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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 Sinak 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. Similarity, 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: Yeni 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 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Exchange</th>
<th>Structural Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Elicitation of teacher</td>
<td>I R F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Direction of teacher</td>
<td>I R (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information of teacher</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Elicitation of student</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information of student</td>
<td>I F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Main Class of Lessons Change.

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 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 Coulthard (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) IRI R structure, (3) IRFR structure, (4) IF Ir R structure, (5) IR Ir RRR 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 miriki. Ngoten pripun? (I)
Da‘i: Nek, lhaaana...nggih niku. Nek kula prinsep, yang yang paling sering njenengan jumaha pundi, itu yang diutamakan. Nek, puadha-padhane, ya asep jawaal loro ya ra isoh, noko dijawaal loro ya dijawaal loro, nggih. Nek ora bareng nika karoo an isoh njawaal. Neng yang kedah kita jawaal niku, engkang kita kalina wonten miriku, 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?
Da‘i: Ya (R)

Questioner: Selesai di, apa innaka hamidun majid baca yang lain boleh? (I) [ended up in, is it innaka hamidun majid, (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 ai re kaufu hantum nahiyanakun uniddikhaari adubil adhioqi kata Rasululllah dulu saya melaran kamu untuk menyimpan daging, daging kurban al aan atau ada fat ja’ulu waaminu waddakhiitu tiga hal makananlah dan berikan kepada orang-orang, yang ketiga simpanlah, boleh kamu menyimpanannya. Dan ketika Nabi me (-) setelah menyembelih ternak kurban, ah namanya, ada yang kurban ada yang; ya apa ketika haji itu, ada dam,atau ..... (R)
Da‘i: OhNm lhaaaa....nggih. .... (R)
Ma’du: Atau namanya apa haidibiyu itu Nabi juga mengatakan ketika di Mina fat iddakhiitu simpanlah dan boleh sampai menuju ke Mekkah tu membawa daging sambelinan 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 hamidun majid, setelah selesai ataukah setelah doa allahumma inni a’udzubika minal apakah itu termasuk daripada yang dianjurkan atau memang apa ada dasar hakumnya? mohon penjelasannya! (Ir)


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 da’i. 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 maksimun itu. 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 Ustad?]}

Da’i: Ya sudah, ya ndak ngerti yang dimakmumi ya sudah, ... yang ndak ngerti kan yang yang yang yang maksun tadi kan nggak ngerti itu sholat rawatib, ya sudah sab, sesuai dengan niatnya masing-masing, yang sholat rawatib dapet rawatibnya, yang maksun dapet jamaibnya. (R) [Yes already, in case the one really does not know it is permissible, ... who does not understand that the one who becomes the maksun ‘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 maksun dengan sholatnya orang su..., sholat sunnah itu tidak ada, tapi ndak ngerti. (R)

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

Da’i: 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 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 penyemb-lishan qurban tidak di masjid gimana? Tidak sekitar masjid, sebab tempat saya ada itu tempat pengayian 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, sebenta. Kalau di masjid itu ada… ada segi negatifnya menjadikan bau masjid tidak enak tidak sedap dan kita dianjurkan untuk memperwangi masjid kita. Jadi sebalik sebaliknya itu tidak di sekitar masjid. Tapi kalau tidak 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 place (do you mean?)

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

Da’i : Lha iya… Nabi juga melaksanaknya 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 disup, dia su ini wis dikei karbol barang telung dina jik nambo meside. Kalau itu disuahkan 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 unanswerings 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 da’i or preacher. The series of actions established the I 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.
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