

Linguistic Landscape and Markedness Conceptualization in Commercial Ads

Mahyuni Mahyuni¹, M. Fadjri¹, Nur Ahmadi¹, Ahmad Zamzam¹, Lalu Jaswadi Putera¹, & Nuriadi Nuriadi¹

¹ English Education Program, Department of Language and Art Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram, Indonesia

Correspondence: Mahyuni Mahyuni, Department of Language and Art Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram, Indonesia.

Received: March 6, 2023

Accepted: June 12, 2023

Online Published: July 6, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v13n7p18

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n7p18>

Abstract

This research focuses on the linguistic landscape (abbreviated as LL) and explores how both linguistic and non-linguistic markedness are manipulated in commercial advertisements to create a compelling impact on potential customers, thereby attracting their attention to the product. The study utilizes data collected from commercial signs found on social media platforms and snapshots taken within the Mataram Municipal area. These gathered data are then subjected to analytical processing, taking into account the verbal and non-verbal context surrounding the advertisements. Additionally, the conceptual aspects of the speakers are also considered to support the analysis of the marked and unmarked status of the analyzed terms. The findings reveal that the exposure of markedness in the signage heavily relies on foregrounding techniques. Foregrounding is primarily achieved through the violation of the speakers' expectations regarding the terms used, encompassing both linguistic and socio-cultural perspectives that readers possess. Furthermore, these foregrounding techniques are reinforced by the proximity between the text and the surrounding context of the signage and its environment. By combining these textual and environmental elements, advertisers aim to optimize the intended message conveyed by the signage.

Keywords: linguistic landscape, marked/unmarked concept, expectation violation, adjacency principle strategy

1. Introduction

Interest in the study of the relationship between language ecology and landscape has been a growing trend for the last three decades (Gorter, 2006). Part of the interest relates to the ultimate goal for 'income generating' of commercial purpose and to intensify communicative stronghold between the power holder (governmental bodies) and the people on the part of official or governmental bodies. In both, there happen to be parallelism in terms of the linguistic and image manipulation. In general the linguistic and image manipulation serves main purpose of ensuring the reach of the message upon the target. It is under such background, and then the manipulation of language expression relies much on the message senders' perspective. Academic interest for the issues, as adopted in this study, relate to seek the contribution of linguistic and textual performance in *topicalizing* marked-unmarked terms, which in turn serves the foregrounding functions.

This research paper focuses on exploring the concept of *markedness* and *unmarkedness*, particularly in relation to the notion of interest. The interest lies in investigating how what is typically taken for granted becomes the center of attention. The deliberate highlighting of unmarked situations or terms is believed to play a crucial role in the creation of advertisements for businesses and public signs. This emphasis on the unmarked serves as the core selling point, aiming to attract potential buyers and entice them to visit. The study further examines the linguistic and perceptual strategies employed in promoting unmarked terms as marked situations. This is achieved through the manipulation of language and conceptual expectations, deviating from the norm to foreground the "neutral" situation through contradictory and provocative means. The research is conducted within the field of linguistic landscape, which entails describing and analyzing language usage in relation to the surrounding environment. Thus, it can be considered a linguistic landscape study. To analyze the data, the research incorporates concepts of primary deviation as proposed by Leech (2013) in the categorization and analysis of advertisements for businesses and public signs found in and around Mataram city.

The aim of the paper is to examine issues concerning the investigation. This encompasses the inquiries concerning how the concept of markedness is emphasized in both commercial and public signs (Andrews, 1990; Zhang & Tian, 2015). A specific concern to elaborate on is the linguistic methods employed to highlight what is typically considered neutral in ordinary situations. Additionally, the transformation of a neutral situation into a marked one is assumed to involve not only formal linguistic mechanisms but also cultural perception. In terms of cultural perceptual promotion, this study also aims to uncover the relationship between people's background practices and their perception. Within this framework, the emphasis on cultural background implies the foregrounding of textual background to the forefront.

