

UTTERANCES BETWEEN THE VICTIM AND THE CAUSER IN PRAMBANAN JAZZ 2017

Putri Ayu Rezkiyana
putri.ayurezki@gmail.com
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta
Indonesia

Abstract

As one of the biggest music event in Indonesia, Prambanan Jazz 2017 becomes infamous because of the incident that happened towards an Indonesian male singer, Afgan Syahreza. In the middle of his performance, the sound system and the lighting were turned off because there was an international artist on the other stage that felt disturbed by the sound of his performance. It evoked anger and disappointment from the audiences, especially his million fans. Regarding this, the issue will be the concern of this writing by focusing on the utterances between Afgan (written statement) and CEO of Prambanan Jazz Anas (oral statement) portrayed in Instagram. The study uses pragmatic approach that includes context in which the statements were taken as well as the language choices. The study asks two questions which are *What kinds of utterances are reflected in both speakers*, and *What the salience of utterances related to the context*. Regarding the first question, the results are seen from the use of active-passive sentences by the speakers. Afgan who was considered himself as a victim tends to use passive sentences, while the CEO as the event organizer in chief prefers using active forms in his utterances. It also affects the diction choices such as *dimatikan*, *dusir*, *melakukan negosiasi*, and *memohon maaf*. For the second question, the writer explains the significant language choices made by each speaker that represent the situation based on their perspectives.

Keywords: pragmatics, context, utterances analysis, Prambanan Jazz 2017

INTRODUCTION

The frenetic music festival is never out of spotlight. What happened during the event, whether good or bad, it will be the news. The same thing came about in the Prambanan Jazz 2017 which is one of the big music events in Indonesia that usually held annually during three days by Rajawali Indonesia, the music promotor. In the second day, on August 19th 2017, there was an incident that was allegedly defaming an Indonesian best singer Afgan Syahreza. In the middle of his performance, the committee stopped his singing suddely by turning off the sound system as well as the lighting. The crowd that was enjoy the song became angry and disappointed, and at that time they helped Afgan singing by raising up their mobile phone as the lighting. This incident became viral especially in the social media such as Instagram which shows negative comments judgung that the promotor was really unprofessional. Afgan as the singer was furious as well, and then he wrote a statement of his disappointment in the Instagram. On the other side, the CEO of Rajawali Indonesia Anas Syahrul Alimi gave his speech regarding this. He apologized about what happened to Afgan as well as explained the reason why such thing ocured. His explanation was posted in the video through the official account of Prambanan Jazz, saying that it was difficult decision at that time because the performance of Afgan was rightly in the same time with Sarah Brightman who performed on the other stage. It made crush between the management of Sarah and the promotor because they did not want to have clashed sound output during the performance. The utterances spoken by the CEO as the event organizer and Afgan as the

By using pragmatic analysis, the study about utterances cannot be detached from its context. It is because understanding the context is a bridge to construe the meaning thoroughly, not one by one word semantically. Meanwhile, in context, it is not only about the situation where the study taken, but it also includes the linguistic choices. By means, what is uttered by the speaker has structure that contains word choices, as also happened in this study under investigation. 'Exactly as in the reality of spoken or written languages, a word without linguistic context is a mere figment and stands for nothing by itself, so in the reality of a spoken living tongue, the utterance has no meaning except in the context of situation. (Malinowski, 1923: 307)' (Verschueren, 1999: 75). It means that the language use is not a single unit standing for itself but it has dependency towards the context surrounds it. Particular linguistic choices, whether it is consciously used or not, reflect the speaker's mind. Regarding this, the study is aimed to interpret the language use uttered by two different subjects by which one is considered as the victim and another one is the cause of the problem. It also dismantles the linguistic choices that presumably represents the speakers' mind. Henceforth, 'aspects of physical, social, and mental reality get 'activated' by the utterer and the interpreter in their respective choice-making practices, and that is how they become part of language use as elements with which the making of choices is interadaptable' (Verschueren, 1999: 88). To achieve this goal, the writer formulates two research questions to identify the pragmatic information implied in the utterances. The first one is what kind of language use occurred in the utterances. This question covers the analysis on the syntactic aspect (structure) used by the victim and the causer, and the references that discusses personal deixis which tend to appear in each speaker. The second one is what is the significant language use uttered by the speakers. This last question is actually about the saliency of the utterances that highlights the analysis of this study.

