

Commerce Register Analysis of Minangkabau Vernacular in a Colloquial Conversation: A Sociolinguistics Studies

Siti Nurani

(rani_siti16@yahoo.com)

Widya

(widya.center@gmail.com)

Nico Harared

(nico.hrd@gmail.com)

University of Indraprasta PGRI

This research aims at identifying register used in the commerce colloquial conversations among sellers and buyers. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach is applied to examine the linguistic features viewed from the aspect of field, tenor and mode of discourse. Findings show that in the field of discourse, registers release the experiential domain of nouns, verbs, idiomatic expression, and word blending. The goal orientation appears to have both short and long term while the social activity results in exchanges among participants. Furthermore, in the field of tenor, participants have an equal agentive role as they have same social function. The social role is non-hierarchical and the social distance is minimal. Finally, in the mode of discourse, both constitutive and ancillary language role formed in present simple, past simple and future simple. The channel is phonic and the medium is spoken with visual contact as it is characterized by the use of back channel signs. The Systemic Functional Linguistics approach employed in this research could be used as the parameter for educators in teaching Sociolinguistics especially in conducting discourse analysis in various colloquial discourse contexts.

Keywords: SFL, commerce register, conversation, Minangkabau vernacular

Penelitian ini bertujuan mengidentifikasi register yg digunakan dalam 'commerce colloquial conversations' antara penjual dan pembeli. 'Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL) digunakan untuk memeriksa fitur linguistic dari aspek field, tenor and mode discourse. Penemuan menunjukkan bahwa dalam discourse, register yang muncul adalah kata benda, kata kerja, ekspresi idioms, dan pencampuran kata. Orientasi tujuan yang muncul keduanya memiliki term singkat dan panjang. Dalam tenor partisipan memiliki peran agen yang sama. Terakhir, pada mode discourse, peran bahasa konstitutif berbentuk present simple, past simple dan future simple. Systemic Functional Linguistics approach yang digunakan pada studi ini dapat digunakan sebagai parameter untuk mengajarkan sosiolinguistik, khususnya analisa discourse di berbagai konteks discourse kolokial.

INTRODUCTION

Language as a medium for communication has a great variety of purposes. By using language, people can exchange experience and can recognize others well. The use of language varies in some respects in such contexts of situations. Language varies according to its uses as well as its users and also according to the contexts of situations being talked. Languages are

distinguished by their status and social function into two language varieties, which are spoken differently in two different contexts of situations (i.e., in formal and in informal context). In various formal contexts, such as at court, groups of people tend to use language variety known as standard language that has been standardized and codified. In contrast, in such informal domains, groups of people will tend to use language variety used in everyday interaction that is generally referred to vernacular language.

As far as the study of language and society in the classrooms context is concerned, teaching Sociolinguistics at every level of education serves higher attention to the language use in such classroom contexts. The language (or dialects) difference may arise problems to the use of classroom language. That language problems are mainly often found in the cultured students' classes that can be as a major cause of miscommunication among them. Students from different culture might deliver the speech by using their mother tongue. In accordance, they might also use dialect, jargon, register, or other specific utterances in their communication.

Students nowadays tend to use a more relaxed language (commonly called as vernacular) both to teachers and to their mates without considering the formality of the talk. This situation, of course, could affect the learning-teaching process. Hence, it is a task for educators to employ an approach in increasing their motivation to learn language that deals with the classroom's society appropriately. By teaching Sociolinguistics, educators may find easier to teach students to achieve their message of the talk. One of the approaches that can be used to teach language use in various classroom discourse contexts is known as Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This is taken a significant approach as it serves the theory of language centred around the notion of language function. SFL accounts for a structured-systemic language approach by examining the context of situations. SFL here can be assumed as the approach that could facilitate students to use better classroom language by seeing many aspects of situations (topic, participants, and so forth).

As it is discussed, students might deliver such specific vocabularies or utterances (generally known as register) as their communicative need. Register in this context is generally used in the informal setting and are initially only used at certain events that may evolve into a vernacular language as it is used in daily life of its community. Furthermore, Holmes (2013) stated that there are three components of meaning of vernacular. The first component is the vernacular language is not standardized and codified. The first component is the most widely used as a reference to classify a language into the vernacular. The second component is the way of language acquisition, in which vernacular language acquired in the house and used as the first variety. The fact that vernacular language used as the language for relatively circumscribed function is a component of the third meaning of the vernacular.

In a wider context of communication, groups of people in a specific field will use the forms of vernacular language in different ways. They will use specific language variety of vernacular to convey messages to ease their communication which is commonly known as register. The term register is defined as "A variety of language associated with particular groups of people or particular circumstance of use" (Holmes, 2007:259). Register can also be defined as a variety according to use. Moreover, register is also defined as the variety of language associated with people's occupation used in the pursuance of one's job.

Wardhaugh (2002) emphasized the term registers as sets of vocabularies items associated with occupational groups. It is certainly true that a number of studies have focused on the registers analysis employed by specific groups in such particular discussions. There are a number of important factors that can influence the choice of using register. Those important factors are participants (who the speaker is speaking: the addressor, and who the speaker is speaking to: addressee), the social setting (where the participants are speaking), the topic (what topic is being talked about), the function (why the participants are speaking), and the social

distance and formality (what relationship exists between the participants). Register is, therefore, known as conditioned discourse oriented variety of language. Register may be classified on the basis of style. This refers to the relation among the participating people who engage in interaction. It is stylistic and functional as the language used in a narrow range of informal domains.