According to Cuddon (1998), the term "foregrounding" can be traced back to its etymological origin as the English translation of the Czech word "aktualisace." This term refers to the employment of devices and techniques that bring the act of expression to the forefront, thereby drawing attention to the language itself. In the realm of literature, this attention-grabbing function, as emphasized by Cuddon, sheds light on how literary language portrays reality. Foregrounding is particularly prevalent in poetic language. Crystal (2008), in agreement with Cuddon, acknowledges the familiarity of the term within the field of stylistic analysis. Consistent with Cuddon, Crystal (2008) also

recognizes its common usage in stylistics, particularly in poetry. However, he also notes its application in pragmatics and discourse analysis. In these areas, foregrounding serves a similar purpose to emphasize relative prominence in discourse and pragmatics, paralleling its poetic use. Essentially, whether employed in poetry or in pragmatic-discourse contexts, foregrounding involves a departure from the linguistic or literary norm. This foregrounding parallel may be shown by juxtaposing an image with its backdrop (the remainder of the text is commonly referred to simply as backgrounding). The deviant or notable attribute that stands out is considered to have been foregrounded. Rhyme, alliteration, and metrical regularity, for example, are viewed as phonological methods that enhance the action of foregrounding.

In addition to the definitions put forth by Cuddon and Crystal, we can expand the concept of foregrounding to encompass the conceptual framework in which an unremarkable term, a term typically taken for granted in common usage, is brought into focus or highlighted to have a profound impact on the reader. As an example, consider a public signage banner featuring an emotionally intense scene of a mother holding her child on her lap (a situation commonly perceived as unremarkable due to the expected nature of their relationship). However, when the text accompanying the image reads “*Dengarkan suara mereka*” (hearken their voice) as shown in Figure 1, we are suddenly struck by the presence of an abnormal parental nurturing dynamic. The traditional intensity and close emotional bond between mother and child appear to have weakened in contemporary times. This weakened and less interactive attachment is believed to contribute to drug abuse among young individuals.



Figure 1. A banner of public signage

Foregrounding, which involves deviating from linguistic or socially accepted norms, is considered a fundamental aspect of aesthetic communication. This principle applies to both visual and verbal artists, where language norms are seen as the “background” against which features that stand out due to their abnormality are emphasized.

An evident example of foregrounding is found in the semantic contrast between literal and figurative meanings. A literary metaphor, for instance, presents a semantic peculiarity by assigning a linguistic form a meaning other than its normal (literal) interpretation. A metaphor often involves unexpected collocations or sequences of words. In the phrase “Broke the grape’s joy” we can see a collocative clash between the collocations of “broke” and “joy,” as well as between “grape’s” and “joy.” To make the sequence more coherent, one would need to replace “joy” with a concrete noun like “skin” or replace “grape” with nouns for human and animal (animate noun) and “broke” with a verb like “spoiled.” The poem contains numerous instances of foregrounded collocations, with a notable focus on pairing inanimate nouns with items denoting psychological states, as seen in “grape’s joy”.

The deviation occurs when an item is chosen that falls outside the normal range of choices for a particular structural position. For example, if we consider the frame “pulled the...down,” we can easily generate a list of nouns, mostly concrete and inanimate, that would predictably fill the blank space. However, the noun “wind” is not an expected choice in this context, indicating that the poet or verbal artist has disregarded the normal conditions of selection.

Less explicitly, ‘foregrounding’ can also refer to the opposite situation in which a writer momentarily gives up the freedom to select and establishes regularity where diversity would typically be anticipated. Line 4 of the poem has an example of this, with a grammatical parallelism produced between two noun phrases with similar structures: “Man in the day” followed by “Wind at night.” Despite the fact that the language allows for a vast range of noun phrase constructions, the poet chooses to stick to the same pattern, providing a specific equivalency between the two grammatical units. Leech (2013) refers to these foregrounded patterns as ‘schemes’, whether in grammar or phonology.

