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Abstract: The paper works in the area of linguistic landscape (hence LL). It concerns with the issue of how markedness (linguistic and extra-linguistic) is manipulated in commercial ads in creating dramatic effect on the part of potential customers and hence attract attention on the product. The data of the study derive from commercial signages on the social media and direct snapshot taken around Mataram Municipal. The data gathered are then analytically processed by considering the verbal and non-verbal context surrounding the ads. In addition, speakers’ conceptual aspects are also taken consideration to support the marked and unmarked status of the terms analysed. It is found that markedness is exposed on the signages relies much on such strategy as foregrounding techniques. The foregrounding takes the form mainly of violation of the speakers expect on the term. The violations include both linguistic and socio-cultural perspective that the readers have. The foregrounding techniques are further supported by textual adjacency between the text and co-textual adjustment in the signage and the signage environment (topography). It is through the combining of such textual and environmental elements the advertisers expect to maximize the meaning of signage.
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INTRODUCTION

The paper is interested in dealing with the issue of marked and unmarked issue relates to the idea of interest. The interest concerns with the elaboration what is taken for granted comes to be put in focus. The focusing of unmarked situation or term in to highlight is believed to be deliberate. In the context of commercial ads and public signage creation this play with the unmarked and its promotion as focus situation plays crucial position. It is the core and selling point which functions to attracts the potential buyers to pay a visit. The study further traces the promoting of unmarked terms for marked situation to its linguistic and perceptual strategies which is mainly conducted by way of ‘abusing language, conceptual (semantic) expectation. Such linguistic and conceptual deviation serves to fore ground (promote) the ‘neutral’ situation by way of its contradictory and provocative performance. The paper works under linguistic landscape, the description and analysis of language performance in relation to the ecology which makes up the text. So it is linguistic landscape in nature. To work with the data the study seeks to elaborate Leech (2013) concepts of primary deviation in the classification and analysis of the commercial and public signages found in and around Mataram Municipal.

The paper seeks to find out problems related to the study. This consists of the inquiries related to how markedness is made marked in commercial and public signage. Of particular issue to elaborate is the linguistic devices applied in foregrounding what is in normal situation taken as neutral. Furthermore, promotion of neutral situation into marked situation is assumed not only involving formal linguistic mechanics, but it also involves cultural perception, then the observation also seeks to find out the answer to question in relation to peoples background practice of living.
The term foregrounder is the English rendering of the Czech word aktualisace. The term denotes the use of devices and techniques which push the act of expression into the foreground so that language draws attention to itself. This draws attention, in turn, to the way that literary language represents reality. Foregrounding occurs especially in poetic language (Cuddon, J. A. 1998).

Foregrounder is commonly used in stylistics (especially poetics) and sometimes in pragmatics and discourse analysis, to refer to relative prominence in discourse, often involving deviance from a linguistic norm; the analogy is of a figure seen against a background (and the rest of the text is often referred to as backgrounding). The deviant or prominent feature is said to have been foregrounded (Crystal, 2008). For example, the use of rhyme, alliteration and metrical regularity are examples of foregrounding operating at the level of phonology. Against this definition we may also extend the foregrounding in terms of conceptual makeup when an unmarked term, a term which in common use is taken for granted as such comes to be focused or highlighted to have an impact on the reader. A banner of public signage for instance shows a picture of a mother and her kid on her laps in an intense emotional scene (unmarked situation as we expect the relation works in that way). However, the text ‘dengankan suara mereka’ we are then struck by the fact that there seems to be abnormal nurture taking place, mothership today has loosed its emotional intense tight. The loose and the less interactive relation is believed to be responsible for drug abuse by the youth.

Foregrounding or motivated deviation from linguistic, or other socially accepted norms, has been claimed to be a basic principle of aesthetic communication. Such principle is applied both by Artist and verbal artists. The norms of the language are in this dimension of analysis regarded as a ‘background’, against which features which are prominent because of their abnormality are placed in focus. (see jangan lihat kiri)

The obvious illustration of foregrounding comes from the semantic opposition of literal and figurative meaning; a literary metaphor is a semantic oddity which demands that a linguistic form should be given something other than its normal (literal) interpretation.