The research questions formulated above is using the concept of four angle of investigation in pragmatics (Verschueren, 1999: 66). Firstly, the contextual correlates of adaptability have to be identified. It means that the context should be understood at the very first place by which the communicative context happens and contains linguistic sources. Those linguistic choices have to be interadaptable. The idea of interadaptable itself is by correlating the linguistic sources with the context so that understanding the words are not mistakenly uprooted from the circumstances in which the utterances occur. Secondly, it is about the structural objects of adaptability. There are layers in structuring the utterances such as phonemes, morphemes, syntax, to discourse and beyond. Thus, it is considered 'not only 'structures' are involved, but also principles of structuring'. Next, in the third level, we enter to the process of interpretation or what so called as dynamics. The last is salience. In salience, it is about consciousness related to what is significant in the language use. Thus, guided by these four tasks, the utterances can be well studied pragmatically.

METHODOLOGY

This study undergoes qualitative method since it has depth analysis by using pragmatic approach. The data are taken from Instagram accounts of Afgan Syahreza and Prambanan Jazz. In this case, the utterances data is different each other. Utterances in Afgan's account are written, while the utterances in Prambanan Jazz account is from two videos with duration for about 2 minutes. The analysis is divided into three discussion. The first analysis goes to

syntactic aspect which focusing on the use of passive/active sentences in the utterances. It tells the tendency of each speaker when talking about the incident in Prambanan Jazz 2017. Next analysis concerns on the word choices that mainly discusses the use of personal deixis. In the third analysis, the writer portrays the salience of the utterances which becomes the significant point of this study.

ANALYSIS ON THE UTTERANCES

The Use of in Active/Passive Sentences

The utterances from the victim, Afgan, are spoken in written in his official account. He tends to use passive sentences which are purposed to identify him as a victim. However, the active sentences are also used when related to his professional acts as an artist. Here are the examples of his utterances.

Semalem ngalamin pengalaman manggung yang gak mengenakan, pertama kali ngalamin kaya gini. Jadi dari awal memang acaranya ngaret banget, gw seharusnya perform jam 8 malam. Tapi gw baru naik panggung sekitar jam 10 malam. Padahal gw sudah stand by satu jam lebih awal untukantisipasi. (*Last night having experienced terrible music performance, that's the first time for me.*)

Dan karena ada international artist yang harus main di waktu yang sama, gw malah dibilang nggak usah main sama panitia, (And because there was an international artist that should perform at the same time, I was told not to perform by the committee,...)

Walaupun sound awalnya gak dinyalain oleh mereka, gw tetep nyanyi, at least fans gak sia-sia udah nunggu. (although the sound system firstly was not turned on by them, at least fans did not get nothing after waiting for long time.)

Eh di lagu ke 4, lampu panggung semua di matiin, alias gw diusir. (But in the fourth song, all lightings were dimmed, which means I was turned back.)

Firstly about the active sentence, it is shown in the opening statement telling that the beginning of the incident and his preparation as seen in sentence (1), by phrases such as *gw seharusnya perform jam 8* (I should have performed at 8), *gw baru naik panggung* (*I'd just run to the stage*), and *gw sudah stand by* (*I had already stand by*). Those are referring to the chronological order showing he had done something usual as a performer and having a good preparation. He intended to say that he is innocent in this case as well as professional as an artist. For the second thing, the utterances turned into passive sentences when they came to his experience by using the words *dibilang* (was told), *gak dinyalain* (was not turned on), *dimatiin* (was stopped), and *diusir* (was turned back). In sentence (3), for instance, he wrote 'sound awalnya nggak dinyalain oleh mereka', while *mereka* refers to the committees. Then, the next sentence reflects its climax by stating that all lightings were dimmed and he was turned back (sentence 4).

