

# EXCHANGE STRUCTURES BETWEEN SELLERS AND BUYERS AT THE DELI OLD TOWN TRADITIONAL MARKET

Herawati Br Bukit<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Postgraduate Studies the State University of Medan, Medan, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: herawatibukithera@yahoo.com

**Abstract-** This research is aimed to derive exchanges structures occurring between sellers and buyers in the market, investigate how exchanges are realized linguistically and reason for the use of exchanges structures between sellers and buyers at Deli Old Town Traditional Market. This research was conducted by using descriptive qualitative research. The data was the clauses produced by the sellers and the buyers. The data was analyzed based on Martin theory. The result of analysis found that there were two conversational systems, namely, of typical and uncommon contexts or congruent and metaphorical coding. In conversational structures, as the realizations of conversational systems, it was found some marked structures. Normally, the structures of giving and asking for information are represented by k1 and k2, but it was found some hindrances in bargaining language, there are other representations, namely k2 followed by k1(k2) or question followed by question. It was happened because social context influences the exchange structure in the dialogues and the verbal violence that are the social context, situation and concept of traditional market that include to language style of sellers and buyers whereas sellers and buyers retaining the price, whereas the negotiation will success if the price give benefit to seller and it is fit to buyer. The buyers want to get best product with cheapest price, while the sellers want to get most benefit from their product. In addition, exchanges structure that found was exchange dynamic since it was found ch, rch, cf, rcf, cl, rcl and the exchange structure that found were k1, k2^k1, k2^k1^k2f, k2^k1^k2f^k1f, dk1^k2^k1^k2f, a1, a2^a1, a2^a1^a2f, a2^a1^a2f^a1f, da1^a2^a1, da1^a2^a1^a2f, da1^a2^a1^a2f^a1f. Based on the findings, it was recommended to the other researchers who are interested in analyzing the Exchanges Structure to conduct such a research with different variable such as can use the newspaper or other sources to know and understand the flow of conversation.

**Keywords:** exchange structures, congruent coding, metaphorical coding, social context, market concept, bargaining language, language style, exchange dynamic

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Market is the important place for human life whereas going to the market is a daily activity for human body help. But human body must see the social and culture context because in the market communities the language that used among one seller with another seller or one buyer with the other buyer is different, but the most language that they used not standardized and informal. To determine the understanding of the communication, it needs to know the relationship between language and context. If human body doesn't see the social context, the sale interaction will not happen and it also occur the social gap. Therefore, it must be studied to know or to understand the meaning that is intended by the researcher, it is not only to understand the intended meaning or phrase is used, but it is required to take knowledge and conclusion about what it was said or written by use the existing context and also analyzed the exchange structure that produced from seller and buyer.

The social and cultural differences between sellers and buyers cause the unique of language use, especially bargaining activities in the market. The social differences such as job, education level, age and gender influence someone characteristics. Sellers's speeches that occur in a market community have aims to direct, guide, instruct, suggest and to persuade purchasers. All their speeches have their own functions. This matter intended to simplify and speed up the interaction of sale reached fast. It also occurs between sellers and buyers that influence bargain language that use to get the exact price according to buyers and also give benefit to sellers. The main problem of this case is the exchange structure that occurs between sellers and buyers to reach the agreement in bargain interaction.

Interaction between addressee and addresser in face to face conversation with in written conversation is different. Face to face conversation always involves body languages and gestures. But

in written conversation that can be only realized in move. Move is defined as the function and the commodity being exchange. When somebody is raising question (asking information) the move made by the addresser is termed *k2* “secondary knower” whereas another is providing the answer (proving information) the move made by the addressee is *k1* “primary knower”. When the interaction between the addresser and addressee is exchange information on goods and services, terms of *a2* “secondary actor” and *a1* “primary actor”, the move is structured by  $a2 \wedge a1$  and further may be followed by  $a2f \wedge a1f$ .

