

Regular Exchanges of Dialogical *Dakwah* Discourse in Surakarta City

Miftah Nugroho, Sri Samiati Tarjana, and Dwi Purnanto
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia
miftahnugroho@gmail.com

Keywords: Regular exchange, structural exchange, structure, dialogical *dakwah*, *dai*, *mad'u*.

Abstract: This article empirically elucidates structure of exchanges, especially the regular exchanges manifested in the dialogic *dakwah* or Islamic preaching discourse in Surakarta city. The data of this article is in the form of spoken words expressed by *dai* 'Islamic preacher' and *mad'u* 'the recipients' as reflected in the question and answer (Q&A) session. The data obtained through implementing techniques of *Simak Bebas Libat Cakap* (Uninvolved-Conversation Observation), recording, and note taking. The data were classified, and analyzed using the theory of structural exchange by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and was further developed by Stubbs (1983). The result shows that in this genre of discourse, there were found two structures of exchange, namely regular exchange and irregular exchange. Findings on the regular exchanges comprise of six structures, namely the I R structure, I R Ir R structure, I R F R structure, I F Ir R structure, and the structures of I R Ir R F R, and I R Ir R Ir R Ir R.

1 INTRODUCTION

The use of language in dialogic Islamic preaching discourse in Surakarta city is one of the linguistic events that deserve to be studied. Basically many aspects researchable from such a linguistic event, one of the potentially and interestingly aspects to be studied is on the structure of exchanges or interaction patterns, which occur at the time the *dai* 'preacher' and *mad'u* 'recipients' interchangeably interact in a question and answer (Q&A) session. Previous studies on language use in Islamic preaching or *da'wah* discourses have been mainly referred to monological discourses. Similarly, studies on the structure of exchange have never been found in the language use in *da'wah* or Islamic preaching discourse. This is evidenced by a number of studies undertaken by the various researchers such as Ma'ruf (1999), Hidayat (1999), Subagyo (2000), Maksan (2001), Atmawati (2002), Irawati (2004), Hadisaputra (2005), Sadhono (2005), Gusneti (2007), Atmawati (2009), Abdullah (2010), Sadhono (2011). In religious preaching discourse, Susanto (2006) reported that codeswitching appears to be mostly found in preaching discourse and very much influenced by metaphorical factors. Similar genre to those such as Religious discourse of sermons (Christianity) studied by Morozov (2015). In regard of the theoretical method applied in this study, Sinclair and Coulthard's

method has been dominantly applied to various discourses especially in teaching domain (White, 2003; Raine, 2010; Sauntson, 2011). Departing from those various studies, the structure of exchange becomes a relevant gap to study dialogical discourse.

Dialogical preaching is mainly divided into two sessions, namely the question and answer (Q&A). In that session, the only speaker is a *dai* or Islamic preacher. As for the Q&A session, speakers are not only a *dai*, but also a *mad'u* or recipients. In other words, during the Q&A session there occurs an interaction between *dai* and *mad'u*.

The *dai* 'preacher' and *mad'u* 'recipients' commonly interact in the Q & A type of communication. In which a *mad'u* (s) conveys Q and *dai* delivers A. Despite the overall realized through Q&A type of communication, the dialogic *dakwah* discourse results the following interaction marked with (1) and is illustrated as below.

(1) Questioner: *Yen anu Pak, menawi sok-sok nembe ngaji, ngoten nggih. Ngoten napa ya kedah mandek napa diteruske?*

Da'I : *Menawi kita maos Alquran, enten azan, kendhel rumiyin, kita mengutamakan azan karena itu panggilan untuk shalat, nggih. Menika mengutamakan adzan. Nggih menika*

On data (1) there is an interaction between a questioner and preacher. The spoken utterance produces by the questioner is an initiation or a

beginning symbolized by (I), while the spoken utterance is A or response symbolized by (R). In other words, from the interaction (1) it is found a pattern or structure formulated into I R structure.