On the other hand, the utterances spoken by Anas through two videos are about his apology towards what happened to Afgan as well as reponded to Afgan's disappointment. Anas mostly uses active sentences for asking for apology and explaining about the incident based on his perspective, as seen in the sentences below.

Penyelenggara Pambanan Jazz meminta maaf kepada management afgan, afgan sendiri dan afganisme, fansnya Afgan.

Jadi saya semalam bersama project director melakukan negosiasi. Yang pertama kami memang memohon maaf karena molornya beberapa check line dari sebelumnya sehingga menyebabkan molor.

Karena kan live orchestra, jadi pihak Sarah Brightman tidak mau ada suara dari festival itu karena klo orchestra itu *kan* begitu diem suara masuk.

Nah, kami melakukan negosiasi dengan pihak Afgan, bagaimana kalo maen setelah Sarah Brightman dan terjadi miskomunikasi karena memang dari pihak afgan tidak bersedia untuk memainkan konser setelah Sarah Brightman. Akhirnya kita sepakati Afgan tetap maen dengan resiko yang harus kita ambil.

Namun pada kenyataannya begitu maen pihak Sarah Brightman tetap minta harus dicut.. Dan ini pilihan tersulit yang harus saya ambil.

Saya mohon maaf sekali kemarin kejadian pada lima lagu Afgan harus berhenti.

The differences about the action done by Anas are depicted from the use of active sentences. The phrases such as *meminta maaf* (asking for forgiveness), *mohon maaf* (apologize), *melakukan negosiasi* (doing egotiation), are repeated several times. In (5), it is clearly stated 'who' apologize to 'whom' which is between Prambanan Jazz and the Afgan management, Afgan, and his fans. The explanation about the problem is started from (6) to (9). Firstly in (6) he apologized about the reason why the event did not hold on time which was caused by lack of dicipline. Next, in (7) it is seen the active sentence tells on how Sarah Brighthman team reacted towards the other sound that is considered as irritating the performance with orchestra: *pihak Sarah Brightman tidak mau ada suara dari fesival itu* (Sarah Brightman management did not want any other voices from that festival). Meanwhile, the sentence in (8) tells *pihak Afgan tidak bersedia melakukan konser setelah Sarah Brightman*, Afgan's management did not want to run the concert after Sarah Brightman. The important one also appears in (9) *...ini pilihan tersulit yang harus saya ambil* (...this is a hard decision that I should take) The use of active in this case means the subjects clearly stated that they do this action nad result something.

Event though the pattern of active sentences is mostly uttered by Anas, he seems implied passive form instead of active forms. It is said in (9), for instance that *pihak Sarah Brightman tetap minta harus di-cut*(Sarah Brightman's team kept asking it should be cut), *it* in this case refers to Afgan's performance. In Indonesian language, the reference *it* does not appear, meaning that the utterer less emphasized in this thing which probably he did not want to be obvious in mentioning 'who' threathened 'who'. It can be understood from the position of Anas as the CEO in which he tried to be neutral, but actually not. The statement becomes clear in (10) that says *pada lima lagu Afgan harus berhenti* (in the fifth song Afgan should stop). When saying Afgan should stop, it implies the meaning that Afgan was stopped by someone/ certain people / committee and it is purposely stopped because of the complicated situation.

The Matter in Reference

The use of reference is closely related to its role in a sentence. Especially for personal deixis, they might refer to the subject or the object that undergoes an event or an action. In term of

CLLT 2017

Conference on Language and Language Teaching

reference, in the statement written by Afgan, he did not directly mention about the name of related subjects that made his performance did not run well. He also uses personal deixis such as *gw* (I/me) refers to he himself, *kalian* (you) to the fans or the participants, local artist and international artist. Sentence (1) is the beginning of his statement. There is the reference about himself which is omitted. He did not directly point to himself by using *saya* (I) in his utterance: ‘Semalam saya ngalamin pengalaman manggung yang gak mengenakan’ (Last night I experienced a terrible performance ever). It is already understood that the subject who experienced this is the owner of this account. The use of *gw* or *gue* in Indonesian language is considered as slang language or *bahasa gaul* which indicates close relationship between he and the netizen or his fans specifically. Afgan seems telling a bad experience to his friends or fans just like daily conversation.

