inquire as to whether the speaker's assertions are true or not (Gu, 2015). The question words *apa* (what) or *apakah* (whether) or even the absence of question words are indicators of closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian. However, using *muot* (무엇), the Korean query word for "what" in interrogative sentences will produce an open interrogative sentence type. Though not invariably, the usage of question words in Korean interrogative sentences might result in closed interrogative sentences as well. Consider the following examples of Korean interrogative sentences that use the question word *eodi* (어디, where).

(1) Neo eodi-e ga-ni? (너 어디에 가니?)
you where-to go-SENTEND.Q

According to Yang (1991), sentence (1) becomes an open interrogative sentence if *eodi* (어디, where) is interpreted as a question word. However, sentence (1) becomes a closed interrogative sentence if *eodi* (어디, where) is interpreted as an infinitive. When sentence (1) is translated into Indonesian, the translations "*Kamu mau pergi ke mana?* (where do you want to go?)" and "*Kamu mau pergi?* (you want to go?)" will both appear. Example (1) demonstrates the differences between closed interrogative sentences used in Indonesian and Korean.

To give understanding to speakers of both languages and foster communication fluency, it is crucial to thoroughly research it. Students can learn to comprehend, organize, and employ sentences in the language they are learning with the aid of research that compares sentences from many languages. As a result of its ability to characterize a sentence type's properties, this research is especially helpful in the fields of teaching and translation, which both depend on accurate translations. Thus, based on the above-mentioned context, the research question for this study is the similarities and differences between closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian and Korean. This study aims to compare the closed interrogative sentences used in Indonesian and Korean.

Supriadianto and Asrori (2020) conducted comparative studies on sentence structure between Indonesian and Korean. Resalia (2018) focuses on comparing imperative sentences in Korean and Indonesian from syntactic and pragmatic perspectives in the context of the Indonesian translation of the Korean novel *Singeulbil*. Resalia (2018) discovered that the difference in imperative sentence markers between the two languages may be noticed in the use of the affix *-lah* in Indonesian, whereas sentence-ending (*eomi*) in Korean. The contrastive single sentences of Korean and Indonesian are also discussed in a study by Supriadianto and Asrori (2020), along with the consequences of teaching foreign languages. The findings demonstrate that there are similarities and differences between Indonesian and Korean at the level of function, word order, and category of each constituent in a single sentence.

Kim (1998), Choi (2015), and Lin (2019) are three earlier studies that are still relevant to the investigation of contrastive interrogative sentences in Korean with those in other languages. Kim (1998) carried out comparative research on closed interrogative sentences in both Korean and English, focusing on speech acts. Meanwhile, Choi (2015) and Lin (2019) compared closed interrogative sentences in Korean and Chinese. Choi (2015) discovered that Korean closed interrogative sentences can be recognized by their limited sentence-ending (*eomi*). For instance, the Chinese particles '吗' (*ma*) and '吧' (*ba*) as interrogative phrase builders can be used or not in interrogative sentences. In contrast, the Korean sentence ending '*-llae'* (–르래) is restricted to action verbs. Lin (2019) also discovered that whereas Chinese auxiliary interrogative words and tone of voice more commonly serve as closed interrogative indicators, interrogative sentence endings play a larger role in marking closed interrogatives in Korean.

This study compares specific types of sentences from two distinct languages, similar to the earlier study mentioned above. However, no research on contrastive studies of closed interrogative sentences in Korean and Indonesian has been discovered based on searches on related topics. To fill up the gaps left by earlier research, this study focuses on the study of morphosyntax, which encompasses the elements and structures of closed interrogative sentences in both languages.

Method

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach to make comparisons. Qualitative research is a study that stresses meaning and is inductive in nature to develop hypotheses and collect detailed data (Sugiyono, 2008). The contrastive study of language, on the other hand, is a comparison that looks at the variations

between two or more languages by the norms (Nur, 2016). The goal of contrastive research, according to Anderson (1990, p. 23), is to uncover and describe certain grammatical components. The closed interrogative sentences in Korean and Indonesian were collected through a literature review of books, dictionaries, journals, novels, and other sources. The next step is data analysis, which involves identifying closed interrogative sentences in Korean using Im et al. (2001) classification of interrogative sentence endings, outlining the similarities and differences between closed interrogative sentences in both languages, and describing the morphosyntactic characteristics of each. Making conclusions based on the analysis that has been done is the final phase of the research process.

Findings and Discussion

Based on the results of data analysis in both Indonesian and Korean, it was found that the morphosyntactic features of closed interrogative sentences in both languages can typically be seen in three aspects, namely the markers of closed interrogative sentences, sentence structure, and the form of negation of closed interrogative sentences. According to Im et al. (2001), the classification of interrogative sentence-endings (*eomi*) corresponds to the following when identifying closed interrogative sentences in Korean.