Accordingly, Halliday and Hasan (1989) defined register is narrowly defined in the correlation of the variables of situation. Here, register is said to be as a variety according to use includes three parameters of context of situation which it is used, that is, field, tenor and mode of discourse. The first variable, '*field of discourse*', refers to 'what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what is it the participants are engaged in, what is the text about?' Second, '*tenor of discourse*', refers to 'who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships'. This variable functions as a marker of formality and intimacy of relationship between the speaker matters that commonly affects phonology, and accent. Third, '*mode of discourse*', refers to 'what part the language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, including the channel and the rhetorical mode'.

The way people communicate in different contexts clearly reflects the relation of the register use and the context itself. The use of register varies according to the context of situation in which it is used. People who are in a particular situation make certain linguistic choices based on that situation. The language people use needs to be appropriate to the context of situation being used. Context of speech in register use is very important and has to be appropriate to the individual of speaker as well as to particular occasions and situations. It plays an important role for speaker who chooses or decides the code or variety used in communication (Holmes, 2007). In other words, context is characterized as an influence factor on the use of register among interlocutors involved.

Many scholars have carried out investigation of register variation in some particular discussions. Some of them are Jankowski (2006), Anderson (2006), Olateju & Yusuf (2006). These scholars investigated the register analysis in such discussions, such as "a corpus-based variationist analysis" by Jankowski (2006); "corpus-based study" on the phraseology of administrative French by Anderson (2006); and "consultative register analysis" on the back-channel behavior by Olateju & Yusuf (2006). Jankowski (2006) did the research of the *s-* vs. *of-*genitive in standard Canadian English by presenting a corpus-based variationist analysis. The research was aimed at focusing on cross-register variation and change in Canadian English. In this research, *s-* and *of-*genitive tokens were extracted from two Canadian English register spanning 1906–2006: journalistic prose (N=703) and Ontario "Hansard" (transcripts of formal parliamentary debates, N=481). The finding of the research shows that the increase of the *s-*genitive is over time in both registers, with journalistic prose leading the change. It is said that animate subject is the strongest predictor of *s-*genitive and the "economy" factors are currently being coded in order to determine the contribution of intra-register factors to the change. However, spread of the *s-*genitive into a highly constrained subtype of inanimate subjects—places (N=271)—is apparent in both registers. This indicates a possible grammatical change in conjunction with register change.

Another scholar, Anderson (2006) did the analysis of register used in administrative French within the context of European United (EU). He focused the analysis on the collocations of "can't" in administrative French. The object of the study is administrative French, both at home and in the EU, showing the cross influence of national and EU administration speak on each other. The analysis was conducted by overviewing the register of administrative language

into a sociolinguistic context by looking at the linguistic situation in the EU, particularly as regards the role of the French language. The purpose of the analysis was aimed at defining the collocations of “can’t” by using the phraseological approach within a corpus linguistic perspective. Finding has shown that French of the EU has an influence on French internal administrative language, hence legal and political notions.

Furthermore, Olateju & Yusuf (2006) did the analysis of backchannels and their relative functions in the development of the theme of the play “*Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again*” by Ola Rotimi. It was observed that there is a preponderance of backchannel items which is one of the features of spoken or interactive discourse. The analysis is aimed at examining how along with characterisation and cleverly woven language these backchannel items heighten the hilarious and comical effect of Ola Rotimi’s *Our Husband Has gone Mad Again* which is meant to ridicule the selfishness and naivety of neo-colonial African politicians. Findings have shown that language items in the analysis were identified in relation to the characters involved, of which different characters used different fragments depending on their social and educational exposure. Fragments such as ‘ehen’, (surprise) ‘e-he-en’, (I said so) ‘aahen’ (It is so) are close adaptations from the Yoruba language. It is also important to note that ‘ooh’, ‘uh’, can also be attention seeking in conversations.

The use of register is found in many vernaculars, one of them is spoken by people in West Sumatera that is called by Minangkabau language (also known as ‘Baso Minang’ or Minang). Since West Sumatera consists of several regions, therefore Minang has variation of language. Variation of language among Minang speakers is different in each region. Some terms of register are thus also spoken differently in each region. In other words, every region in West Sumatera, such as Bukittinggi, Agam, Pariaman, Payukumbuh, Solok and Padang has its own vernacular language and characteristic, particularly to the use of register.

In certain respect, Minang speakers use register in various events to meet communication needs among specialists in the field. One of the major discussions found in Minang vernacular is the use of register in commerce field. For example, in the category of noun, the word ‘*dagiang*’ (in Bukittinggi and in Padang) could be defined as both ‘*dagiang*’ and ‘*lauak*’. Another instance, the term ‘*ikan*’ in Bahasa is known as ‘*ikan*’ or ‘*bada*’ (in Bukittinggi and Padang). Also, the term ‘*uang kembalian*’ in Bahasa is known as ‘*songsong/baliak pitih*’ (in Bukittinggi), whereas Minang speakers in Padang define the term as ‘*baliak pitih*’ only. Register of the commerce language in Minang vernacular is also occurred in the category of verb, the term ‘*maambiak-an*’ in Bukittinggi and Padang is identified as ‘*melayani pembeli*’. In addition, besides the verb ‘*maambiak-an*’, Minang speakers in Bukittinggi also know the term ‘*mambuek-an*’ as ‘*melayani pembeli*’. In this case, Minang vernacular in Bukittinggi have two different varieties of register, one term refers generally to the sense of serving customer by just taking the goods demanded by customers and serving customer by wrapping up the goods within a plastic bag.