Delitua Traditional Market opened on 1960, it is located at the major road Delitua Pamah, Delitua eastern village, district of Delitua, but since 2013, Delitua Traditional Market change name into Deli Old Town Traditional Market. Deli Old Town Traditional market is place to interact between sellers and buyers, sellers sell a variety of merchandise ranging from our daily needs such as rice, fish, vegetables, glassware, clothing, and others. When there is interaction between seller and buyer, they use language as a communication tool and they do the exchange of their conversation and the exchange of each utterance that they used occur directly without see the structure of each utterance, whereas exchange structure is the subject in this study, researcher wanted know exchange structures are used in social interaction at Deli Old Town Traditional Market.

The reasons for this study are, firstly, sellers and buyers have the uniqueness of their language when make negotiation and we must know the social and culture context in the market, if we don't know about it, the sale interaction will not be happened and it will be happen the social gap. This case results the structure of the selling and buying conversation is very dynamic and complex and sometimes it doesn't fulfill the system and conversation structure that proposed by [7] and this case is important problem in this research. Secondly, their speech functions are usually realized in interaction although they use body language. And thirdly, throughout the researcher's knowledge, study of exchange structure that performed at Deli Old Town Traditional Market don't ever do by other researchers, this factor that make researcher is interested to study it.

Exchange Structure is the process of exchanging information in conversation. The components of conversation will take their turn during conversation. There are three components in conversation; they are speaker, message, and listener. In other terms, some linguists use the term addresser, message and addressee, but they still stand in the same reference. In interactions, the speakers realize their roles. Dealing with the role of the speaker in conversation, the terms *moves* is used. Moves is defined as the function or role played by a speaker (addresser) in a conversation with its relations to the function or role played by the hearer (addressee) and commodity being exchanged [10]. With information exchanges the situation is more complex; it is not simply a matter of introducing a contradictory modality because these either function as or to negotiate the *k1* move. Rather, as with exclamations, interlocutors have to avoid grading probability or usually completely. The easiest way to do this following a *dk1* or *k2* move is to claim ignorance [10].

Exchange structure analysis (ESA) has significant advantages over other discourse analytic approaches in that the model is based on a comprehensive, systemic language model making it possible to describe and quantify discourse patterns at different strata and with varying levels of detail; secondly, conversations are understood as a way of doing social life and seen as enacting and constructing dimensions of social identity and interpersonal relations [1]. ESA focuses on the interpersonal dimension of discourse and therefore on the social identities speakers take up or allow each other, making visible the power relations between participants.

In conversation, the speaker who is raising question is not really to search the information that s/he does not understand. But s/he seems to delay the telling information [7]. This is commonly found in seller and buyer conversation in make negotiation when *seller* gives the lie answer. It does not mean that seller does not know the answer, but she/he wants to get much profit for her/his sale. In this case, the exchange structure is different. This is to say that exchange structure is the instrument of analysis of the conversation in language point of view, specifically discourse analysis point of view [10].

It can be said that the move of *dk1* indicates a speaker who seems to ask information but s/he really knows the information. Thus, s/he delays telling the information to the interlocutor. This is often found in *seller and buyer* phase where *seller* raises the question for *their buyer*. *Seller* knows the answer to the question and it is the seller's ways in making transaction in the market (Saragih, 2013:28 - 29). For example:

dk1      Seller : *Carii kan apa dek?*

- (What kinds of fish that you want?)  
k2 Buyer : *Ikan tongkolnya berapa sekilo bu*  
(How much is the price of mackerel fish?)  
k1 Seller : *Rp 29.000 dek. Baru ikannya ne dek*  
(Rp 29.000. It's fresh, sist)

- da1 : Delayed primary actor (the person who delays giving goods and services)  
a1 : Primary actor (the person who gives goods and services)  
a2 : Secondary actor (the person who demands goods and services)  
a1f : Primary actor follow up move  
a2f : Secondary actor follow up move

Tracking is one of exchange dynamics that heads the interruption which focuses on experiential meaning. Clearly, in order to negotiate interpersonal meaning, interlocutors have to agree on what they negotiating about. Consequently, any comprehensive treatment of conversational structure must include discussion of the resources used to ensure that the experiential meaning under consideration is shared. One common signal of this is the back channel (bch), which is proceeding smoothly (this phenomenon is most prominent in telephone conversation). These are realized paralinguistic ally (*hm, mm, etc*) and by polarity items (*yes, yeah, no*). They typically occur during another speaker's turn and do not appear to be sensitive to phonological, grammatical or discourse boundaries [7].