Table 1. Classification of Interrogative Sentence-endings in Korean (Im et al., 2001)

Honorific Style	Verb Type	Sentence-ending (*eomi*)	
		Formal Form (격식체)	Informal Form (비격식체)
Polite form (존대형)	Action verb, State verb (동작동사, 상태동사)	*-m/seumnikka* (-ㅂ/습니까)	*-eo (a, yeo) yo* (-어 (아, 여)요) *-jiyo* (-지요)
	Copula (서술격)	*-(i)mnikka* -(이)ㅂ니까	*-eo (a, yeo) yo* (-어 (아, 여)요) *-(i)jiyo* (-(이)지요)
Neutral form (중립형)	Action verb (동작동사)	*-(eu)nikka* (-(으)니까) *-neunga* (-는가) *-deonga*(-던가)	-
	State verb (상태동사)	*-(eu)lkka* (-(으)ㄹ까) *-(eu)nga* (-(으)ㄴ가) *-deonga*(-던가)	-
	Copula (서술격)	*-(i)lkka* (-(이)ㄹ까) *-(i)nga* (-(이)ㄴ가) *-(i)deonga*(-(이)던가)	-
Casual form (하내형/ 반말)	Action verb (동작동사)	*-ni* (-니) *-neunya* (-느냐)	*-eo (a, yeo) yo* (-어 (아, 여)) *-ji* (-지)
	State verb (상태동사)	*-(eu)ni* (-니) *-(eu)nya* (-(으)냐)	*-eo (a, yeo) yo* (-어 (아, 여)) *-ji* (-지)
	Copula (서술격)	*-(i)ni* (-(이)니) *-(i)nya* (-(이)냐)	*-(i)ya* (-(이)야) *-(i)ji* (-(이)지)

Closed interrogative sentence markers in Korean and Indonesian

Examining the interrogative sentence markers is one way to identify closed interrogative sentences in both languages. Closed interrogative sentences in Korean can be distinguished by their sentence endings. Korean sentence-ending (*eomi*) is tied to the sentence's predicate. The following is an illustration of how to use sentence-ending (*eomi*) in closed Korean interrogative sentences.

(2) Igeos-eun changmun-imnikka? (이것은 창문입니까?)
This-TOP window-SENTEND.Q
'Is this window?'

(Hwa et al., 2015: 333)

(3) Neo-neun jib-eseo cheongso jaju hae? (너는 집에서 청소 자주 해?)
You-TOP house-at cleaning often do-SENTEND.Q
'Do you clean often at home?'

(Lee et al., 2013, p.41)

The sentence-ending (*eomi*) used in a sentence (2) is '*-mnikka'*(-ㅂ니까). This *eomi* is joined to the noun "changmun" (window) and the copula verb "*-ida*" (-이다). This sentence-ending (*eomi*) is frequently used at the formal speech level (격식체) according to Im et al. (2001). As for sentence (3), the verb *ha-* (하-, do) was attached by sentence-ending (*eomi*) at the informal speech level, namely '*-eo* (*a, yeo*)' (-어 (아, 여)) so that it becomes *hae* (해). Sentence (2) shows that closed interrogative sentences with formal speech levels can be identified only through sentence-ending (*eomi*) alone without the need to observe sentence intonation, while in a sentence (3), sentence-ending (*eomi*) and intonation become markers to identify closed interrogative sentences. This is because sentence-ending (*eomi*) at the informal speech level has the same form and structure as declarative sentences. Therefore, different intonations are needed to indicate that the sentence is a question or a statement. The intonation in interrogative sentences is raised at the end of the sentence.

One of the other characteristics of sentence-ending (*eomi*) is that it can be attached to bound morphemes, such as the morpheme that signifies the past tense '*-ass/eoss-*' (-았/었-) and the future tense '*-gess-*' (-겠-). Therefore, sentence-ending (*eomi*) which signifies closed interrogative sentences can also be found in use in these elements. Consider the following examples.

(4) Eoje Seoul-e nun o-ass-neunya? (어제 서울에 눈 왔느냐?)
Yesterday Seoul-in snow come-PST-SENTEND.Q
'Did it snow in Seoul yesterday?'

(5) Naeil bi-ga o-gess-eo? (내일 비가 오겠어?)
Tomorrow rain-NOM come-FUT-SENTEND.Q
'Will it rain tomorrow?'