The Q&A interaction in dialogic preaching discourse in Surakarta city, surely establishes an interactional pattern or exchange structure as shown from data (1). The next question would be what structures of exchange were formed?. Such a question is appealing to know and elaborate, what sorts of interaction do *dai* and *mad'u* undertaken a communication through Q&A session. To seek the answer of such question, then the theoretical underpinning to address the focus of this study is the theory of exchange structure as put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). This theory is used to analyze the interactions reflected from class discourses. On the basis of such theory, interactions at the class discourse at least establish a structure called I R F which means the exchange is begun with initiation, replied by a response, and followed up with feedback. By this theoretical underpinning, is it possible the structures of exchange reflected from a class discourse which share similarities of that dialogic *dakwah* or other forms of structural exchanges?, for that reasons at least has led the writing of this paper.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) argue that an exchange is the basic unit of an interaction. Exchange is one of the ranks besides acts, moves, transactions, and lessons. If they are listed from the bottom, the class discourse rank starts from *act*, *move*, *exchange*, *transaction*, and *lesson*. The bottom rank establishes the next ranks. The act of composing move, the move of composing exchange, the exchange of composing transaction, the transaction of composing class.

Within the exchange, there were found two main classes which are boundary and teaching. In the exchange there were established two moves, namely framing and centralization. Meanwhile, the exchange of teaching includes 5 main classes as follows.

Table 1: Main Class of Lessons Change.

Class Exchange	Structural Exchange
The Elicitation of teacher	I R F
The Direction of teacher	I R (F)
The Information of teacher	I R
The Elicitation of student	I R
The Information of student	I F

The elicitation of teacher means initiation / the opening of an exchange begins with questions, responded with answers, and followed by evaluation. In the meantime, the directive act of the teacher means an exchange beginning with a request or order, responded with a nonverbal answer, and followed by an arbitrary evaluation. In that sense, the information of teacher is an exchange which is initiated or opened with the delivery of information and responded with approval. The elicitation of student means the exchange which is initiated or opened students with questions and responded by the teacher with answers. The information of students means an exchange opened with the delivery of information from students and the teacher's response with approval.

The structure of exchanges reflected in Table 1 is composed of three structural elements, namely the structural element I which includes initiation, such structure of r includes response, and the structural element of F as feedback. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), the structural element of I comprised of the act of asking for attention, act of delivering the introduction, informing, the directive acts, and the act of elicitation (asking). Meanwhile, the structural element of R was realized by the act of answering acts of approving and commenting. In that a case, the structural element of F structure realized through the acts of accepting, commenting, and agreeing, in addition to the act of judging as well.

There has been criticism of the model introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). It was criticized, corrected, and modified by a number of experts (White, 2003, p.3-8). White (2003, p.3) criticizes that model for being failed to account role changing in students-teachers' interaction within classroom communications. Additionally, Stubbs (1983) argues that the S&C's model needs modification and he suggested that the structural exchanges at least taxonomically consist of 9 structures i.e., (1) [Inf], (2) [Inf (F)], (3) [Inf (Ir R) (F)], (4) [I R], (5) [I R (F)], (6) [I R (Ir R) (F)], (7) [I R/I R], (8) [I R/I (F)], and (9) [I R/I (Ir R) (F)]. For that reason, the Stubbs' taxonomy (1983) was then used to provide a vivid and more systematic classification in understanding the S&C's model.

3 METHODS

This study descriptively examines the spoken words expressed by *dai* 'Islamic preacher(s)' and *mad'u* 'the recipients' in question and answer (Q&A) session. The data sources were obtained from various locations from which the dialogic *dakwah* or Islamic

preaching taken place, either the events were organized by Islamic organizations such as Muhammadiyah, MTA (Majelis Tafsir Alquran) or other non-Islamic organizations. The data were obtained by using the techniques of *Simak Bebas Libat Cakap* (Uninvolved-Conversation Observation), the techniques of recording, and note taking. After having collected the data, these data were then classified, and analyzed using the theory of structural exchange put forward by Sinclair and Coulthart (1975) in addition to using Stubbs' opinion.