See the examples below.

Terimakasih buat semua yang hadir semalam, gak tau lagi deh kalo gak ada support kalian.

(Thank for all coming here last night, (I) didn't know what to do without your support.)

Sayang sekali padahal acaranya bisa digarap dengan bagus, semoga bisa jadi pelajaran buat penyelenggara Prambanan Jazz. (It was so sad, however, the event should have been held well, hope the event organizer of Prambanan Jazz can learn from this.)

Dan semoga ke depannya local artist bisa dapat apresiasi yang sama dengan international artist. (And, hopefully next time local artist has similar appreciation to the international artist.)

Besides, it is emphasized in the sentence (11) by which Afgan thanked his fans and people who watched his performance by using *kalian* (you, indicates plural form in Indonesia) and *semua yang hadir* (all who saw his performance). Meanwhile, through sentence (13) that is also his closing statement, he mentioned local artist and international artist in the same sentence. It means Afgan wanted to expose as well as highlighten the current problem of appreciation among them. Local artist is written in singular form, not local artists which might indicates all local artists in Indonesia, that can be inferred he was pointing to himself. The same thing occurs in the reference of international artist which refers to Sarah Brightman. International artist is stated twice which are in the sentence (2) and (13). Another thing to notice, the reference about the event of Prambanan Jazz appears when he was going to close his statement (sentence 12), not at the beginning that the unexpected experience happened in the Prambanan Jazz. It is presumably that Afgan emphasized to his experience rather than the event.

Different from Afgan, in Anas references, the writer is more explicit in stating about the subjects who get involved in this incident. In Anas' speech, it is seen that the reference about Prambanan Jazz is mentioned firstly (1) followed by apologizing expression to Afgan management, Afgan himself, and the fans of Afgan (Afganisme). Those subjects that related to this matter are acknowledged at the beginning which means he wanted to highlight the main idea about his statement in the video. When explaining the chronology of the incident, he used personal pronoun *saya* (I) and also his team (project director). It can be inferred that there was an effort of him as a person to solve the problem with his team which, then, is expressed by using *kami* (we). During negotiation, Anas used the word *pihak Afgan* (Afgan's team) and *pihak Sarah Brightman* (Sarah Brightman's team) meaning to say that Anas as the event organizer involves whole teams, not taking the decision personally. Look at other

Kejadian ini promotor tetep berusaha sebaik-baiknya untuk bagaimana event tahun depan bisa lebih baik. Kami akan lebih ketat lagi dalam hal rundown.

Dan mudah-mudahan Afgan masih bersedia kita undang. Saya sendiri menganggap Afgan itu penting di industri musik endonesa dan fans basenya sangat banyak.

Sekali lagi, saya sebagai promotor minta maaf.

Dan ini pilihan tersulit yang harus kami ambil. Terima kasih.

In addition, Anas stated clearly who involved in this problem, for example by mentioning the name of Sarah Brightman which was not found in Afgan's which using the term *international artist*. In example (14), *promotor* refers to Rajawali Indonesia, the EO company where Anas governed. Henceforth, by using references such as *saya*, *kami*, project director, and promotor, there is an intention of saying that they who organized the event did not remain silent about the incident but all is involved. Meanwhile, the references of *saya* and *kita* indicate Anas and his team faced complicated situation so that they have to be responsible.