(Kim et al., 2005, p. 274 & 513)

Sentence (4) is a past tense form of a closed interrogative sentence with a verb predicate *o-* (오-, come) attached by the past tense morpheme '*-ass-*' (-았-) and sentence-ending (*eomi*) '*-neunya'* (-느냐) at the end of the sentence. Sentence (5) shows a closed interrogative sentence in the future with the predicate verb *o-*

(오다, come) attached to the morpheme marker of the future tense '*-gess-*' (-겠-) and eomi '*-eo*' (-어). In addition to being attached to the tense marker, sentence-ending (*eomi*) in closed interrogative sentences can also be attached to the dependent morpheme of the politeness marker '*-(eu)si-*' (-(으)시-). This politeness marker serves to elevate the person who occupies the subject function in the sentence. The following example sentence (6) uses the politeness marker '*-si-*' (-시-) and the interrogative sentence-ending (*eomi*) '*-lkka*' (-ㄹ까). The politeness marker in a sentence (6) indicates that the speaker respects the *geu bun* (that person) who is the subject of the sentence.

(6) Naeil-jjeum geu bun-i Seoul-e dochakha-si-lkka?
(내일쯤 그 분이 서울에 도착하실까?)
Tomorrow-around that person-NOM Seoul-in arrive-HON-SENTEND.Q
'Will he arrive in Seoul by tomorrow?'

(Im et al., 2001, p.223)

It is clear from the description above that sentence-ending (*eomi*) is a crucial component used to distinguish closed interrogative sentences in Korean. In contrast, examples (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6) do not include question words. This demonstrates that the question word is not a distinguishing feature of Korean closed interrogative sentences. As was mentioned in the example sentence (1), question words used in closed interrogative sentences are viewed as infinitives rather than the subject of the question. Consider the examples below.

(7) A: Nuga o-ass-eoyo? (누가 왔어요?)
Who come-PST-SENTEND.Q
'Someone is coming?'
B: Ne, geureon geot gath-ayo. (네, 그런 것 같아요.)
'Yes, I think so.'

(Hwa et al., 2013, p.314)

The question word *nuga* (누가, who) is used in the interrogative sentence (7). However, it can be seen that sentence (7) is a closed interrogative sentence, and the question word *nugu* (누구) functions as an infinitive (부정사, *bujeongsa*) by observing the interlocutor's response, which was "yes (네, *ne*)". Therefore, the Indonesian translation reads "*Ada yang datang*? (Someone is coming?)" rather than "*Siapa yang datang*? (Who is coming?)".

These characteristics are different from closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian. In Indonesian, question words have an important role in identifying closed interrogative sentences, especially the question word *apa* (what). The question word *apa* (what) has two functions. The first function is as a modifier of a declarative sentence into an interrogative sentence without reducing the information contained in the statement. In other words, the word *apa* (what) can be used to ask for confirmation whether or not the statement of the news sentence is true. Second, as a substitute for a syntactic function or a substitute for one of the elements in a sentence such as the subject, predicate, and object into the form of a question (Pandean, 2018, p. 82). Therefore, the position of the question word *apa* (what) in a sentence can also affect the type of interrogative sentence and the

resulting answer. For the first function, the question word *apa* (what) is usually placed at the beginning of the sentence as in the following examples.

(8) *Apa* saya salah?
'Am I wrong?'
(9) Saya salah *apa*?
'What did I do wrong?'

(Tarmini, 2009, p.86)

The question word *apa* (what) in a sentence (8) changes the statement "I am wrong." to a question that requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer. Meanwhile, in example (9) the question word *apa* (what) is placed at the end of the sentence to ask for an informative answer on something that the subject 'I' did wrong. Sentence (9) is an open interrogative sentence. Sentences (8) and (9) show that the placement of the question word *apa* (what) has a significant role in determining the type of closed or open interrogative sentences in the Indonesian language.

Along with the word *apa* (what) another closed interrogative sentence marker is the particle *-kah*. The particle *-kah* is an optional interrogative particle that serves as an affirmation of the question form in interrogative sentences (Moeliono et al., 2017). Just like the question word *apa* (what), this particle can also be used to change a declarative sentence into an interrogative sentence. The particle *-kah* can be attached to the question word *apa* (what) to form the word *apakah* (what) to emphasize and make the question more polite and formal (Moeliono et al., 2017; Tarmini & Sulistyawati, 2019). The word *apakah* (what) in a sentence is usually placed in front of the sentence and cannot be placed at the end of the sentence. The use of *apakah* (what) in closed interrogative sentences makes the question more formal, so this form is often found in textbooks. Aside from being attached to the question word 'what', the particle *-kah* can also be attached to the topic of a declarative sentence without adding the question word *apa* (what) as in sentence (13). Here are the example sentences.

(10) Apakah ada kursi?
'Is there any chair?'

(Adnyani, 2015, p. 66)

(11) Apakah Andini sudah menikah?
'Is Andini married?'

(Novianti & Nurlaelawati, 2016, p. 13)

(12) Apakah karangan itu berupa teks eksplanasi?
'Is the essay in the form of an explanatory text?'