Cohesion of foregrounding forms a distinct facet of descriptive statements, where the isolated highlighted elements are interconnected both amongst themselves and with the overall text. Leech has already identified a specific pattern of resemblances in the poet’s unconventional lexical combinations. Consequently, it becomes intriguing to explore how this phenomenon operates in the signage created by verbal artists. Scheme cohesion arises as a result of scheme implementation. Additional parallelisms throughout the poem, for example, generate semantically comparable links to strengthen the original correlation of “This bread...This wine...”, as seen in the line “My wine you drink, my

bread you snap." When a single scheme penetrates the entire text, it may be viewed as a type of cohesiveness in and of itself. Further foregrounding is shown in the phonological component of words, where the phonemic congruence of 'wind,' 'wine,' 'vine,' and 'veins' is prominent.

In connection to text, the idea of "interpretation" is inextricably tied to the presence of ambiguity and unpredictability of meaning. When ambiguity occurs in poetry, unlike in other kinds of language, we often credit it to the writer's conscious aim. This idea may also be used to business ads, provided the signage is specifically tailored to attract potential purchasers. As a result, ambiguity along with other occurrences of semantic confrontation are purposeful, and we can only understand this intended ambiguity by imagining poets or verbal artists aiming for the harmonious coexistence of various interpretations. Grammatical or lexical ambiguity is an example of this, which is common in non-literary language. Foregrounding is another key source of ambiguity in interpretation. Grammatical or lexical ambiguity is an example of this, which is common in non-literary language. Another key source of ambiguity in meaning is foregrounding and contextual implication, both of which can only be made "intelligible" by assuming a deliberate construction.

Since there are variable degrees of deviation, foregrounding is a relative notion, and in most circumstances, there are no conclusive criteria for determining whether feature A is normal and feature B is foregrounded. As a result, conflicts might occur about whether components of a poem require interpretation. Poetic language is characterized by deviation, as poets break from the "expected norms" of linguistic expression. In essence, they have "poetic license" in the fullest sense. In a similar line, it appears that most people think that wordplay in business signs advertisements is a "normal strategy" used to entice potential purchasers. As a result of this societal tolerance, it might be regarded a rule of thumb that verbal artists, like poets, are allowed a certain type of protection.

2. Methods

Data for this study were gathered through social media platforms and by photographing shop signs in the Mataram City and West Lombok districts. The data gathered was then given to qualitative evaluation, with an emphasis on studying the interplay among the linguistic verbal content, the signage's surrounding context, and the geographical location of the advertising. This analysis aimed to portray the overall landscape of the highlighted commercial messages by considering the contextual exposure of the ads, which is expected to enhance the product's appeal to potential customers.

To determine what is marked and foregrounded, we need to compare and derive them from the unmarked (the normal values that are commonly assumed) and from background knowledge (common sense). Therefore, in order to evaluate any deviations from readers' expectations, we must establish the general values that prevail among the target audience as the standard of expectancy. Throughout the process of data processing and analysis, the elements that characterize the default terms are utilized as foundational information against which the contrasting markedness value can be compared. These default values, encompassing both linguistic and cultural norms, serve as widely accepted knowledge or references against which the deliberate deviations from neutral standard values are assessed. Advertisers leverage this dynamic interaction between the formal linguistic components and an awareness of the contextual composition, taking into account socio-cultural expectations. Their goal is to underscore and optimize the significance and appeal of their products.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 Findings

Through the course of the investigation, an analysis of advertising signs yielded intriguing discoveries pertaining to markedness and foregrounding tactics. Notably, these promotional materials employ a combination of grammatical and pragmatic approaches to undermine conventional linguistic and pragmatic expectations. The overarching objective is to bring into focus and accentuate values that are commonly overlooked or taken for granted, thereby challenging our customary neutral interpretation. Within product-promoting commercial signs, two predominant strategies centered around markedness were identified, working in tandem to enhance the foregrounding impact.