From various instances exemplified above, it clearly shows that Minang vernacular comprises of such varieties of register, particularly of register in the commerce language used among sellers from two different regions (i.e., Bukittinggi and Padang). In conclusion, register tends to be associated and can be understood only by particular groups of people or community in a certain situation in which it is used. The choice of register is intended to give some particular groups an ease to communicate with each other. The examples above indicate different functions of their uses as they are spoken in different settings and also addressed to different speakers.

Although studies on language variation have been greatly conducted in such vernaculars, there is not much observation on the register in Minang vernacular as specialists in the commerce field which involve a situation in which it is used. Therefore, the research

formulates its focus in analyzing the linguistic features of commerce language spoken by two regions, that is, Padang and Bukittinggi seen from the Sociolinguistics perspective. For the purpose of this research, the writers adopt the theory of register as developed by Halliday and Hasan (1989) who narrowly defined register by reference of subject matter (field of discourse), to the level of formality, that is style (tenor of discourse), and to medium (mode of discourse).

The approach of Systemic of Functional Linguistics (SFL) used in this study could be used as the parameter for educators in teaching Linguistics (particularly Sociolinguistics) in relation to students' discourse analysis in various classroom colloquial contexts. For the purpose of register is analyzed, the students' comprehension in identifying register will work well. In some certain respects, there is an enrichment of particular lexical items dealing with the contextual meaning of register use.

Such angles or approaches particularly of the use of register in teaching Sociolinguistics will be also linked to several other perspectives of disciplines for educational matters, such as Corpus-based approach to define specifically of lexical items used in both spoken and written corpus. Moreover, educators are also expected to combine an information technology in the lexical items (thesaurus) design that is integrated in an online device (online thesaurus). Once the integrated design is governed, the educators then can release a more interactive learning media (i.e., an online 3D colorful pictures and corpora of lexical items of thesaurus) for the enrichment of lexical sets of register.

The use of register really depends on the context of speech being used. Therefore, educators should explore more register usage in such contexts as the register lesson can enrich vocabularies in some respects of criteria, such as the use register in a specific domain (register for ESP). The results of study are expected to be as a contribution to the enrichment of language variation mainly of the lexical sets in the commerce register. The results are also expected to give an important insight and valuable information for educators in investigating the theoretical underpinnings of language variations. This present research deals with the identification of register where the lexical and grammatical features analysis is as its main focus. This present research deals with the Sociolinguistics approach where the descriptive grammar is used to describe the phenomena in the discourse level. Thus, educators can link such approaches from various disciplines, especially in educational matters that can foster them to create a more innovative learning media used particularly in teaching Sociolinguistics in the classroom context.

METHOD

The present research aims at analyzing register in Minang vernacular seen from its Sociolinguistics perspective. The data is analyzed and described qualitatively by examining the interplay of the field, the tenor, and the mode of discourse of the *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL) to the use of linguistic features that characterizes the interaction. Qualitative method in this present research involves description and analysis. The descriptive analysis dealt with the examination of lexical and grammatical variations of the register. The data was a face-to-face recorded interaction among sellers and buyers engaging in the conversations. The analysis will start off with a discussion about the use of SFL as the parameters of situation (i.e., field, tenor, and mode of discourse) which will be used in analyzing the data by providing appropriate examples and an overview to describe each linguistic feature of register (i.e., grammatical features and lexical features) which will be then presented in the table. The research technique in this present research is conducted through several stages as follows:

Collect the data

In this starting step, the writers take the recordings of face-to-face interaction among sellers who are native speakers of Minang engaging in the conversations. The participants were about 30 to 65 years of age as sellers and buyers. The participants come from two ethnicities in Minangnese (i.e., Minang Bukittinggi and Minang Padang). The recordings are taken directly at their work place (i.e., at the shopping center or market place) for all members of participants together interacting in the commerce discussions in informal situation. The conversations are recorded by using Samsung J5 and Lenovo A7000. The recorded conversations are taken in the form of sound recordings and video recordings. The data is collected for about three months, consisting of 15 recordings of Minang Padang and 35 recordings of Minang Bukittinggi.

Transcribe the data

Once the recordings are taken, the writers transcribe the data of the conversations organizing and describing the presentation of transcription conventions which includes three main important ways to do as follows:

- a. Number every example to refer to specific lines as the readers could easily find the examples and check the context they require. This process of numbering is an effort to ease the writers to indicate the interaction orderly.
- b. Use transcription conventions to transcribe a stretch of speech relied in the interaction. The transcription conventions are aimed to capture the situation of talk as well as to inform readers of what situation happened in the interaction.
- c. Give the abbreviation of every participant's names of the research as it is beneficial for readers to know the speakers who involve in the interaction in each recording. For the sake of privacy, the writers identify the names of every participant by only mentioning their initials.