4 FINDINGS

Having done classification on data, there were found a number of structures of exchange in dialogical *dawah* or preaching in Surakarta city, one of which in the form of regular structure. A regular structure is named after the occurring structure which appears for more than once. The regular structures found include 6 structures, namely (1) IR structure, (2) IR Ir R structure, (3) IRFR structure, (4) IF Ir R structure, (5) IR Ir IRR structure, IR Ir R and (6) IR structure Ir R Ir R Ir R. Here is description of the 6 regular structures.

4.1 I R Structure

The I R structure is realized by the structures of initiation and response. These structures tend to establish a series of question and answer as in example (2) above.

(2) Questioner: *Lha kula kaleh. Kadang ten musola kadang ten mriki. Ngoten priipun?* (I)

Da'i: *Nek, lhaaaa...nggih niku. Nek kula prinsipe, yang yang paling sering njenengan jamaahe pundi, itu yang diutamakan. Nek, puadha-padhane, ya arep jawab loro ya ra isoh, nek iso dijawab loro ya dijawab loro, nggih. Nek ora bareng niku karoan isoh njawab. Ning yang kedah kita jawab niku, engkang kita kulina wonten mriku, nggih.* (R)

The above interaction is an exchange consists the act of elicitation (asking), expressed by the questioners (*mad'u*) and being answered by the preacher (*da'i*). This structure in the dialogical Islamic preaching discourse in Surakarta city as much as found 9 times.

4.2 I R Ir R Structure

The I R Ir R structure composed of initiation responded by the act of response, followed by re-

initiation and response. This structure tends to be composed of a series of frequently repeated questions and answers as in (3) below.

(3) Questioner: *Jadi pada intinya itu dibolehkan ya Ustad?* (I) [*So in essence it is permissible Ustad?*]

Da'i: *Ya* (R)

Questioner: *Selesai di, apa innaka ham dun maj d boca yang lain boleh?* (I) [*ended up in, is it innaka ham dun maj d, (is it permissible to recite the other?)*].

Da'i: *Ya* (R) [*Yes*]

The above interaction is an exchange comprising the act of elicitation expressed by the questioner and followed by the acts of answering by *da'i* or preacher. The series of elicitation and reply actions repeated for twice. In the discourse of dialogical preaching in Surakarta city, these structures were found as much as 6 times of use.

4.3 The I R F R Structure

The I R F R is a structure which consists of initiation, response, feedback and response. In other words, in this structure there are occurring exchanges beginning with initiation, replied by a response, and replied again with response, and replied back by response, as found in (4) below.

(4) Questioner: *Tanya cara menyimpan daging, Pak?* (I) [*May I ask how to keep meat, sir?*]

Da'i: *Oh iya, dulu menyimpan daging tu ndak boleh, li ajri kaafah kuntum nahaytukum 'aniddikhaari udubil adhoqii kata Rasulullah dulu saya melarang kamu untuk menyimpan daging, daging kurban al aan atau ala fat fa'qulu waaminu waddakhilu tiga hal makanlah dan berikan kepada orang-orang, yang ketiga simpanlah, boleh kamu menyimpannya. Dan ketika Nabi me (-) setelah menyembelih ternak kurban, ah namanya, ada yang kurban ada yang, ya apa ketika haji itu, ada dam, atau* (R)

Mad'u: *Dam* (F)

Da'i: *Atau namanya apa haidibuyu itu Nabi juga mengatakan ketika di Mina fat iddakhilu simpanlah dan boleh sampai menuju ke Mekkah tu membawa daging sembelihan di Mina ya, saya kira demikian mungkin ada* (R)

The above interaction is an exchange which begins with the act of elicitation, responded by the act of answering, and was mixed with the act of commenting, and then followed by the act of answering. Elicitation is delivered by the questioner. In the meantime, acts of replying and commenting on each were expressed by both preacher and recipients. The exchange of I R F R structure is found as much as 3 times.