A metaphor frequently manifests itself in a highly unpredictable collocation, or sequence of lexical items. In ‘Broke the grape’s joy’ (5) there is a collocative clash between ‘broke’ and ‘joy’, and between ‘grape’s’ and ‘joy’: to make the sequence ‘sensible’ we would have to substitute a concrete noun like ‘skin’ for ‘joy’, or else replace ‘grape’ by an animate noun and ‘broke’ by a verb such as ‘spoiled’. Of the many foregrounded groupings of lexical items in the poem, two kinds are prominent: those which yoke together inanimate nouns and items denoting psychological states (‘grape’s joy’ (5).

The deviation consists in the selection of an item which lies outside the normal range of choices at a particular place in structure. If we set up the frame ‘pulled the . . . down’, it is easy to make a list of nouns (mostly concrete and inanimate) which could predictably fill the empty space. But the noun ‘wind’ is not available for selection in this position: the poet or may it be the verbal artist in such expression of pull the wind down have disregarded the normal conditions of choice.

Less obviously, ‘foregrounding’ can apply to the opposite circumstance, in which a writer temporarily renounces the permitted freedom of choice, introducing uniformity where there would normally be diversity. An example is the grammatical parallelism in line 4 of the poem1: one noun phrase of the structure noun + prepositional phrase (‘Man in the day’) is followed by another noun phrase of like structure (‘wind at night’). Although the language tolerates a great variety of noun-phrase structures the poet successively restricts himself to the same pattern, thereby setting up a special relationship of equivalence between the two grammatical units. Leech (2013) refers to such foregrounded patterns, whether in grammar or phonology, as ‘schemes’.

1 This bread I break
   This bread I break was once the oat, 1
   This wine upon a foreign tree 2

Plunged in its fruit; 3
Man in the day or wind at night 4
Laid the crops low, broke the grape’s joy. 5

2773
Cohesion of foregrounding constitutes a separate dimension of descriptive statement, whereby the foregrounded features identified in isolation are related to one another and to the text in its entirety. A certain pattern of similarities has already been observed by Leech in the poet’s deviant lexical collocations. It is interesting then to seek further how it works in verbal artist signage. There is also cohesion of schemes: for example, other parallelisms in the poem reinforce the initial correspondence of ‘This bread...This wine...’, by setting up semantically analogous equivalences: ‘My wine you drink, my bread you snap’ (15). If a single scheme extends over the whole text, it can itself be regarded as a form of cohesion. Further extended foregrounding is observed in the phonology of words: the phonemic congruity of ‘wind’, ‘wine’, ‘vine’, ‘veins’.

The whole notion of ‘interpretation’ on the text is bound to that of ambiguity and indeterminacy of meaning. When ambiguity arises in poetry, in contrast to other kinds of discourse, we generally give the writer the benefit of the doubt, and take it to be intentional. Such is applicable for commercial ads under the assumption that the signage is made on purpose with potential orientation of attracting potential buyers. Thus, ambiguity and other semantic clash are intentional and so the intentional ambiguity can only be understood by supposing that the poet or the verbal artists intend a peaceful coexistence of alternative meanings. The examples can be manifested in the form of grammatical or lexical ambiguity that is liable to occur in non-literary language. A more important sources of indeterminacy of meaning derives from foregrounding, and implication of context – both of which can only be rendered ‘intelligible’ by an act of the imagination by assuming an intentional construct.

Foregrounding is a relative concept: there are degrees of deviation, and in most cases there are no absolute grounds for regarding feature A as normal and feature B as foregrounded. So there is room for disagreement on what aspects of a poem require interpretation.