Code the data

In this step, the writers describe and mark the data by giving the codes to make the classification and the analysis of each data of recording easier. The data coding in this study is described and presented as follows:

- a. The names of the recordings on every topic discussed which are abbreviated as follows: Recording one or the first recording (R1); Recording two or the second recording (R2), Etc.
- b. The length of time for each recording, which includes the information of hour, minutes, and seconds, are written as follows: 01:12:25 which means that the recording is taken for one hour, twelve minutes and twenty five seconds; 35:40 which means that the recording is taken for thirty five minutes and forty seconds, Etc.
- c. The origins of speakers are written as follows: Bukittinggi (BKT); Padang (PDG)
- d. The types of word classes which are abbreviated and written in capital letters as follows: Noun (N); Verb (V), Etc. The example of data coding is as follow: R4/28:50/BKT/N = It

indicates that the conversation is recorded for twenty eight minutes and fifty seconds spoken by Bukittinggi people and the type of data is as the category of noun.

Analyze the data

The register analysis in this present research adopts the framework of *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL) by examining the three variables of situation as the parameters for people use register (i.e., field, tenor, and mode of discourse) in identifying the linguistic features occur (i.e., lexical and grammatical features) in the data which are identified, classified, described and presented in tables.

Draw a conclusion

In this last stage, the writers draw a conclusion based on the analysis. Here, the writers make a valid conclusion which will be noted in a description of the linguistic features used in the register in Minang vernacular, particularly of the commerce language variation in such colloquial discourse contexts.

The data of this present research is the register in Minang vernacular, particularly the linguistic features (i.e., lexical and grammatical features) used in the commerce discussions. The source of data is face-to-face conversations among sellers who are native speakers from two regions of West Sumatera (i.e., Bukittinggi and Padang). The data is recorded from various commerce discussions in such colloquial discourse contexts.

The data analysis in this present research will be based on the framework of *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL) as developed by Halliday and Hasan (1989) who identify three variables of situation that affect the way people use register, namely: field of discourse, tenor of discourse, and mode of discourse. The data is analyzed as follows:

1. Field of discourse which includes: Experiential domain; Goal orientation (short term vs. long term); Social activity
2. Tenor of discourse which involves the role relationships among the participants which varies according to: Agentive role; Social role (hierarchic vs. non-hierarchic); Social distance (minimal vs. maximal)
3. Mode of discourse which consists of three main concepts, namely: Language role (ancillary vs. constitutive); Channel (graphic vs. phonic); Medium (spoken vs. written)

FINDINGSS AND DISCUSSION

Field of Discourse

The field of discourse is identified as the discussion's exchange of the language elements between participants. This present research focuses only on the analysis of three main aspects in the category of field of discourse, namely: experiential domain, a goal orientation, and a social activity.

Experiential Domain

The main focus of this experiential domain analysis is only on the recurrent specific lexis used in the commerce field. This lexis discussion consists of four types of word classes, that is,

nouns and verbs (specifically single-word and compound or phrasal-word forms), idiomatic expressions, and blending.

Example (1) and (2) is given to illustrate how the field of discourse describes the context of situation.

R3/01:11/BKT/N

(1) ID: Nan langan panjang atau tigo parampek?

WI: [[nan tigo parampek lah.

ID: Tigo parampek.

WI: ko ciek ukuran go?

ID: iyo ciek ukuran. Nan maa **ragi** no di uni?

WI: [[Jan nan rami na ragi no, Buk. Ndak pandai wak makai baju rami ragi.

ID: Aaa nan iko lah. Nan putih gambar Jam Gadang ko, dih. Rancak tum ah. Suai jo uni.

WI: Bara ko, Buk?

ID: tigo limo.

R16/05:12/BKT/N

(2) AN: A cari, Ni?

WI: Bahan pambuek donat, Ni.

AN: [[Oo iyo. Sabanta yo.

WI: Tarigu, gulo, mantega, susu bubuk.

AN: Aa lai Ni?

WI: **Ragi** jan lupu yo, Ni. Ragi instan sin lah.

AN: Ko ni.

Note:

- Bold designates noun indicating polysemy.

Example (1) and (2) above belongs to the category of noun (single-word form) that represents polysemy, one of which is the word '*ragi*'. First, '*ragi*' as a noun meaning 'design' or '*motif/corak/pola*' in Bahasa. This meaning can be identified within the conversation of two speakers participating about buying clothes. In this conversation WI, the buyer, asked ID about a piece of clothe which does not have too much design. Moreover, the term '*ragi*' could also release in the form of noun which refers to a kind of donut ingredient.

Illustration (3) below is given to describe how the field of discourse plays the role in the context of speech being used. There are RA (56), SA (63), and WI (34) as participants involved in the conversation talking about lime.

R1/01:11/BKT/N

(3) RA: Baoklah **asam**, Buk?

SA: **Limau** Dua buah bara go?

- RA: Ko tigo limo ribu.
SA: [[tigo limo ribu.Iko?
RA: ko ampek moibu.
SA: Ndak iko ampek aa?
RA: [[Indak.
WI: **Asam** aa go, Bu?
SA: **asam** puruik. Bali agak tigo untuak ikan.
RA: **limau** ko buk? Tigo?
SA: Sapuluah si lah, Pak.=

Note:

- Bold designates the nouns indicating synonymy.