4.4 I F Ir R Structure

The I F Ir R is a structure which includes initiation, feedback, re-initiation, and response. In other words, the exchange is considered to hold I F Ir R structure at the time being initiated, responded to feedback, followed by re-initiation and response. The interaction below observes the I F Ir R structure.

(5) Questioner: *Tanya* Ustad (I) [May I ask for a question, Ustadz?

Da'I : *Iya* (F), [yes please]

Questioner: Mohon penjelasannya perihal bacaan tasbih daripada tahiyat akhir apakah kita baca doa sampai *innaka ham dun majid*, setelah selesai ataukah setelah doa *all humma inn a' dzubika minal* apakah itu termasuk daripada yang dianjurkan atau memang apa ada dasar hukumnya? mohon penjelasannya! (Ir)

Dai: Memang ... di akhir salat. Setelah kita membaca *fil ' lam na innaka ham dun majid* ada sebuah *hadits* yang menyuruh kita itu atau membolehkan *hadits* itu kita berdoa sesuai ketentuan kita. Maka dari di sini para ulama tidak menyalahkan ketika setelah salat menambah permintaan kepada Allah yang semau kita. Bisa paham? Maka ada yang *fil ' lam na innaka ham dun majid* Pak Kholil kemarin mengatakan saya baca, doa asma Allah, ya *ndak papa* 'tidak apa-apa'. Yang penting dari itu, saya harus membacakan dasar hukumnya. Setelah itu baru kita enak mengamalkan. Dasar hukumnya mereka itu di mana? Apakah di dalam sujud, akhir, atau di akhir tahiyat? Setengah ulama menerangkan akhir sujud, *lha* besok Selasa depan *insyaallah* kalau *gak* 'tidak' lupa, saya akan ketengahkan di hadapan bapak-bapak ibu-ibu secara jelas. (R)

The above interaction is an exchange beginning with the acts of asking for attention, responded by the acts of acceptance, followed by the act of elicitation (ask), and responded with answering. In that sense, the acts of asking for attention and questioning were expressed by questioners. In addition to expressing the acts of accepting and answering by the preacher or *dai*. In dialogical preaching discourse in Surakarta city, the I F Ir R structure found as much as 4 structures.

4.5 I R Ir R F R Structure

The I R Ir R F R structure consists of initiation, response, re-initiation, response, feedback, and response. In other words, an exchange is found in the

structure of I R Ir R F R beginning with initiation, responded with feedback, followed by re-initiation, and then continued by response. The interaction of I R Ir R F R structure is found below.

(6) Questioner: *Ini berhubungan dengan sholat. Nah sehabis sholat dhuha kan ada sholat rawatib dua rekaat. Terus itu kan ada yang melakukan, terus seorang datang itu langsung makmum gitu. Itu gimana Ustad?* (I) [This deals with prayer. Well, after praying *dhuha* there is no *rawatib* prayer for two *rekaat*. Then, in case there is someone who did, and the one who came was instantly follow him up. That's what Ustadz?]

Da'i: *Ya sudah, ya ndak ngerti yang dimakmumi ya sudah, ... yang ndak ngerti kan yang yang yang yang makmum tadi kan nggak ngerti itu sholat rawatib, ya sudah sah, sesuai dengan niatnya masing-masing, yang sholat rawatib dapat rawatibnya, yang makmum dapat jamaahnya.* (R) [Yes already, in case the one really does not know. it is permissible, ... who does not understand that the one who becomes the *makmum* 'follower of a congregational prayer did not understand it is a *rawatib* prayer, so it is legal, in accordance with the each personal intention, the one who did *rawatib* prayer will be counted for the *rawatib*, and one who's following will be counted for congregational prayer]

Questioner: Boleh? (Ir) [So is it permissible?]