Deviation is especially characteristic of poetic language: the poet deviates from ‘expected norms’ of linguistic expression. In other words, he exercises, in the broadest sense, ‘poetic licence’. In some ways, the people seem to accept that the play of words in commercial signage Ads constitute ‘normal strategy’ for attracting potential buyers. In line with such social tolerance then by analogy it is take here as rule of thumb that verbal artists too, in addition to poets are allowed a kind of ‘poetic licence’ by the people.

METHODS

The data of this study derive from social media and on street snapshots of commercial signages around Mataram Municipal and West Lombok district. The data were then qualitatively analysed by focusing on the description of the interrelation among the linguistic verbal text and the surrounding context which make up the signage as well as the geographical placement of the ads themselves. This interrelation between verbal and pragmatic context of the signage supports the picturing of the overall landscape of the commercial highlight of the text. Hence, the contextual exposure of the ads is expected to enliven the attraction of the product on the part of the potential customers.

What is marked and foregrounded are to be determined and derived from the unmarked (normal value taken for granted) and from the background knowledge (commonsense). Hence, in order to have access for judging the violation from readers’ expectation then we do need to set general values living in the target speakers as standard of expectancy (Levinson, S. C. 1983 and 2000). In relation to the data processing and analyzing, the aspects which make the unmarked terms are taken as background knowledge against which the markedness value is to be contrasted. The unmarked values (linguistic, cultural norms) function as commonsense knowledge/information by which the foregrounding and the motivated violation from neutral standard values are judged (Leech, Geoffrey 2013). Armed with this combining interplay between the formal linguistic material and the acknowledgement of contextual makeup, the socio-cultural expectation in mind, the advertisers expect to highlight and maximize the meaningfulness and attraction of their product.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
The Data Findings

The observation on the commercial signages taken during the research in relation to the markedness and the strategies for foregrounding found that the commercial observed involves both grammatical and pragmatic downplay with the normal expectation (linguistic and pragmatic). In general the unmarked values, which is commonly taken for granted gets focused and foregrounded by counteracting our normal neutral reading. There are two major strategies observed in the promotion of products on commercial signages which deal with markedness. The two strategies are intertwined and work simultaneously in its foregrounding function. In the first, there is a play down with linguistic structure and lexical semantic\(^2\). The text highlights prohibition in its written text by way of using negative form in a place where we expect it to be positive. For instance, our general understanding on the promotion of product would take it by default that it is intended to invite potential customers to buy the product. Unfortunately, the signage play a special emphasis on the use of negation which suggests prohibition (samples for case in point: Jangan beli rokok di sini and Jangan lihat Kiri while the thing on the left is the Store which promotes its product. studies elaborates the semantic default in the terms soto daging dan soto ayam, (see Mahyuni and Ahmadi 2021), jangan beli gudang garam di sini karena harganya 15000/packs. The negation also manifest in the use of word which lexically invite the reader to abuse social order by suggesting to the opposite end (semantic clash). Budayakan malas mencuci sepatu. In terms of social order and values, it is taken for granted that public invitation recommend the keeping with social accord. The ads however struck us with the semantic clash of combining budayakan and malas.

The next strategy for highlighting product concerns with the deviation against readers’ assumed background knowledge (the unmarked) by promoting counter expectation. This strategy of the deviation combines the application of adjacency principle of shared values in the society is observed in such ads as the prohibition to purchase the promoted product. This deviation attracts attention by firstly intimidates the reader with the prohibition and then challenge the reader’s background knowledge the cigarettes price (regular price: 18.000/pack). The case of budayakan malas also goes with this counter-expectation strategy. The next candidate which combines the linguistic and normal pragmatic expectation on the part of potential customers manifests in the Jual Kambing Qurban Ads. In spite of the indexing between the graphological system (word and arrow pointing) with the representation of pictorial reference, the cow’s picture, but the intended meaning affiliates with the pragmatic (shared background knowledge).