Other feature of commerce register is also described in illustration (3). The register is included as the category of single-word noun that designates synonymy. The term '*asam*' refers to 'lime' or 'jeruk nipis' in Bahasa. In Minang Bukittinggi, the term '*asam*' has similar counterpart, that is, '*limau*' that is used in some certain contexts of situations, whereas Minang Padang speakers commonly only know '*asam*'. The term '*limau*' may mislead the listener because it might also refer to a name of fruit 'jeruk' in Bahasa.

Instance (4) is also exemplified to show how field of discourse describes the context of speech situation. There are three speakers in the conversation, they are OK (36), BP (65), and WI (34), discussing about spices.

R7/52:16/BKT/N

- (4) OK : [[Jadi bawang merah jo bawang putih gabuang se duo ribu, Pa?
BP : Iyo gabuang si lah.
OK : Lado merah? **Lado**
bulek? =
BP : = Iyo yo.
OK : **Lado ijau** bulek atau
giliang, Pa?
BP : Nan bulek si lah.
OK : Lado bulek iyo ki
agiah, Pa? =
BP : = A iyo Pa. apo di Apa
lai, Pa?
OK : Lado ijau.
BP : O iyo lado ijau tadi yo.
OK : **Lado aluih** atau **lado**
kasa tadi tu Ki.
BP : Nan aluih, Pa. =

WI : = Ki bumbu giliang ko
bara lamo tahan no ko
Ki?

OK : Saminggu bisa (.)

WI : = Jadi tahan lado ko
gai agak saminggu yo=

OK : = Ki giliang tum ah ya.

WI : [[Ki manggiliang?

OK : [[Iyo. **Lado giliang**
tangan ndak **lado**
giliang masin gai tu
do.

WI : O dulu waktu iya
Kamari Amak nan
manggiliang kan =

Note:

- Bold designates the nouns indicating hyponymy.

The number of nouns identified in instance (3) above designate the hyponymy. The term '*lado*' in Minang Bukittinggi and in Minang Padang refers to '*cabai*' in Bahasa. '*Lado*' has lexical sets in its compound form, namely: '*lado aluih*' refers to '*cabai yang digiling halus*'; '*lado giliang*' defines as '*cabai giling*'; '*lado bulek*' identifies as '*cabai yang belum dihaluskan*'; '*lado ijau*' refers to '*cabai hijau (belum merah)*'; '*lado kasa*' or '*lado pacah*' that is identified as '*cabai yang ditumbuk kasar*'; '*lado jawa*' which has the same meaning with '*cabai yang dikirim dari daerah Jawa*'; '*lado kotak*' that refers to '*cabai yang dikirim dari daerah Jawa yang dikemas dalam kotak kayu*'; '*lado kutu*' is defined as '*cabai rawit*'; ' and '*lado masak*' refers to '*cabai merah*'. Moreover, the term '*lado giliang*' has two-sub subordinates, that is, '*lado giliang masin*' of which the '*lado*' is processed by machine, while '*lado giliang tangan*' is processed by hand. The meaning of *lado* itself is seen from many aspects of speech situations, depending on how it is interpreted by seeing from its color (*lado ijau* and *lado masak*), its shape (*lado kutu* and *lado bulek*), its origin (*lado jawa* and *lado kotak*), and how it is processed (*lado aluih*, *lado giliang* (i.e., *lado giliang masin* and *lado giliang tangan*), and *lado kasa* or *lada pacah*). All of those terms have the same equivalence of its interpretations for both speakers in Minang Bukittinggi and in Minang Padang. Both speakers equally find such terms in their commerce field concept.

Table 1. Noun

| Nouns |
|----------------------|
| Single-Word Nouns |

| | |
|------------|---|
| Indicating | <i>ragi: design, ingredient</i> |
| Polysemy | |
| Indicating | <i>asam, limau</i> |
| Synonymy | |
| Compound | |
| Nouns | |
| Indicating | <i>lado: lado aluih, lado</i> |
| Hyponymy | <i>bulek, lado ijau, lado kasa (or lado pacah), lado jawa, lado kotak, lado kutu, lado masak, lado giliang (lado giliang masin & lado giliang tangan)</i> |

Example (5) is examined to show how the field of discourse is used to analyze the context of situation in which it is used. There are two interlocutors, namely: YA (57), AY (36), participating in the conversation about buying banana.

R13/05:19/BKT/V

(5) YA: A cari? **Singgahlah** dulu.

AY: mmmm...

AY: **Caliaklah**, caliaklah...

AY: Buk, bara pisang ko sasikek, Buk?

YA: Nan ma?

AY: Ko buk.

YA: [[oh itu duo limo.

AY: kalau iko buk? Nan agak masak ko?

YA: samo. Duo limo jo.=

Note:

- Bold designates the verbs indicating synonymy.