**Table 1.** Key to Codes Used in ESA [7]

Type of Move	Code
<i>Synoptic Moves</i>	
Person giving information	k1
Person receiving information	k2
Follow up move by k1	k1f
Follow up move by k2	k2f
Delayed k1 move	dk1
Person carrying out action	a1
Person in receipt of action	a2
Follow up move by a2	a2f
Follow up move by a1	a1f
<i>Dynamic Moves</i>	
Tracking moves	
Back channel	bch
Check	check
Response to check	rcheck
Clarification	cl
Response to clarification	rcl
Confirmation	rcf
Replay	rp
Response to replay	rrp
Challenging moves	
Challenge	ch
Response to challenge	rch
Justification	just
Response to justification	rjust

## 2. METHODS

The design of this study was the application of descriptive qualitative research design. The researcher used the qualitative research design because it describes and interprets what concerns with the condition or relationship that exist, opinion that are held, processes that are going on, effect that are evident or trends that are developing.

The data of this research was clauses found in the conversation from direct observation through interaction from 10 participants (sellers and buyers) at Deli Old Town Traditional Market. The sources of data were 5 sellers and 5 buyers at Deli Old Town Traditional Market. The sellers came from less lasting and long lasting goods commodity. Less lasting goods commodity consists of consist of onion, potato, chili, vegetables, tomato, and meat. Long lasting goods commodity consist of shoes, glassware, stationery, trousers and bags.

In this research, the research instruments that used for data collection were observation sheet that was useful to record anything that happens that may not be recorded, image and sound recording which cellular phone was used to capture the image of sellers and buyers when they made the bargaining and negotiation transaction and also used to record the voice of the conversation among sellers and buyers whereas the researcher hoped this tool could obtain accurate data about the exchange structure or conversation structure and the conversation context and guided interview used to collect data.

The data was collected through record the conversational sound of exchange structure among sellers and buyers at Deli Old Town Traditional Market. Then, these data converted into a written transcription.

The data were analyzed by performing the interactive models of Miles, [6] state that there are three phases that are needed during the analysis processes; three current flows of activities are: (a) data condensation, (b) data display, (c) conclusion drawing and verifying. According to them, the data were obtained from the field analyzed through the following stages:

- a. Data condensation includes editing, selection and summary of data without losing valuable information. Data condensation also include abstracting and focusing. Relate to this study, the editing was done because it found many unnecessary sounds that were recorded from the result data through record, such as the other buyers' sound that came to bargain the other products from target sellers, the other sellers' sound that called the buyers so that the buyers bought their products and also the other noisy sounds. In this study, the researcher selected the utterances in the form of sentences become to clause.
- b. Data Display is an activity to interpret data that has been interpreted by informant to the problems that have been studied. In this study, data doesn't need to display, so the researcher only analyzed data.
- c. Conclusion drawing and verification are the conclusions based on the composition of a narrative that has been arranged, so that researcher can obtain answers to questions on the research problem.

### **3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

After the analysis conducted, some findings were found as the answer for the questions in chapter one, it was found that: Exchange structures that were found between sellers and buyers at Deli Old Town Traditional Market presented by corresponding moves of information to those of goods and services exchanges. They were:  $k1$ ,  $k2^k1$ ,  $k2^k1^k2f$ ,  $k2^k1^k2f^k1f$ ,  $dk1^k2^k1^k2f$ ,  $a1$ ,  $a2^a1$ ,  $a2^a1^a2f$ ,  $a2^a1^a2f^a1f$ ,  $da1^a2^a1$ ,  $da1^a2^a1^a2f$ ,  $da1^a2^a1^a2f^a1f$ .