Discussion

Markedness: marked and unmarked terms

Unmarked (adj.) A term used in linguistics in various senses, to refer to a property of language which is more neutral, common, expected or general\(^3\) than a corresponding property, which is said to be marked. Unmarked values in some approaches are also often called “default” values, and can be handled by conditions that a category must meet if it can, but need not meet if it cannot, e.g. the default value for case might be accusative.

The next strategy for highlighting product

Markedness: marked and unmarked terms

Unmarked (adj.) A term used in linguistics in various senses, to refer to a property of language which is more neutral, common, expected or general\(^3\) than a corresponding property, which is said to be marked. Unmarked values in some approaches are also often called “default” values, and can be handled by conditions that a category must meet if it can, but need not meet if it cannot, e.g. the default value for case might be accusative.

The current use of the term in core grammar should be noted, as should its use in recent phonological theory (e.g. underspecification theory).

Markedness is analytic principle in linguistics whereby pairs of linguistic features, seen as oppositions, are given different values of positive (marked) and neutral or negative and to attract reader’s attention on the term, advertisers of commercial product put the features into focal point (foregrounding). The foregrounding function is conducted way of putting the unmarked term in contrast with the marked values. In this way, the readers are made realize something new and thus attention gathering is reached to the fullest.

---

\(^2\) The sample: budayakan malas mencuci sepatu- cucu sepatumu di sini.

\(^3\) Due to its commonsense and being a default value then on the part of the speaker the properties contained in a term tend to be forgotten, taken for granted. Such situation makes unmarked term being ‘ignored in communication, being kept suppressed in the cognition. In order to promote such default value
(unmarked). In its most general sense, this distinction refers to the presence versus the absence of a particular linguistic feature. There is a formal feature marking plural in most English nouns, for example; the plural is therefore ‘marked’, and the singular is ‘unmarked’. The reason for postulating such a relationship becomes clear when one considers the alternative, which would be to say that the opposed features simply operate in parallel, lacking any directionality. Intuitively, however, one prefers an analysis whereby dogs is derived from dog rather than the other way round – in other words, to say that ‘dogs is the plural of dog’, rather than ‘dog is the singular of dogs’. Most of the theoretical discussion of markedness, then, centres on the question of how far there is intuitive justification for applying this notion to other areas of language (cf. prince/princess, happy/unhappy, walk/walked, etc.).

One of the earliest uses of the notion was in Prague School phonology, where a sound would be said to be marked if it possessed a certain distinctive feature (e.g. voice), and unmarked it if lacked it (this unmarked member being the one which would be used in cases of neutralization). In generative phonology, the notion developed into a central criterion for formalizing the relative naturalness of alternative solutions to phonological problems. Here, evidence from frequency of occurrence, historical linguistics and language acquisition is used to support the view that marking is a basic principle for assigning universal (and possibly innate) values to phonetic features (by contrast with the language-specific, phonological approach of the Prague School).

The distinctive features are each assigned marking values, e.g. [+voice] is seen as marked, [-voice] as unmarked. segments, in this view, can then be seen as combinations of marked or unmarked features, and thus be compared with each other, e.g. /a/ is the maximally unmarked vowel because it is [-high], [-back] and [-round]; /N/ is more complex because it is [+low] and [+round], and so on. In later phonological theory (e.g. in underspecification theory), the notion of markedness took on a critical status. Based on the view that the unmarked value of a feature is the normal, neutral state of the relevant articulator, some approaches assert that only one value need be present in the underlying representation; the other can be predicted by a context-free rule which mirrors the relevant markedness statement. For example, [ ] ⇒ [-nasal] would represent the notion that segments are normally oral. The rule would insert [-nasal] by default only in segments lacking a nasal value. Such rules are known as ‘markedness-based context-free redundancy rules’.