Another form of commerce register found in the data is the use of verb. For example, the verb '*singgah*' in (5) shows different meaning in two distinct concepts that could mislead interlocutors who are not accustomed to commerce field concept. In the commerce concept, '*singgah*' means 'choose/have a look at the goods'. The sellers try to attract people's attention by saying or shouting the word '*singgahlah*' to show hope that the prospective buyers choose or take a look at his goods. In general concept, '*singgah*' is also a verb which means 'stop by' or '*mampir*' in Bahasa. The use of this word in two different concepts is found both in Minang Bukittinggi and in Minang Padang. In accordance, the word '*singgah*' is synonymous with '*caliak*' in this context which means 'choose/have a look at the goods'. Both '*singgah*' and '*caliak*' are frequently added by particle '*lah*' in this context to express politeness.

Instance (6) is given to point out the role of field of discourse used to analyze the context of situation. There are four interlocutors, namely: RU (48), WI (34), C (60), and IB (52), participating in the conversation about buying goods.

R14/00:12:16/BKT/V

- (6) WI : Biaso dima Pak
manggaleh, Pak?
RU : [[Oo apak manggaleh
kaliliang dunia.
WI : [[Oo **manggaleh**
babelok Pak?
RU : Iyo. Kalau bulan puaso
galeh apak tilakuang.
Sari sabalum babelok
pernah lo Apak
manggaleh bajojo.
IB : Pak, ko bara go Pak?
RU : Saratuih anam puluhan.
IB : [[Kurangan lah Pak.
RU : Indak talok di apak lai
sagitu. Tipih untuang
Apak mah.
IB : Ndeh pak, maha na
Apak maatakan
harago mah, Pak.
RU : Cubo lah cek di kadai,
lai dapek sagitu?
Ambiak lah ciek (.)
Buliah pacah talua
Apak.
C : Pak, jadi lah iko jo
nan biru ketek tu Pak.
RU : Iko Buk. Jadi saratuih
limo puluhan datang
saratuih jadi duo ratuih
limo (.)

Note:

- Bold designates the verbs indicating hyponymy.

In the category of verb, the register also appears in the form of hyponymy. As identified in instance (6) above, the term *'manggaleh'* is the superordinate of two co-hyponyms, *'manggaleh babelok'* or *'babelok'* and *'manggaleh bajojo'* or *'bajojo'*. *'Manggaleh'* in Bukittinggi and Padang is defined as *'berjualan'* or *'berdagang'*. In addition, besides the verb *'manggaleh'*, Minang speakers in Bukittinggi also know the term *'manjojoan'* or *'bajojo'* as *'berjualan asongan'* or *'berdagang asongan'*. In this case, Minang vernaculars in Bukittinggi have two different varieties of register, one term refers generally to the sense of selling goods in common as *'manggaleh'* and the other two terms *'manjojoan'* or *'bajojo'* specifically refer to the sense of selling goods that constitutes only to *'barang asongan'*. The co-hyponym of *'manggaleh bajojo'* and *'manggaleh babelok'* refers to selling something nomadically from one area to another area.

Table 2. Verb

| Verbs | |
|--------------|---|
| Single-Word | |
| Verb | |
| Indicating | |
| Synonymy | <i>singgahlah, caliaklah</i> |
| Phrasal-Word | |
| Verb | |
| Indicating | <i>manggaleh:</i> |
| Hyponymy | <i>manggaleh babelok</i> (or <i>babelok</i>), <i>manggaleh bajojo</i> (or <i>bajojo</i>) |

Example (7) is given to point out the role of field of discourse used to analyze the context of situation. There are speakers, namely: OK (36) and D (42), participating in the conversation about buying spices.

R8/25:58/BKT/IE

- (7) SA : Ambiak-an Ibuk
 langkok-langkok
 untuak randang duo
 Kilo (.)
- SI : Randang duo kilo,
 Buk?
- EM : Jon **lado pacah** ciek
 lu dih Jon.
- KA : [[**Lado kutu** ciek.
- SA : Pagi lah habih
 supadeh ciek.

- EM : Lai. Sadang
diambiak.
- SA : Diak ambiakkan lado
ijau ko ciek diak.
- YE : [[Ndak do bawang
goreng ni Ema do,
Ni?
- EM : Lai. No baganti-ganti
tukang angkek no.
- YE : [[Lah ni Ema, bara
du?
- EM : [[Lah iko si no? Duo ampek, duo ampek, ampek lapan, Yo ((pause))

Note:

- Bold designates idiomatic expression.

Some compound/phrasal word forms with idiomatic meaning that express different meanings in two different fields are also identified in the data. They are '*lado pacah*' and '*lado kutu*'. Both phrases are used in Bukittinggi and Padang. '*Lado pacah*' means a rough chili pepper in the field of commerce. It refers to chili mashed by hand not until it is smooth, the texture is still rough. In the general field concept, '*pacah*' means '*cracked*' and it of course does not collocate with chili. Another term used that collocates with chili is '*kutu*' in field of commerce used both in Bukittinggi and Padang. '*Lado kutu*' is green or red cayenne pepper that tastes so spicy. In general concept '*kutu*' is a kind of tiny insect called louse or tick. The term '*kutu*' collocates with '*lado*' as it is small, its taste and the effect of eating too much '*lado kutu*' are quite the same with ones caused by louse and ticks.

Instances (8), is given to show the role of field of discourse used to analyze the context of situation. These following conversation discuss about the use of blending.