(Kosasih et al., 2017, p. 151)

(13) Hari inikah pekerjaan itu harus selesai?
'Should the work be finished today?'

(Tarmini & Sulistyawati, 2019, p. 108)

In Indonesian, intonation is a key factor in recognizing closed interrogative sentences in addition to the question word *apa* and the particle *-kah*. In sentences where the interrogative and declarative sentence structures are the same, this intonation is used, just like in Korean, to distinguish the meaning of speech.

Sentence (14) can be pronounced with rising intonation at the end of closed interrogative sentences and falling intonation at the end of declarative sentences.

(14) Kak Alam sudah kuliah?
'Alam is in college?'
(Kak Alam sudah kuliah.)
'Alam is in college.'

(Kosasih et al., 2017, p. 221)

The explanation above shows that there are differences in the markers of closed interrogative sentences in Korean and Indonesian. First, sentence-endings (*eomi*) play an important role in the identification process of closed interrogative sentences in Korean, while question words *apa* (what) and the particle *-kah* are important markers in closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian. Question words used in closed interrogative sentences in Korean are seen as infinitives and not the focus of the question. Second, the location of closed interrogative sentence markers in Indonesian, namely the particle *-kah* is even more varied because it can be attached to words that are at the beginning or middle of a sentence. Meanwhile, markers in the form of closed interrogative sentence endings (*eomi*) can only be attached to the predicate at the end of the sentence. However, there are similarities in both languages, namely the rising intonation at the end of sentences in closed interrogative sentences.

Closed interrogative sentence structure in Korean and Indonesian

In Indonesian sentences, the word order is subject-predicate-object. In contrast, the word order in Korean sentences is subject-object-predicate (Song, 2006, p. 101). As a result, the predicate always takes up the final position in Korean sentence structure, and sentence-ending (*eomi*) is attached after the predicate. The particle (조사) is another component in Korean sentences that is equally significant. Nouns and pronouns can have particles affixed to them to indicate the word's role in a sentence, such as subject, object, or adverb. The attachment of this particle allows the word order in Korean to change without changing the meaning (Song, 2006, p.102). Here are example sentences.

(15) Yeogi-e gangeuisil-i iss-seumnikka? (여기에 강의실이 있습니까?)
Here-in lecture room-NOM exist-SENTEND.Q
'Is there a lecture room here?'
(16) Gangeuisil-i yeogi-e iss-seumnikka? (강의실이 여기에 있습니까?)
Lecture room-NOM here-in exist-SENTEND.Q
'Is there a lecture room here?'

(Hwa et al., 2015, p. 63)

In sentences (15) and (16), the word *yeogi* (here) is attached to the placemark particle *-e* (-에), and the word *gangeuisil* (lecture room) is attached to the subject marker particle *-i* (-이). Sentences (15) and (16) therefore have the same meaning despite having different sentence structures.

Another characteristic of closed interrogative sentences in Korean can be seen in the subject element of the sentence, which tends to be omitted, especially

if the subject is in the first person or the second person pronoun. An example can be seen as follows.

(17) Jeonyeok meog-eoss-eoyo? (저녁 먹었어요?)
Dinner eat-PST-SENTEND.Q
'Have you had dinner?'

(Oh, 2005, p. 100)

The sentence above consists only of the object *jeonyok* (저녁) and the predicate verb *meok-* (먹-) attached to the past tense marker *-eoss-* (-었-) and sentence-endings (*eomi*) *-eoyo* (-어요). Although the subject is not used in a sentence (17), it can be understood that the subject in question is the second person 'you'. The absence of the subject 'you' in Korean is not only found in closed interrogative sentences but also interaction and communication in general. This can be said to be related to the complexity of choosing the right word to refer to the second person in Korean. Koo (1992, p.36) explains that no word can generally be applied to younger and older interlocutors in Korean, like the word 'you' in English. It was further explained that the choice of words to refer to the second person in Korean must pay attention to age, gender, social relations, degree of intimacy, and educational background (Koo, 1992, p. 38).

Another important thing in closed interrogative sentence structure is the use of objects in the sentence. Similar to declarative sentences, the object of the sentence can be used when the predicate of the sentence is a transitive verb. If the predicate is an intransitive and passive transitive verb, then there is no need to use an object. Here are the example sentences.

(18) Rea, neo maeun eumsik joaha-ni?
(레아, 너 매운 음식 좋아하니?)
Rea, you spicy-REL food like-SENTEND.Q
'Rea, do you like spicy food?'

(Hong et al., 2019, p.197)

(19) Je mal deul-lyeoyo? (제 말 들려요?)
My-GEN word listen-PASS-SENTEND.Q
'Can you hear me?'