Several other interpretations of the notion of marking are found in the literature, where the concept of ‘presence v. absence’ does not readily apply. One interpretation relates marking to frequency of occurrence, as when one might say a falling intonation pattern was unmarked, compared with a rising one, because it is more common. Another is found in the semantic analysis of lexical items, where pairs of items are seen as unmarked and marked respectively, on the grounds that one member is more specific than the other (e.g. dog/bitch, where the latter is marked for sex – one can say male/female dog, but these adjectives are inapplicable with bitch). A third, related sense occurs when the distribution of one member of an opposition is restricted, compared with the other: the restricted item is then said to be marked – several comparative sentences illustrate this, e.g. How tall is John? (where How short is John? is abnormal). In later generative linguistics, a more general theory of markedness emerged. Here, an unmarked property is one which accords with the general tendencies found in all languages; a marked property is one which goes against these general tendencies – in other words, it is exceptional (a relative universal). Markedness in this sense can be represented as a continuum along which language-universal and language-specific properties can be related. A highly unmarked property is one which makes a strong claim to universal status; a highly marked property is one which makes a weak universal claim. A universal which is strongly represented in a particular language makes that language highly unmarked in that respect, and vice versa. For example, in relation to the proposed phonological universal that words must start with a consonant+vowel structure (CV), some languages (e.g. Yawelmani) totally satisfy this universal, whereas others (e.g. English) do not; English is therefore more marked than Yawelmani, in this respect. In optimality
theory, the ranking of constraints and constraint violations allows the notion of markedness to be encoded directly into the model.

**Highlighting and Foregrounding Strategies in the Commercial Ads**

Ahmadi and Mahyuni (2020) discussed about the etymology of bak of bakso in Cantonese. Bak in Canton Chinese means daging ‘meat’. However, the literal meaning in both languages differ significantly in terms of the general understanding of the speaker. In its Chinese origin, the bak means literally ‘pig meat’ and this is the neutral unmarked interpretation of the word. Its importation to Indonesian vocabulary is followed by social cultural adjustment. It is because Indonesian majority of people are Muslim then the bak is taken or granted as the unmarked term for daging sapi.

Moreover, in relation to Indonesian and Sasak in general the terms daging is taken to mean as daging sapi as unmarked term also in fact that the word daging means meat in general. A more specific use of the word with regard to various kind of meat pork, mouton etc makes the situation as marked. The marked use of the term necessitates the mentioning of the modifying word (modifier) such as lele or ayam (in which the daging is made unmarked and needs no mentioning).
The Ads above makes an advertisement about sacrificed cows on sale. The construction on the top most writer Jual Hewan Qurban 3 M and right underneath in red in between bracket we read (murah, meriah, menyenangkan). The relevant points to deal with is that the above phrase is written in a larger grapheme while the one in bracket is much smaller. In spite of its highlighted red, the phrase is less in focus as compared with the top most phrase.

The phrase Jual hewan Qurban 3 M is interesting to deal with first because it makes the headline o the signage. In terms of syntactic make up the construction has verbal head jual ‘sell’ and the object sapi Qurban ‘cows for scarification’. In relation to the verb jual then at first reading we tend to interpret the M of 3M as a shortened form of Miliar. This price reading of the phrase 3M is the default reading in the light of the head verb. And such is the ‘assumed intended reading the seller expect the reader to have. Such reading however is surprising (surprise makes the deliberate point on the part of the reader). By provoking reader’s attention then the seller expects elaborate and closer attention on the advertisement. The ads sapi korban 3M at a glance counter expectation to the price. The lexical diction jual in combination with number are normally interpreted as unmarked information about price. Thus when we read Jual sapi kurban 3M the ‘default reading is 3 miliar (billions). This glance reading struck us and our surprise is reasonable because this part of the text is in larger notation compared with the correct reading (written with smaller fonts albeit in red. Cows price is not to in Billion (3M initiates the reading 3 miliar).

The ads makes a play of word by deviating the normal reading of the text. It plays with readers background normal knowledge and linguistic phonological knowledge (3M as 3 miliar). The highlighted text in red in the small letter satisfies the reader’s confusion, but only after a close reading, that it is not miliar but abbreviation of the phrase in bracket.