R2/07:26/BKT/BL

- (8) SA: [[Limo puluah kini? Ndak kurang lih?
UD: Indak buk, Buk.
SA: Ampek limo lah, Pak. Ambiak duo.
UD: Ampek limo nan agak ketek ko, Buk. Ko ampek limo
SA: oo.. Iko sin lah. Piliahan nan gapuak. Nan gapuak, Pak.
UD: Bismillaahirahmaanirrahim (menyembelih ayam)
SA: Mintak isi paruik no ko agak anam buah, eh. Bara ciek du?
UD: **sibu motuih.**
SA: [[ampek limo ribu.
UD: [[ndaak buk.=

Note:

- Bold designates blending.

The above instances show the lexical sets of blending. Blend word or a blend is a word form from parts of two or more other words. These parts are sometimes, but not always morphemes. The amount of blend word is also found in commerce register in Minang vernacular. Most of them belong to quantifier. Blending words 'sibu' and 'motuih' are some instances in data. These words have undergone one of blend method that will be explained as follows:

- *Sa ribu* → *sibu* : 'seribu'

This blending is also known as with blend with overlapping. There is phonological overlap within each word, resulting in less shortening in between the two words that are being blended. As a result, the end of one word and the beginning of the second word overlap and facilitate the blend.

- *Limo ratuih* → *motuih* : 'lima ratus'

This kind of blending occurs when the end of one word is appended to the end of the end of the other.

Goal Orientation

Doing the act of convincing and proposing are very common in commerce field as it is the sellers' intention to sell their goods as many as possible. Some expressions can be used to show this intention as can be seen in the following conversation:

R14/12:16/BKT/GO

(9) RU: **baoklah baoklah** tas, dompet.

IB1: Ko bara ko, Pak?

RU: satuiah mopuluah

IB1: Ndak kurang ko, Pak?

RU: ndak. Harago, harago pas. **Ndak maha-maha** Apak agiah do.

IB2: ko ndak Ella ambiak, La?

IB1: nan ma?

IB2: ko ah nan biru.

IB1: nan biru ko bara ko, Pak?

RU: saratuiah tujuh puluah kalau nan itu.

Barang rancak go, Buk. Ndak barang cuci gudang gai ko do. Barang bukak karate go.

IB1: ndak saratuiah limo puluah si do, Pak?

RU: Ooo indak. Ndak kurang bali no do. Pas.

Note:

- Bold designates the expressions used to propose buyers.
- Underline designates the expressions used to convince buyer.

The expression *'baoklah, baoklah'* in (9) shows seller's effort to propose their prospective buyers. Furthermore, when people have already got interested in buying things, sellers usually need to convince them also by using specific language items such as the use of the word *'rancak'*. Accordingly, the sentences "*Barang rancak go, Buk. Ndak barang cuci gudang gai ko do. Barang bukak karateh go.*" in (9) shows the way how seller convinces buyer by complimenting his own good.

Social Activity

The data show that the social activity results in exchanges among participants. All participants are actively involved in conversations that may represent the communicative need from each conversation of sellers and buyers (i.e., to promote the goods, to gain more of profit, to get and to maintain relationship between sellers and buyers).

Tenor of Discourse

The *tenor* of discourse refers to the role relationship between the participants (i.e., between sellers and buyers). The *tenor* of discourse analysis in this present study involves several discussions, such as agentive role, social role, and social distance.

Agentive Roles

When doing transactions, sellers and buyers share the same agentive roles. They use the same reference of words that are specifically used in the field of commerce. Nouns indicating polysemy, synonymy, and hyponymy, verbs indicating synonymy and hyponymy, idiomatic expression, and word blending are some of the word forms found in the data showing the technical terms used as the means of communication in doing transaction.

Social Role

In this social role analysis, the attention is given to the level of expertise discussion as one of the important factors in determining the participants select the language. Illustration below shows how the tenor of discourse plays its role in defining register within the context of situation.

R15/02:28/BKT/SR

- (10) WI : Buk kopi buk. Sakiko bara ko buk?
IB : Limo ribu.
WI : Limo ribu. Sakiko si lah buk (.) kopi a ko buk?
IB : Bukik Apik.
WI : Bukik Apik.
IB : **[[Asli Bukik Apik ndak dicampua do. Urang banyak campua campua kopino siko.**
WI : Kopi ko bapangaan buek no go buk?
IB : **[[Barandang dulu.**
WI : Barandang. No kan apo ndak buk, biji-biji

- IB : **[[Iyo bajamua barandang, bamasiaakan, bakacau dalam balango. Balango gadang tanpaik mamask Pangek lai tau?**
WI : Lai buk. A tu mancaiaannyo? Bacaian dulu sabalum di randang?
IB : **[[Indak. Barandang dulu lah masak baru bacaian ka masin.**
WI : Oo ka masin lo buk.
IB : **[[Iyo kini lah ado masinno. Saisuak diadu urang dalam lasuang.**
WI : O iyo lasuang yo buk. =

The social role analysis illustrated in example (10) focuses on the analysis of level of participants' expertise as their choice to use the language. There are two participants participating in the dialogue, WI (34) is the buyer and IB (65) is the seller who has expertise about the process of making coffee. The bolded sentences show the way how the seller (i.e., IB) explains about it clearly to the buyer. It can be seen that the seller takes over most of the turn taking. The seller dominantly explains the topic discussion over the buyer as the buyer clearly understands the message of the talk.