(Jin, 2015)

Sentence (18) has a transitive verb predicate *joaha-* (좋아하-, like) and a noun phrase object *maeun eumsik* (매운 , spicy food), while sentence (19) has a predicate as a passive intransitive verb *deulli-* (들리−, sounds) so it does not have an object. Sentences (18) and (19) show that both transitive and intransitive verbs can be used in closed interrogative sentences.

The function of the subject, object, and adverb in sentences can all be indicated by particles in the Korean language, but Indonesian does not have this feature. Because of this, word order is crucial in Indonesian, and changing it can alter the meaning. In closed interrogative sentences, the Indonesian question word *apa* (what) and the particle *-kah* serve as markers. The closed interrogative sentence structure has rules regarding where the particle *-kah* should go.

The first rule is that if the declarative sentence that presents the main information has adverbs such as *harus* (must), *bisa* (can), *dapat* (can), *mau* (want), and *sudah* (already), the adverb is generally moved to the front of the sentence and affixed with the particle *-kah* to form closed interrogative sentences (Alwi et al., 2003; Moeliono et al., 2017). Here are the example sentences.

(20) Haruskah iklan dilenyapkan?
'Should advertising be eliminated?'
(Tinarbuko, 2002, p.145)

(21) Bisakah anak saya berjalan?
'Can my child walk?'
(Prasetyaningrum, 2021, p. 1)

(22) Maukah kau memandangku?
'Will you look at me?'
(Untoro, 2009, p.101)

(23) Sudahkah Anda tahu?
'Did you know?'
(Nababan et al., 2021, p.75)

Moeliono et al. (2017, p. 487) explain that adverbs such as the words *akan* (will), *sedang* (ongoing), and *telah* (done) cannot be used as in the rules and examples above. However, in Indonesian practice, the word *akan* is often used at the beginning of closed interrogative sentences, as in the following example.

(24) Akankah Indonesia tenggelam?
'Will Indonesia sink?'
(Susanta & Sutjahjo, 2007, p. 3)

The second rule relates to the function of the *-kah* particle to change the predicate or object in a declarative sentence into a closed interrogative sentence. Sentences that have an adjective, verb, or noun as a predicate can be converted into a closed interrogative sentence by exchanging the position of the subject with the predicate so that the predicate occupies a position in front of the sentence, then the predicate is affixed with the particle *-kah* (Moeliono et al., 2017). Example sentences are as follows.

(25) Baguskah penyanyi ini?
'Is this singer good?'
(Darma, 2017, p. 240)

(26) Urusan Pak Alikah masalah ini?
'Is this Mr. Ali's problem?'
(Moeliono, 2017, p. 488)

(27) Pergikah dia kemarin?
'Did he go yesterday?'
(Triwarsih, 2014, p. 111)

The example sentence (25) has an adjective predicate *bagus* (good), while sentence (26) has a noun phrase predicate *urusan Pak Ali* (Mr. Ali's problem). Both sentences are formed into closed interrogative sentences by placing the predicate at the beginning of the sentence and affixing it with the particle *-kah*.

Meanwhile, sentence (27) shows the verb *pergi* (go) as a predicate of a closed interrogative sentence attached to the particle *-kah*.

Not only can it be attached to the predicate, but the particle *-kah* can also be attached to the object and subject of the sentence, as in sentences (28) and (29) below. In sentence (28), the particle '*-kah* is attached to the object 'tetangga', while in a sentence (29) it is attached to the subject 'dia' in a closed interrogative sentence. Another variation can be seen in example (30) which shows the particle *-kah* attached to the object *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian language) at the end of the sentence.

(28) Menolong tetangganya<u>kah</u> orang itu?
'Was this man helping his neighbor?'

(Moeliono et al., 2017, p. 488)

(29) Dia<u>kah</u> yang mencuri uang?
'Was he the one who stole the money?'

(Purba, 1997, p. 134)

(30) Siti Halimah sedang belajar Bahasa indonesia<u>kah</u>?
'Is Siti Halimah studying Indonesian?'

(Setyadi, 2018, p. 237)

According to the sentences in the aforementioned examples, the subject, object, and predicate of closed interrogative sentences can all be attached to the particle *-kah* The location of the particle *-kah* in closed interrogative sentence structures in Indonesian varies due to the variety of words that can be attached to it.

In contrast, the basic structure of interrogative sentences in Indonesian is similar to that of Korean, which consists of a subject, predicate, object, and description, if any. The subject component, which is required in the construction of Indonesian sentences, accounts for the difference. This is also supported by Moeliono et al. (2017), who states that a sentence must include a subject and a predicate at the very least. Even though the closed interrogative sentences are spoken to the listener directly, second-person subjects such as *kamu* (you), *kau* (you), and *Anda* (thou) are still required to be mentioned in Indonesian. In addition, the object in the interrogative sentence structure also has similarities in both languages because it depends on the type of verb that occupies the predicate function in the sentence. The following are examples related to the object elements in the closed interrogative sentence structure of the Indonesian language.