Figure 2. Offers on top of the tree

Figure 3. Offers in Majas language
The contradictory impression of the commercial Ads: Foregrounding the reader’s background knowledge and violating reader’s expectation. The ads ‘jangan beli rokok di sini-surya 12 Rp. 15.500/bks attracts our attention on the first reading. Our attention is caught under at least two reasons, linguistic and assumed common knowledge. Linguistically speaking, an advertisement is not expected to prohibit or ban potential buyer from buying the product promoted (jangan beli rokok di sini). In terms of expectation, the reader is assumed to share the knowledge about the cigarette prices. Smokers in general are assumed to be familiar with the regular price of the product.

Thus, the advertisement in its own way foregrounds and highlight the prioritizing the visit to the store because of the lowest price it offer (assumed knowledge about the cigarette prices). Instead of ignoring the messages, the smoker would tend to care about it due to the textual deviance. The text deviates the linguistic standard of product promotion. The deviation is expected to trigger potential customer’s curiosity and scrutinize the price. The background knowledge then leads the customer to arrive at the ultimate purpose of the ads maker: to make them pay a visit and purchase the product.

Figure 4. sentences with the opposite meaning

**Adjacency Principle and the deviation of linguistic principle**

*Adjacency pair (Principle)* is a term commonly used in sociolinguistic analyses of conversational interaction to refer to a single stimulus-plus-response sequence by the participants (Crystal, 2008). Adjacency pairs have been analysed in terms of their role in initiating, maintaining and closing conversations. Our sense making in an conversation relies much on the principle of closeness of expression in temporal order. In linguistics (syntactic analysis) the terms is commonly used to explain the acceptability and unacceptability of a construction with regard to their adjacent position (for case marking or the like).

An application of the general sense of this term is observed in several areas of linguistics. A seemingly unrelated expressions can be made meaningful under the adjacency principle. Thus, John: Have you had your lunch? Jane: Marry is on her way. Due to the fact that the expression is understood as a respond to the John’s question (expressed in an adjacency turn) then we infer that Jane’s ‘Marry is on her way’ as a direct answer ‘I haven’t had my lunch, because I’m waiting for Mary to have it with me. She is on her way, anyway. Udin can readily understands that his mom is asking him to answer the phone when she says from the rest room: Udin, the phone. I am in the rest room!

On the level of syntax we may cite the example in which the first object can bind the second (1a-b), but not vice versa (2a-b) as in the following pairs of sentences:

1. (1) a. Give a teacher an apple and [a policeman a flower.]
   b. [Give a policeman] and sell a postman a flower.

2. a. *[A policeman a flower] and give a teacher an apple,
   b. *[Give a flower] and sell an apple a policeman.

In the case of ditransitive verbs, then, it shows up in the fact that the first object can bind the second, but not vice versa:

(5) a. I introduced Keats and Chapman to each other,
b. *I introduced each other to Keats and Chapman.

The *adjacency principle* may equally apply to the spatial dimension in a signage. Thus, when the expression on the ads reads ‘sela pemberani and there is a picture of a pack of cigarette then in terms of adjacency principle, we are invited to relate the man’s bravery jumping towards the running train and the smoking of the cigarettes. In the case of: soto sasak- ibu baiq- Rp. 10.000,- then in terms of adjacency it must be read as Ibu is the one on sale. However, the expected interpretation is that what is on sale is the soup not the Ibu Baiq. There happens to be a deviation on display in the ads. How do we make sense about such deviation? With regards to the signage then the deviation serves as a devise for eye catching and attention taking. By analogy, the attraction of spring bed is not on the performance o the bed but more on the pretty woman having a nice dream on it. The lady is not for sale, and so is Ibu Baiq. Both the lady having a nice dream and the ibu baiq serve as invitations to spare time for the product.