Social Distance

The social distance of participants in the interaction is considered minimal which is highly characterized by the use of intimate address form such as '*Pa*', '*Apa*' and '*Nte*' in Bukittinggi. Also, the use of nick names '*Di*' and '*Ko*' found in Padang. The following dialogues illustrate social distance between sellers and buyers in Bukittinggi and Padang.

R7/52:16/BKT

- (11) OK : Jadi bawang merah jo bawang putih gabuang se duo ribu, **Pa?**
BP : **[[Iyo gabuang si lah.**
OK : Lado merah? Lado bulek?
BP : Bumbu gulai lah duo ribu duo ribu duo.
OK : **[[A jadh. Agiah kunyik, Pa?**
BP : Ndak, ndak usah. Kalau bawang merah bawang putih ndak usah.
OK : Ndak, bumbu gulai agiah kunyik.
BP : **[[Iyo yo.**
OK : Lado ijau bulek atau giliang, **Pa?**
BP : Nan bulek si lah.
OK : Lado bulek iyo ki agiah, **Pa?**
BP : Baa lai eh. a buekkan jo lah agak duo ribu, **Ki.** =
OK : **[[Iyo. Kadang Ki istirahat ama masak, = Baganti-gantian se (.) kok ndak panek mek ama. =**
BP : **[[A iyo Pa. apo di Apa lai, Pa?**
OK : Lado ijau.
BP : **[[O iyo lado ijau tadi yo.**
OK : Lado aluih atau kasa tadi tu **Ki.**

- BP : Nan aluih, **Pa**. Jadi iko ko ciek, duo, tigo, ampek, limo, Limo kali duo sapuluah tambah limo limo boleh.
- BP : Ko Ki (.)
- OK : Pitih **Apa** Ki tarimo se ah.
- BP : A iyo baitu Ki
- OK : Iyo **Pa**. mokasih yo **Pa**. =
- WI : = Ki lado saparampek Ki. Capek, Ki. Lah malam hari ki
- OK : Anam ribu **Nte** =

Note:

- Bold designates the use of intimate address form.

Mode of Discourse

The *mode* of discourse refers to the way in which the exchange is transmitted. The *mode* of discourse analysis in this research includes three main discussions, that is, language role, channel, and medium.

Language Role

The attention given to this language role analysis is on the occurrences of tense and present tense represents a high frequency of all the occurrences of verbs marked for tense (active and passive).

Channel

The channel used in this present research is all in the spoken mode (phonic) with visual contact which is then recorded and transcribed. The spoken mode of the register is from the conversations of such topic discussions as known in the commerce field.

Medium

For the purpose of this research, the attention of this medium analysis is only focused on the use of pronouns, both the use of an intimate address form (*'pa'*, *'apa'* and *'nte'*).

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study show that the use of register in the commerce field is excessively applied to give an ease between buyers and sellers. Register here functions as the technical term to do the transaction. It is observed that one's speech used in communicating among others not only reflects and expresses the aspects of identity, such as age and addressee, but also indicates the context in which the language is used. With respect to the *field* of discourse, findings show that in the experiential domain analysis, all terms of register which are commonly used in the commerce field function as technical terms used in discussing their transactions. There are five types of technical terms found in the analysis, namely: 1) the single-word and compound nouns; 2) the single-word and phrasal verbs; 3) idiomatic expressions, and 4) blending. The goal orientation is considered as both short and long term goal orientation

which appears in two major kinds of technical matters, that is, to propose and to convince the buyers to have the goods sold out. The social activity is exchange.

With respect to the *tenor* of discourse, the agentive role among the speakers is said to be equal as they are sellers and buyers. The social role among participants is considered non-hierarchical. There are two kinds of level of expertise of the speakers defined in the social role analysis, that is, more knowledgeable speakers (sellers) and less knowledgeable speakers (buyers). The more knowledgeable speakers tend to do short pauses in a long turn taking, give detailed explanation in answering the questions, give detailed feedback or response, and also use the terms of register more frequently in the interaction. In short, they are dominant to do the exchange in the conversations. Meanwhile, the less knowledgeable speakers often do long pauses in a short turn taking, give brief questions, give concise feedback, and also do not use the terms of register frequently during the interaction. In short, they are not dominant to do the exchange with other participants in the interaction. The findings show that the use of a large number of register is found in the utterances of more knowledgeable speakers rather than in the utterances of less knowledgeable speakers. The social distance among participants tends to be minimal which is excessively characterized by the use of informal expressions.

With respect to the *mode* of discourse, the language role exists equally of both constitutive and ancillary which appears in the present tense form. The channel is all in the spoken mode (phonic) with visual contact which is then recorded and transcribed. The spoken mode of the register is from the conversations of such discussions in particular topics as known in the commerce field. The medium is excessively characterized by the use of filler as their back channel sign in the conversation.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W.J. (2006). The phraseology of administrative French: a corpus-based study, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(1), 128-134.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan. R. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, J. (2007). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th Edition)*. London: Longman.
- Jankowski, B. (2006). The s- vs of- Genitive in Standard Canadian English: Grammatical Change or Register Change? (Thesis). University of Toronto.
- Olateju, M.A., & Yusuf, Y.K. (2006). Backchannel communication in Ola Rotimi's our husband has gone mad again, *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(4), 520-535.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.