(31) Kalian<u>kah</u> yang *mengotori* <u>tempat ini</u>?
'Were you the ones who polluted this place?'
(32) Hanya kami<u>kah</u> yang *disalahkan*?
'Are we the only ones to blame?'

(Setyadi, 2018, p. 240)

Sentence (31) has a transitive verb predicate *mengotori* (polluted) with the object *tempat ini* (this place), whereas sentence (32) has a passive verb predicate *disalahkan* (to blame), which is an intransitive verb so there is no object.

In this section, it can be seen that the word order in closed interrogative sentences in Korean is more flexible, considering that Korean has particles that indicate the function of words in sentences. Meanwhile, changes in word order in

closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian can cause changes in meaning. However, the flexibility in changing the word order in Indonesian interrogative sentences can be seen in words that occupy the function of the subject, predicate, or object and are attached to the particle *-kah*. These words can be placed at the beginning, middle, or end of closed interrogative sentences in Indonesian. Another difference can be seen in the subject in closed interrogative sentences in Korean, which tends to be omitted, while in Indonesian, the subject still needs to be present. Similarities related to the structure of interrogative sentences are found in the use of the object of the sentence, which depends on the type of verb in the predicate.

Closed interrogative sentence negation in Korean and Indonesian

The negative form of closed interrogative sentences in both languages is also interesting to observe. The negation marker in Korean, according to Kim et al. (2005), consists of the forms *an* (not, 안), *mot* (can not, 못), and *malda* (do not, 말다). Closed interrogative sentences in Korean can use all of these forms of negation except the *malda* (do not, 말다) form because this is the negation form for imperative sentences. Kim et al. (2005) further explain that the short form of the negation *an* (not, 안) is in the form of the adverb *an* (not, 안) which is placed in the middle of the sentence before the verb or adjective predicate. Another form is *-ji anhda* (not, -지 않다) which is placed after the verb or adjective predicate. For the negation of a sentence with a noun predicate, the form *-i*/*ga anida* (to be-not, -이/가 아니다) is used after the noun predicate.

After putting the form of negation, at the end of the sentence the *eomi* of the interrogative sentence is put as a marker that the sentence is in the form of a question. In the form of *-ji anhda* (not, -지 않다), time markers can be placed before or after the negation marker *-ji anhda* (not, -지 않다) followed by an interrogative suffix. The arrangement of the other constituent elements of the sentence is the same as previously described. The following are examples of sentences with the negation form *an* (not, 안).

(33) Geu kkoch-i an yeppeu-mnikka?
(그 꽃이 안 예쁩니까?)
That flower-NOM not pretty-SENTEND.Q
'Isn't that flower pretty?'

(Im et al., 2001, p. 215)

(34) Jinanju-neun nalssi-ga chub-ji anh-ass-ni?
(지난주는 날씨가 춥지 않았니?)
Last week-TOP weather-NOM cold-not-PST-SENTEND.Q
'Wasn't it cold last week??'

(Kim et al., 2005, p. 241)

Sentence (33) uses the negation marker *an* (not, 안) which is placed before the adjective *yeppeuda* (beautiful,예쁘다), while sentence (34) uses the negation marker *-ji anhda* (not, -지 않다) following the past tense marker *-ass-* (-았-). Both examples of sentences ended with interrogative sentence-ending (*eomi*).

Meanwhile, the negation form *mot* (can not, 못) can only be used with a verb predicate because it expresses the inability to do something. This form of negation

has the form of the adverb *mot* (can not, 못) which is placed in the middle of the sentence before the predicate, and the form of '*-ji mothada'* (can not, -지 못하다) which is placed after the predicate. The following is an example of a sentence with the negation form *mot* (can not, 못).

(35) Bab mot meog-eoss-ni? (밥 못 먹었니?)
Meal not able eat-PST-SENTEND.Q
'Couldn't you eat your meal?'

(Kim et al., 2005, p. 252)

In addition to the form of negation above, in Im, et al (2001) there is a form of lexical negation consisting of the word *alda* (to know,알다) with the negation *moreuda* (do not know, 모르다) and the word *itta* (exist, 있다) with the negation *eobta* (not exist, 없다). This form of negation serves as the predicate in closed interrogative sentences. Consider the example below.

(36) Gyosil-e kheompyutheo-ga iss-eumnikka? (교실에 컴퓨터가 있습니까?)
[Is there a computer in the classroom?]
(36a) Gyosil-e kheompyutheo-ga eobs-seumnika? (교실에 컴퓨터가 없습니까?)
[Isn't there a computer in the classroom?]