Observe the following samples of commercial ads:

- (1) *Jangan beli rokok di sini* (Eng: Don't buy cigarettes here)
- (2) *Jangan lihat kiri* (Eng: Don't look left)
- (3) *Soto Daging dan Soto Ayam* (Eng: Meat soup and Chicken soup)
- (4) *Jangan beli Gudang Garam di sini karena harganya 15000/packs* (Eng: Don't buy Gudang Garam cigarettes here because they cost 15,000 per pack)
- (5) *Budayakan malas mencuci sepatu* (Eng: Cultivate laziness in shoe cleaning).
- (6) *Jual Kambing Qurban* (Eng: Selling Sacrificial Goats)
- (7) *Soto Sasak Ibu Baiq Rp. 10000* (Eng: Sasak Soto by Ibu Baiq Rp 10000)

The first strategy involves playing down the linguistic structure and lexical semantics. The text emphasizes prohibition through the use of negative forms in places where we would normally expect a positive statement. For example, our general understanding of product promotion would assume that it intends to invite potential customers to purchase the product. However, these signages place special emphasis on negation, suggesting prohibition. For instance, phrases in [1] and [2] are used, while the object on the left is actually the shop

promoting its items. Studies further elaborate on the semantic defaults found in phrases like in [3] (Mahyuni & Ahmadi, 2021) and [4]. The use of negation also appears in words that lexically invite the reader to defy social norms, such as in [5] that motivates its readers to not cleaning shoes a new habit. This semantic clash challenges social order and values, as public invitations are typically expected to promote adherence to social norms.

The second strategy for highlighting products involves deviating from readers' assumed background knowledge, which represents the unmarked. This strategy employs the standard of shared values in society and is perceived in advertisements that prohibit the buy of the promoted items. This deviation hooks the audience by first intimidating the reader with the ban and then challenging their background knowledge regarding the price of cigarettes (which is Rp. 18,000 for the regular price). The phrase "*Budayakan malas*" also aligns with this counter-expectation strategy. Another example that combines linguistic and pragmatic expectations of potential customers is seen in sentence [6] ads. Despite the graphical representation of a cow's picture, the intended meaning is affiliated with pragmatic shared background knowledge rather than the visual reference.

3.2 Discussion

3.2.1 Markedness: Marked and Unmarked Terms

Unmarked (adjective), a term commonly employed in linguistics, encompasses different interpretations and denotes a linguistic characteristic that is more impartial, ordinary, predictable, or general in comparison to its corresponding marked characteristic. In certain linguistic frameworks, unmarked values are also known as "default" values, which can be fulfilled by a category if possible, but are not obligatory if they cannot meet specific conditions (Casagrande, 1966; Greenberg, 1966). For example, the default value for a grammatical case might be accusative. It is crucial to acknowledge the present use of this word in fundamental grammar and its application in recent phonological theory, such as the underspecification theory.

Markedness is a language analysis principle in which opposing linguistic qualities are ascribed different positive (marked) and neutral or negative (unmarked) values. This distinction, in its widest meaning, refers to the presence or omission of a given linguistic trait (Tomic, 1989). In English, for example, most nouns include a formal characteristic that indicates the plural, resulting in the plural form being "marked" but the single form being "unmarked." When evaluating the alternative, which proposes that the opposing traits work independently without any directionality, the logic for constructing such a connection becomes clear. However, it is more obvious to examine "dogs" as derived from "dog" as opposed to the opposite way around, claiming that "dogs" is a plural version of "dog" rather than "dog"

The idea of markedness was first utilized in Prague School phonology, where a phonological element was categorised as marked if it had a distinguishable characteristic (such as voice) and unmarked if it did not (with the unmarked member used in situations of neutralization). Markedness evolved as an important criteria in generative phonology for registering the comparative authenticity of various solutions to phonological difficulties. In contrast to the Prague School's language-specific, phonological approach, this involved using data from the rate of occurrence, historic linguistics, and language development to corroborate the concept that marking constitutes an essential foundation for imposing universal (and potentially innate) values to phonetic features.