![Figure 4. sentences with the opposite meaning](image)

**Soto Sasak Ibu Baiq**

Note: the unmarked interpretation is that the Rp. 10000, refers to the price of the soup offered. However the ads attracts attention successfully because of its skill in playing with linguistic principle. In terms of syntactic organization we expect that the meaning of the rp. 10000 goes according to adjacency principle which requires that the meaning of a sentential element goes with the closest element in the construction. So according to adjacency principle the price Rp. 10000 should refer to Ibu Baiq. It is this ‘wild sense’ ((interpreted as ‘tariffs’) which maximizes attention attracting. In addition to the adjacency principle, what makes us understand the price as referring to Ibu Baiq ‘tariffs’ is the ‘phonological’ rules. The phrase Ibu Baiq is given extra primacy by the highlighting of Ibu Baiq with double stokes. Conventionally taken, the double underlines mean emphasis and thus the information which follows ideally addresses the doubled underline one instead of the previous.

The linguistic case for the *Ibu Baiq* private commercial ads is also explainable in terms of the principle of grammatical relation principle. What matters is the play down our perception between *grammatical, and psychological subject(hood)*. In linguistic analyses, we distinguish the *grammatical subject* from *psychological subject* (Miller, Jim 2002). In *The dog chases the cats* we have the dog as subject. It is the NP immediate before the verb and it also holds the subject verb agreement. The same is also true in *the cats are chased by the dog*. Here the grammatical subject is the cats (in terms of its grammatical performance as in the equivalent active clause).

However, in *the cats the dog chases* we have two different subjects. The grammatical subject is the dog and the cats functions as psychological subject. It holds a status of psychological subject because It is the *starting point of the message*; it denotes the entities about which the speaker wishes to say something. The emphasis on starting point the speaker’s focusing on promoting...
speaker’s wish makes it a marked in state. The promoting of the cats to initial position is then taken as foregrounding. Thus, taken for granted by analogy to the English case, we take the ibu baiq in the add as ‘the grammatical subject’ and the soto sasak as equivalent to psychological subject. Our neutral normal expectancy would be to understand Ibu Baiq as the subject, the individual valued Rp. 10.000,-. Such is the unmarked/expected reading of the text. Unfortunately, the text means the other way around. It necessitates our reading of the psychological subject to hold central (pivotal relation) to the predicate Rp. 10.000,-. Thus, in its own way, the ads is successful in attracting our attention by way of deviating the unmarked interpretation of the text and in that way it successfully foreground the psychological ‘subject’ matter.

Our linguistic interpretation turns out to compete with and is replete with pragmatic values. In terms of social values, it is highly unexpected that a lady offers herself to the public with a certain tariffs (adult theme is by normal standard is to be kept secret).

CONCLUDING

In its effort to highlight the linguistic ecology of text which make the linguistic landscape (hence LL), the discussion of this paper illuminate the quintessential principles of linguistic and contextual aspects in attraction gathering. It is noted that what is marked and unmarked term is akin to manipulation, in commercial signages, by way of violation of both the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the text. Linguistically, in order to foreground a product prominence, signages are observed to violate linguistic structure (violation of normal syntactic structure). The violation of linguistic form includes also a play with graphological system, such as spelling system as well as logographic performance. Recall how the signage promoting sacrifice animal which ambiguates distance-length interpretation of 50 meters and the logograph ‘arrow’ pointing to goat. This linguistic violation is promoted under the assumption that it contradicts the reader’s expectation (motivated violation). In addition, the violation goes beyond linguistic realm by violating the normal expectation of the speaker upon standard value. For instance, in attracting reader’s attention, the advertiser foregrounds the ‘laziness, ignorance’ as favorable values (budayakan MALAS mencuci). In the same principle with other promotion, such focus and foregrounding on ‘laziness’ serves to strike reader’s normal expectation (unmarked concept) about sanitary behavior (clean living). In so doing, the commercial ads struck the reader expectation and thus create dramatic effect on the part of potential customers on the product promoted.

REFERENCES