Da'i: Boleh, artinya kalau *ndak ngerti* boleh. Tapi kalau makmum dengan sholatnya orang su..., sholat sunnah itu tidak ada, tapi *ndak ngerti.* (R)

Mad'u: Langsung datang langsung. (F) [just after immediately come in]

Dai: *A* datang iya, *pokoknya* ada ikut, boleh (R) [A comes in, as if there is, the one is permissible to follow]

The above interaction is an exchange that begins with the act of conveying the introductory and elicitation acts expressed by the questioner, responded by the preacher's act of replying, followed by the questioner's act of elicitation, responded back by the preacher's act of replying, interrupted act without necessarily commenting, and responded by the preacher's act of answering. The exchange refers to I R Ir R F R structure and found as much as 2 structures.

4.6 I R Ir R Ir R Ir R Structure

The I R Ir R Ir R Ir R structure means an exchange consist of repetitive responses and reactions which occurred for three times. The I R Ir R Ir R Ir R

structure includes three structural elements, namely the structural element of I (initiation), the structural elements of Ir (re-initiation) and R (response).

(7) Questioner: *Tanya Ustadz, ini kalau penyembelihan qurban tidak di masjid gimana? Tidak sekitar masjid, sebab tempat saya ada itu tempat pengajian tapi bukan masjid* (I) [May I ask for question, Ustadz] how if the slaughtering for *qurban* is not undertaken in mosques? Out of the mosque either, because my home is a place for studying, not even a mosque].

Da'i: Kalau tadi saya sampaikan itu di mushola.
(R) [I just said in *mushalla*]

Questioner: Bukan mushola itu. (Ir)

Da'i: *Lha iya, sebentar. Kalau di masjid itu ada... ada segi negatifnya menjadikan bau mesjid tidak enak tidak sedap dan kita dianjurkan untuk memperwangi masjid kita. Jadi sebalik sebaiknya itu tidak di sekitar masjid. Tapi kalau ndak ada tempatnya, jadi malah bagus Pak kalau di...* (R) [Of course, wait a minute, in case there is a mosque ... there would also be negative aspects that probably will generate smell on our mosque area while we are recommended to decorate our mosque with fragrance. Thus, the opposite should not be around the mosque. But if there were no place, so it is even better if in....]

Questioner: Boleh? (Ir) [So is it permissible?]

Da'i : *Tempat di mana ...* (R) [what places (do you mean)?]

Questioner: Jadi... jadi lebih jauh dari masjid (Ir)

Da'i : *Lha iya... Nabi juga melaksanakannya di tempat sholat itu tidak di masjidnya. kalau disini ya tempat kosong mungkin ada... ada halaman, a... ada apa... pekarangan yang kosong kita sembelih di sana. Sebab yang sudah-sudah itu di samping masjid kemudian karena daging yang kecil-kecil itu sulit untuk disapu, *dianu itu wis dikei karbol barang telung dina jik mambu mesjide*. Kalau itu diusahakan jangan sampai begitu. Mangga bagaimana caranya. (R)*

The above interaction is an exchange beginning with the acts of asking for attention, elicitation, and the acts of giving information by the questioner, responded by the act of unanswering by the *da'i*, responded by the act of elicitation by the questioner, exchanged by the act of responding by the questioner, interrupted by the act of giving information by the questioner, ending up with the act of responding by the *dai* or preacher. The series of actions established the I R Ir R Ir R Ir R structure. This structure was found 3 times].