Marking values are assigned to distinguishing characteristics, with [+voice] represented marked and [-voice] considered unmarked. Sections can therefore be regarded as mixtures of marked or unmarked characteristics, allowing for easier comparisons. For example, the vowel /a/ is said to be the least marked since it is [-high], [-back], and [-round], whereas // is more complicated since it is [+low] and [+round], and all that. Markedness became increasingly important in future phonological theories, such as underspecification theory. Certain approaches argue that, based on the concept that the unmarked value of a property represents the normal, neutral situation of the corresponding articulator, just one value should be operating in the underpinning representation, with the other value derived from a context-free rule that complies with the relevant markedness statement. For instance, [] [-nasal] indicates that segments are frequently oral. In segments without a nasal value, the rule is bound to insert [-nasal]. These are known as "markedness-based context-free redundancy rules."

Where the idea of "presence versus absence" is not clearly applied, the literature presents numerous alternate interpretations of marking. One interpretation associates marking with frequency of occurrence, indicating that a falling intonation form is regarded unmarked in comparison to a rising one since it is more frequently noticed. Another interpretation emerges in the semantic evaluation of lexical items, where pairs of items are classified as unmarked or marked, depending on which part is more specific than the other. In the situation of "dog/bitch," for example, the latter is designated for sexual characteristics because someone may say "male/female dog," but these descriptors cannot be used to "bitch." A comparable concept develops when one member of an opposition's distribution is restricted in comparison to the other, resulting in the prohibited item being considered as marked. Several comparison statements, such as "How tall is John?" (where "How short is John?" is deemed aberrant), demonstrate this. A more thorough theory of markedness arose later in the development of generative linguistics, in which an unmarked characteristic coincides with general patterns seen in all languages, but a marked feature deviates from these basic patterns, making it unusual (a relative universal). In such a way, markedness may be characterized as a continuum linking language universal and language specific features. A highly unmarked feature asserts strongly that it is universal, whereas a highly marked feature asserts weakly that it is universal. In this perspective, a language that forcefully represents a given common is considered to be highly unmarked, and vice versa. As an example, when it comes to the supposed phonological universality that words have to begin by using a consonant+vowel structure (CV), certain languages, such as Yawelmani, rigidly adhere to it, while others, such as

English, do not, making English more distinct than Yawelmani in this aspect. The order of priority of constraints and violations in optimality theory allows for the direct embedding of the idea of markedness into the structure (McCarthy, 2002; McCarthy, 2007).

3.2.2 Highlighting and Foregrounding Strategies in the Commercial Ads

Ahmadi et al. (2020) explored the origins of “bak” and its association with “bakso” in Cantonese. In Canton Chinese, “bak” translates to “daging”, which means “meat.” However, the literal meanings of the word differ significantly in both languages, depending on the speaker’s general understanding. In its Chinese origin, “bak” specifically refers to pig meat, which is the neutral and unmarked interpretation of the term. When the term was imported into Indonesian vocabulary, it underwent social and cultural adjustments. Given that the majority of Indonesians are Muslims, “bak” became the default term for “daging sapi” (beef).



Figure 2. Food vendor commercial ads

Furthermore, in Indonesian and Sasak languages, the term “daging” generally refers to “daging sapi” as the unmarked term, encompassing meat in general. However, when referring to specific types of meat such as pork or mutton, the situation becomes marked. The marked usage of the term requires the inclusion of a modifier such as “lele” or “ayam” (where “daging” becomes unmarked and does not need to be explicitly mentioned) (Figure 2).