From above result, it is showed that  $k2^k1$  was the dominant structure. As we know that in the conversation between sellers and buyers, there was no knowledge before about what kinds, mode, size of goods and the goods quantity. The research result found that there were many conversations didn't follow the Martin theory [7]. The main important thing that must discussed in this research is the corresponding moves of information, that was  $k2^k1(k2)$ . It was happened because as social beings, humans live in the circle social interaction. In the association, this interaction often causes conflict avoiding social conflict. Social Conflicts arise because of the mismatch between desire and reality. If the collision is expressed through language, talking activity able become verbal violence. So, it come back again to social context whereas include setting, participant, end, act sequence, key, instrument, norm and genre [3]. According to [4], the communicative action depends to topic, mood, social context, situation, social level, age, and urgency to be conveyed. So, the factors that make question followed by question ( $k2^k1(k2)$ ) occurred in this market because the verbal violence that are the social context and situation of traditional market that include to language style of sellers and buyers whereas seller want to have much profit because to buy more goods give much profit than buy less. In this context, it also give advantage to buyer because if the price is cheaper if buyer buy more than buy less. So, they have desire to tell anything.

**Table 2.** Corresponding Moves of Information and Goods and Services Exchanges at Deli Old Town Traditional Market.

No	Exchange Structures	Number
1.	k1	1
2.	k1 ^ k2f	-
3.	k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	-
4.	k2 ^ k1	11
5.	k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f	4
6.	k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	9
7.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1	-
8.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f	1
9.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	-
10.	a1	3
11.	a1 ^ a2f	-
12.	a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f	-
13.	a2 ^ a1	4
14.	a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f	4
15.	a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f	6
16.	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1	1
17.	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f	3
18.	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>50</b>

Exchange structures that found in the seller and buyer conversation at Deli old Town Traditional Market were realized linguistically in term of speech function, speech function is realized in mood, and speech function and mood is realized in congruent and metaphorical coding. Linguistically, exchange structures realized in term of speech function that occur their conversation are divided into initiating and responding. Initiating that occur in their conversation are statement (S), question (Q), offer (O), and Command (C). Responding that occur in their conversation are acknowledgement statement (AS), response statement to question (RSQ), acknowledgement to offer (AO), and response offer to command (ROC). It was found the exchange structure of k1 continue to k1(k2). And it is realized linguistically in term of speech function in response statement to question followed by question. In this case, question does not replied by answer, but question replied by question. The researcher found the different case of conversation and it doesn't fulfill the system or conversation structure theory. Speech functions are congruently expressed mood which build conversational structure. Here, moods were fully as the realization of speech functions. Although, it was found that it was clear of the sellers that elliptical declarative is dominantly used in the bargaining interaction and the dominant mood used by buyers was interrogative. Thus, in their marked or congruent and incongruent representation their basic speech functions. The researcher found that the conversation between sellers and buyers congruent coding is more dominant than metaphorical coding.

The reasons of exchanges structured realized by sellers and buyers in the way they are as follow:

- Social context influences the exchange structure in the dialogues. Social conflicts arise because of the mismatch between desire and reality. If the collision is expressed through language, talking activity able become verbal violence. So, it come back again to social context whereas include setting, participant, end, act sequence, key, instrument, norm and genre [5]. According to [4], the communicative action depends to topic, mood, social context, situation, social level, age, and urgency to be conveyed If evidence in later talk reveals that it has misunderstood something earlier on their conversation, it happens because the verbal violence that are the social context and situation of traditional market that include to language style of sellers and buyers whereas sellers and buyers retaining the price, whereas the negotiation will success if the price give benefit to seller and it is fit to buyer.
- The sellers and buyers did not know about lexicogrammar especially the roles of speech function in the communication systematically

- The sellers and buyers used the personal life style of communication and they didn't use the formal language style, so it was found that it happen the bad emotion.

After having analysis the data, there are some points as the important ones to be discussed in this study. In the theory of exchange structure, mood is the realization of speech function in written form. Then, according to the [7] there are key codes that used in exchange structure analysis and there is one to one realization between speech function and mood. There are four kinds of speech function, they are statement (giving information), question (demand information), offer (give goods & services), and command (demand goods & services). And there are three kinds of mood, they are declarative (making a statement), interrogative (asking a question) and imperative (giving a directive). In this analysis all components were found. Metaphorical function was also found in this analysis.