(Hwa et al., 2015, p. 54)

Sentence (36a) is the negation form of sentence (36) which changes the predicate of the word *itta* (exist, 있다) to *eobta* (not exist, 없다).

In Indonesian, the form of negation is indicated by the words *tidak* (not) and *bukan* (to be-not) either with or without the particle *-kah*. The word *tidak* (not) is used to negate verb and adjective-predicated sentences, while the word *bukan* (to be-not) is used to negate noun-predicated sentences. The placement is before the predicate, but if the particle *-kah* is added, it is at the beginning of the sentence, as in the examples that follow.

(37) Apa dia bukan murid sekolah menengah kejuruan?
'Is he not a vocational high school student?'
(38) Apa ayahnya tidak marah?
'Wasn't his father angry?'

(Moeliono et al., 2017, pp. 507-508)

(39) Bukankah dia saudaramu?
'Isn't he your brother?'
(40) Tidakkah dia merasa aneh dengan sikapmu?
'Doesn't he feel strange about your attitude?'

(Perdana, 2013, p. 22 & 37)

For closed interrogative sentences that use the word *bukankah* (do not/did not), the predicate does not have to be a noun because this marker is also a form that asks for the certainty of a known fact. An example is as follows.

(41) Bukankah mereka menerima putusan hakim itu?
'Didn't they accept the judge's decision?'

(Moeliono et al., 2017, p. 489)

The preceding sentence has a verb predicate but uses a negation interrogative marker *bukankah* (do not/did not). This happens because the speaker wants to confirm the information he or she already knows to the listener so that the listener's response will determine whether or not what the speaker says is correct.

In addition to the negation words *bukan* (to be-not) and *tidak* (not), in Indonesian there is also a special form of negation for the adverb *sudah* (already), namely *belum* (yet).

(42) Apa kamu belum makan?
'Haven't you already eaten yet?'
(42a) Apa kamu sudah makan?
'Have you eaten yet?'

(Moeliono et al., 2017, p. 507)

Example (42a) is a form of negation of the sentence (42) which is done by replacing the word *sudah* (already) with the word *belum* (yet).. The response received can be in the form of a short answer *sudah* (already) or *belum* (yet).

Based on the explanation above, the form of negation in closed interrogative sentences in Korean is more varied than in Indonesian. The form of negation in Indonesian is limited to the words *tidak* (not), *bukan* (to be-not), and *belum* (yet) which are used to negate verbs, nouns, and adverbs. In contrast, Korean uses more diverse and specific forms of negation, such as having a negation form that expresses 'inability'. This needs to be a concern for speakers in both languages when constructing closed interrogative sentences.

Conclusion

The contrastive analysis of closed interrogative sentences in Korean and Indonesian in this study focused on three aspects, namely: markers to identify closed interrogative sentences, sentence structure, and the form of negation of closed interrogative sentences in both languages. The first difference is seen in the closed interrogative sentence markers, where Korean uses sentence-endings (*eomi*) and Indonesian uses the question word *apa* (what) which is equipped with the particle *-kah*. The second difference can be seen in the way the Korean language has a propensity to omit the subject that refers to the second person, you, and in the way that sentence elements can be moved around in interrogative sentences. This provision was not found in the Indonesian language. Interrogative sentences in Indonesian only have the flexibility to place words that are attached to the interrogative particle marker *-kah*, which can be placed at the beginning, middle, or end of the sentence. The third difference can be seen in the form of negation of interrogative sentences in Korean which is more diverse than Indonesian. The similarities between the two are the use of objects that depend on the type of verb in the predicate and the rising intonation at the end of the interrogative sentence.

This research has methodological limitations as it is an initial study based on a literature review. More actual data needs to be collected and processed to fully comprehend closed interrogative sentences in both languages. This study creates avenues for future research that will enrich further knowledge of Korean linguistics in Indonesia.

References

Adnyani, N. L. P. S. (2015). *Selamat datang Bahasa Indonesia bagi penutur asing tingkat dasar*. Bali: Undiksha Press.

Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H., & Moeliono, A.M. (2003). *Tata bahasa baku Bahasa Indonesia* (3rd Ed.). Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa dan Balai Pustaka.

Anderson, J. M. (1990). Case grammar contrast. In J. Fisiak (ed.), *Further insights into contrastive analysis* (pp. 23-28, Vol. 30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1075/llsee.30

Choi, S. R. (2015). *A comparative study on the speech-act meaning of yes-no question in Korean and Chinese* (Tesis). Honam University, Gwangju.

Darma, B. (2017). *Kritikus adinan*. Yogyakarta: Bentang Pustaka.

Gu, B. G. (2015). *Hangugeo munbeob choron I*. Seoul: Jibmundang.

Hwa, A.K., Yong, C.H., Adinda, R.N., Agung, S., & Hutagalung, F. (2015). *Bahasa Korea terpadu untuk orang Indonesia 1*. Seoul: The Korea Foundation.