SALIENCE

In pragmatic study, salience is considered as the highest level of conciousness in understanding context. This part tries to acknowledge what is stunning or more highlighted, and in this case, it happens on the utterances. From the study on the utterances stated by Afgan and Anas, it should be related to the context so that it does not make bias understanding about what happened in this case. At the first analysis we see Afgan statement of disappointment towards the incident happened to him. He felt as the victim in this case by frequently using the word *gw* instead of passive forms in his sentences. The statement was written in his Instagram account, meaning that the language use had been already planned. Hence, he used the terms such as *diusir* and *dimatikan* to be emphasized, pointing to what had been done by the committees. He also brought the references about his fans by using 'we' and 'us'. Afgan is assumed of building his image as a star who has a lot of supporters. He got frustated, angry, disappointed about this. On the other hand, he implied that the incident will not stop the support from his fans and seemed give some warnings as well as bad image to the event organizer. However, if we look at the detail of his statement, he actually told there was a prior warn from the committee which is uttered in (2), that there was international artist and he was supposed not to continue his performance. The context of situation can be inferred that something had happened so that the EO wanted him to stop. The question will be how far the EO explained about the risks to Afgan and his team so that Afgan insisted to have performance. If the risks had been understood by Afgan team, the incident happened in the middle of his singing would be not that shocking actually.

The second overview goes to the CEO. The point of his video is about apology to Afgan, his team, and his fans. It is in a form of short video in which Anas should prepare and be careful towards his utterances so that it did not make the situation getting worse. The salience in this statement is the use of active sentences in expressing apology such as *minta maaf*, *memohon maaf*, and also in explaining the complicated situation he faced with his team by saying *pilihan tersulit yang kita ambil*. Those actually show he did not intend to do such a bad thing to Afgan on purpose. When the video was uploaded, there were negative comments

CLLT 2017

Conference on Language and Language Teaching

about Prambanan Jazz which flooding in either Afgan IG's account and Pramabanan Jazz official account. So, the video is also about clarification instead of apology. Rajawali Indonesia as the EO runs the business in promoting music events in which they have to have good relationship with the artists/performers. It is impossible that the promotor did something bad to their artist on purpose because it harms their business. We can see in Anas's statement in which he recognized Afgan as one of best singers in Indonesia and hopefully in the next year he can join this event again. Thus, in the response of Afgan's statement that he had been turned back, there must be hard choice and the bad decision of the worst one. The worst is Sarah Brightman stopped her performance and disappointed people who had paid million rupiahs in order to enjoy her singing including the orchestra. Moreover, the position of Sarah as an international artist might impact the world's point of view about the EO in Indonesia. By this, it can be pointed out that the EO at that time should take whether they are humiliated locally (in Indoensia) or internationally, and the EO picked the first choice. But even so, the organizing committees should responsible to the rundown that affects the performance as well. It had been admitted by the CEO because the root of this problem still goes on how the committees organized the event. They cannot blame the mistakes on the artists, but nothing to do except making an apology and carification so that the next event will be well-organized.

CONCLUSION

To enclose this discussion, there are some final remarks to conclude this study. The first one is the linguistic choices can identify the intension or the idea of the speakers towards the thing they are facing. The use of passive sentence indicates the emphasize on the object undergoes the action, in this case it is mostly used by Afgan who is considered as the victim. Meanwhile, active sentences underline the action as well as the persons who get involved in it, which are frequently uttered by Anas the CEO who is representative of the causer. Another lexicon to identify the difference between the victim and the cause also appears in personal deixis in which Afgan uses informal language (slang), *gw /gue/*, referring to himself, while Anas applies *saya* and *kami/kita* pointing to he and his team. The second one is linguistic choices are influenced by its context. It means, by using particular language choices, the speakers actually have been positioning themselves in that matter and they are aware in using the language. The saliences that occur in each speaker can be construed through its context in which there must be a reason and explanation why the incident happened. Here, linguistic analysis focusing in pragmatics has interpreted this phenomena.

References

Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
<https://www.instagram.com/p/BYAe3SNnwo3/?taken-by=afgansyah.reza>
<https://www.instagram.com/p/BYAybJbnXMt/?taken-by=prambananjazz>