5 CONCLUSION

From the findings, it can be concluded that the structure of exchange in the discourse of dialogical preaching is more dynamic so as to find various modifications of structural exchange from the theory of origin put forward by Sinclair and Coulhard (1975). The six regular structures comprise of the regular exchanges reflected in the discourse of dialogical preaching in Surakarta city.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, Asep Abbas, 2010, "*Jenaka dalam Dakwah Ulama: Studi Kasus di Pesantren Tebuireng Desa Cakir Kecamatan Diwek Kabupaten Jombang (Kajian Sociolinguistik)*". Dissertation. Doctoral Degree on Linguistics. Postgraduate Program. Surakarta: Univeristas Sebelas Maret.
- Atmawati, Dwi, 2002, "*Register Dakwah: Studi Kasus Dakwah Islam oleh K.H. Zainudin, M.Z.: Kajian Sociolinguistik. Master Thesis. Linguistics Program. Humanities Studies*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Atmawati, Dwi, 2009, "*Wacana Dakwah Beberapa Dai/Daiyah Terkemuka di Indonesia*". Dissertation. Linguistics Department Faculty of Humanities. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Coulthard, M., 1985, *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.
- Gusneti, 2007, "Penggunaan Bahasa Mubaligh dalam Pengajian Ramadhan di Mesjid Cahaya Rohani Pasir Sebelah Padang: Suatu Tinjauan Sociolinguistik" in National Linguistics Congress XII. Surakarta, September 3-6, 2007.
- Hadisaputra, Widada, 1994, "Gejala Interferensi dalam Bahasa Jawa: Studi Bentuk Tutaran Khotbah Agama Islam" dalam *Jurnal Jala Bahasa*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Hidayat, Dudung Rahmat, 1999, "*Pemakaian Bahasa Indonesia Ragam Lisan oleh Para Khotib di Kotamadya Bandung: Studi Deskriptif Terhadap Ragam dan Fungsi Bahasa*". Tesis. Bandung: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Irawati, Lydia, 2004, "Interferensi Bahasa Sunda pada Dakwah Bahasa Indonesia K.H. Abdullah Gymnastiar (Aa Gym)" dalam *Metalingua* Volume 2 No. 1 Juni 2004. Bandung: Balai Bahasa Bandung.
- Morozov, M.Evgeniy, 2015, Current Trends in Church Sermons. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 200, 22 August 2015, pp. 496-501.
- Maksan, Marjusman, 2001, "Alih Kode dalam Pengajian Ramadan" dalam *Linguistik Indonesia*. Jakarta: MLI dan Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Ma'ruf, Amir, 1999, "Wacana Khotbah Jumat: Studi Kasus Empat Masjid di Yogyakarta". Tesis. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.

- Raine, P, 2010, *An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of discourse analysis*. Retrieved January 2011, from http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/raine_sinc-coul.pdf.
- Sadhono, Kunderu, 2005, "Analisis Wacana Khotbah Jumat: Pendekatan Mikrostruktural dan Makrostruktural". Laporan Penelitian. Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Sadhono, Kunderu, 2011, "Wacana Khotbah Jumat di Kota Surakarta Sebuah Kajian Sosiopragmatik". Disertasi. Program Pascasarjana Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Sauntson, H, 2012, *Approach to Gender and Spoken Classroom Discourse*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- Sinclair, John & Malcolm Coulthard, 1975, "Toward an Analysis of Discourse" In Malcolm Coulthard (editor) *Advanced in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge
- Subagyo, P. Ari, 2000, "Alih Kode sebagai Salah Satu Kunci Sukses Ceramah K.H. Zainudin, M.Z." dalam *Jurnal Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Sanata Dharma*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Susanto, Djoko, 2006, "Codeswitching in Islamic Religious Discourse: The Role of Insha'Allah", A paper presented to the Second Annual Rhizomes: Re-visioning Boundaries Conference of The School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies, The University of Queensland, in Brisbane, 24–25 February 2006.
- Stubbs, Micheal, 1983, *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- White, A., 2003, *The application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF structure to a classroom lesson: analysis and discussion*. Retrieved January 2011, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/AWhite4.pdf>.