Hwa, A.K., Yong, C.H., Adinda, R.N., Agung, S., & Hutagalung, F. (2013). *Bahasa Korea terpadu untuk orang Indonesia 2*. Seoul: The Korea Foundation.

Im, H. B., Hong, K. P., & Chang, S. I. (2001). *Korean grammar for international learners* (Vol. 1). Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

Jin, B. D. (2015). *이모틀(Immortal) 1 권*. Seoul: Munpia.

Kim, H. C. (1998). A semantic analysis of focused yes-no questions in English and Korean. *Studies in Modern Grammar, 14*, 223-262.

Kim, J. S., et al. (2005). *Hangugeo munbeob 1*. Seoul: Communication Books.

Kim, J. S., et al. (2005). *Hangugeo munbeob 2*. Seoul: Communication Books.

Koo, J. H. (1992). The term of address "you" in South Korea today. *Korea journal, 32*(1), 27-42.

Kosasih, E. (2017). *Bahasa Indonesia kelas VIII edisi revisi*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From Language Proficiency to Interactional Competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*, 366-372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05291.x

Lee, J. H., Ahn, K. H., & Lathifah, E. (2013). *Bahasa Korea terpadu untuk orang Indonesia 4*. Seoul: The Korea Foundation.

Lin, Q. X. (2019). *A comparative study on yes-no question in Korean and Chinese* (Tesis). Seoul: Ewha Womans University Graduate School.

Moeliono, Anton M., dkk. (2017). *Tata bahasa baku Bahasa Indonesia* (4th ed.). Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Nababan, E. B., Sari, R.N., Sari, I.M., Satriawan, D., Avicenna, A., Subakti, H>, Tamrin, A.F., Sari, A.S.P., Kuswandi, S., & Harahap, J.M. (2021). *Bahasa Indonesia akademik: Penulisan laporan ilmiah*. Medan: Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Novianti, N., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2016). *Sahabatku Indonesia tingkat A1*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengembangan Strategi dan Diplomasi Kebahasaan, Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa

Nur, T. (2016). Analisis kontrastif dalam studi bahasa. *Arabi: Journal of Arabic Studies*, *1*(2), 64-74. http://dx.doi.org/10.24865/ajas.v1i2.11

Oh, M. J. (2005). *Hangugeo giboneohui ganadara*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

Pandean, M. L. (2018). Kalimat tanya dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Kajian Linguistik*, *5*(3), 75-88. https://doi.org/10.35796/kaling.5.3.2018.25030

Perdana, R. I. (2013) *Penggunaan kata tanya bahasa indonesia dalam cerpen di harian umum Kompas* (Undergraduate thesis). Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

Prasetyaningrum, S. (2021). Pendampingan pada ibu yang memiliki anak cerebral palsy. *Altruis: Journal of Community Services, 2*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.22219/altruis.v2i1.15871

Purba, T. (1997). *Sintaksis bahasa Dani barat*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Setyadi, A. (2018). Pemakaian partikel kah dalam kalimat tanya. *Nusa: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *13*(2), 231-243.

Sihombing, L. P., & Kentjono, D. (2009). *Sintaksis dalam pesona bahasa: Langkah awal memahami linguistik.* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Sugiyono, S. (2008). Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Supriadianto, S., & Asrori, Y. W. (2020). Kontrastif struktur kalimat tunggal bahasa indonesia dan bahasa korea untuk pengajaran bahasa asing. *BASINDO: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, dan Pembelajarannya*, *4*(1), 112-125.

Supriadianto, S., & Asrori, Y.W. (2020). Kontrastif struktur kalimat tunggal Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Korea untuk pengajaran bahasa asing. *Basindo, 4*(1), 112-125.

Susanta, G., & Sutjahjo, H. (2007). *Akankah Indonesia tenggelam?*. Jakarta: Penebar Plus+.

Tarmini, W. (2009). Kata tanya dalam konstruksi interogatif Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian sintaktis dan semantis. *Sosiohumaniora, 11*(1), 77-92. https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v11i1.5580

Tarmini, W., & Sulistyawati, S. (2019). *Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Uhamka press.

Tinarbuko, S. (2002). Haruskah iklan dilenyapkan. *Nirmana*, *4*(2), 143-157.

Triwarsih, C. S. (2014). *Sari kata Bahasa Indonesia & EYD: Ejaan yang disempurnakan*. Jakarta: Lembar Langit Indonesia.

Untoro, B. (2009). *Maukah kau memandangku?: Menikmati keindahan dalam permasalahan hidup* (Cet. 1). Jakarta: BPK-GM.

Yang, M. H. (1991). 국어 의문문의 유형과 응답 유형에 대하여. *관악어문연구, 16*(0), 115-134.