But, it is not same with the move analysis. There was unmarked code in the conversation. k2 was responded by k1(k2). It was found unmarked code where moves in sellers and buyers conversation were not as theory of conversation or basic unit conversation that proposed by Martin [7] where theoretically move is structured by nine constructions. And in this analysis, the researcher found more than it. For example, theoretically a2 is followed by a1, k2 response by k1, but in this case It was found that k2 was responded by k1(k2). It was happened because most dialogues were not asking and giving questions, but debating the opinion. Thus, the responses were not necessary answer of the questions. This is highlighted by the number of secondary knower/k2 as the dominant move in buyers and sellers conversation. When the sellers asking question and information, buyer didn't give information but buyers ask information back. Finally, from this analysis, the researcher found many similarities between analysis and theory, but there is a bit different of theory and analysis in term of move analysis.

Then, in accordance with speech function analysis, there were found miss three points such as greeting, response to greeting and exclamation. There were not found greeting in their conversation for example '*sehat bang, pagi bang, apa kabar bik.*' and also there were no response to greeting, and exclamation. Because, the sellers and buyers conversations are informal language, so they did not care about greeting and they didn't have planting full time to practice of greeting, response greeting and exclamation at the beginning and the end of selling in Deli Old Town Traditional Market.

Finally, in accordance with the social context and its influence in exchange structures, it showed that it can influence the structure of interaction. This is to say that a person will perform different style and expression to different people and different topic. So, the factors that make question followed by question (k2^k1(k2)) occurred in this market because the verbal violence that are the social context and situation of traditional market that include to language style of sellers and buyers whereas seller want to have much profit because to buy more goods give much profit than buy less. In this context, it also give advantage to buyer because if the price is cheaper if buyer buy more than buy less. So, they have desire to tell anything.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the data, discussing findings, conclusions are drawn as the followings: (1) There are eighteen potential exchange structures in English include information and goods and services exchange. The research result found that there were eleven exchange structures between sellers and buyers at Deli Old Town Traditional Market. Because the research result found that there were many conversations didn't follow the Martin theory. (2) Exchange structures that found in the seller and buyer at the Deli old Town Traditional Market is realized linguistically in term of speech function, speech function is realized in mood, and speech function and mood is realized in congruent and metaphorical coding. It found that it was clear of the sellers that question is dominantly used in the bargaining interaction and the dominant mood used by buyers was interrogative. Thus, in their marked or congruent and incongruent representation their basic speech functions. The researcher found that the conversation between sellers and buyers congruent coding is more dominant than metaphorical coding. And (3) The exchanges structures realized in that way because the verbal violence that are the social context, situation of traditional market and market concept that include to language style of sellers and buyers in retaining the price and the negotiation will success if the price give benefit to seller and it is fit to buyer. In addition, the buyers want to get best product with cheapest price, while the sellers want to get most benefit from their product.

## 5. REFERENCES

- [1] Berry, M. 1981. *Towards Layers of Exchange Structure for Directive Exchanges*. In : Network, 2.
- [2] Ginting, S. A. 2010. *Sistem dan Struktur Percakapan dalam Bahasa Karo*. Disertasi. Medan. USU.
- [3] Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. 1985. *Context and Text : Aspects of Language in Social Semiotic Perspectives*. Geelong : Deakin University Press.
- [4] Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London : Edward Arnold.
- [5] Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London : Edward Arnold.
- [6] Huberman, M and Miles, M.B & Saldana, J. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis : A Methods Sourcebook*. Los Angeles : Sage.
- [7] Martin, J. R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [8] Martin, J., Matthiessen, C., & Painter, C. 1997. *Working With Functional Grammar*. London : Arnold.
- [9] Saragih, A. 2004. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. Medan : UNIMED.
- [10] Saragih, A. 2013. *Discourse Analysis : A Study on Discourse Based on Systematic Functional Linguistic Theory*. Medan : UNIMED
- [11] Thomas et al. 2000. *Language Society and Power*. London: Routledge.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203426968>.
- [12] Young, L. and B. Fitzgerald. 2006. *The Power of Language: How Discourse Influences Society*. London : Equinox.
- [13] Ventola, E. 1987. *The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systemic Approach to The Semiotics of Service Encounters*. London: Frances Pinter.