Figure 3. *Jual Hewan Qurban 3M* commercial ads



Figure 4. *Jual Kambing Aqiqah 50M* commercial ads

The advertisement displayed above (Figure 3) promotes the sale of sacrificial cows. The main headline, “*Jual Hewan Qurban 3M*” (Sell Sacrificial Animal 3M), is written in a larger font, while the secondary phrase in red and between brackets, “*Murah, Meriah, Menyenangkan*” (cheap, affordable, pleasurable), appears in a smaller font. Despite the highlighted red color, the secondary phrase receives less focus compared to the headline (Callis, 2009).

We start by examining the phrase “*Jual hewan Qurban 3M*” as it serves as the signboard’s main heading. Structurally, this construction consists of the verb “*jual*” (sell) and the object “*Sapi Qurban*” (sacrificial cows). Initially, when we encounter the verb “*jual*,” we tend to interpret the “*M*” in “*3M*” as an abbreviation for “*Miliar*” (billion). This interpretation is the default assumption given the context of the verb. It is the intended reading the seller expects the reader to have. However, this reading is surprising and deliberately catches the reader’s attention (surprise is the deliberate effect the reader experiences). By arousing the reader’s curiosity, the seller expects a more thorough and focused examination of the advertisement. The phrase “*sapi korban 3M*” in the ad contradicts our expectations regarding the price. Typically, the combination of the verb “*jual*” and a numerical value suggests unmarked information about the price. Therefore, when we read “*Jual sapi kurban 3M*,” the default assumption is “*3 miliar*” (billions). This quick interpretation surprises us, which is reasonable because this part of the text is written in a larger font compared to the correct reading (which is presented in smaller red fonts). The price of the cows is not in billions (the “*3M*” prompts the reading of 3 miliar).

The advertisement plays with words and deviates from the expected interpretation of the text. It takes advantage of the readers’ background knowledge and linguistic understanding (interpreting 3M as 3 miliar). The highlighted text in red, written in smaller fonts, resolves the readers’ confusion, but only upon closer inspection, revealing that it is not “*miliar*” but an abbreviation indicated in the brackets. Essentially, the dominant linguistic strategy used in this commercial advertisement relies on linguistic ambiguity (Lyons, 1977; Griffiths, 2006) to capture the interest of potential customers. By combining the text “*jual sapi korban*” with the distance measurement of 50 meters and an arrow pointing to the picture of a cow (Figure 4), the advertisement intensely grabs the readers’ attention and encourages them to closely consider the product being offered.



Figure 5. Commercial ads with contradictory impressions

The commercial advertising’ contradictory concept: emphasizing the reader’s prior knowledge while confounding the reader’s expectations. The adverts containing the sentence in [1] (shown in Figure 5) quickly pique our interest. Our attention is drawn in two ways: languages and assumed common knowledge. An advertising is not normally expected to restrict or dissuade potential purchasers from purchasing the marketed goods from a language standpoint. In respect to expectations, the viewer is expected to be familiar with cigarette costs. It is typically believed that smokers are aware of the item’s regular price.

As a result, the marketing accentuates a visit to the retailer based on the lowest price it provides (using the presumed knowledge about cigarette costs). Instead of dismissing the communications, smokers are more inclined to pay attention owing to the departure from the typical content used in product marketing. This deviation purposely deviates from language conventions in order to capture the interest of potential clients and persuade them to investigate the pricing. Customers are subsequently guided by their current knowledge towards the advertising’ ultimate goal: to attract them to drop by the business and make the decision to buy.



Figure 6. Commercial ads deviating linguistic principle

3.2.3 Adjacency Principle and the Deviation of Linguistic Principle

The concept of adjacency pairs is frequently utilized in sociolinguistic studies to describe a sequence of stimulus and response within conversational interactions (Crystal, 2008; Noel, 2016). These pairs have been analyzed based on their role in initiating, sustaining, and concluding conversations. Our understanding of conversations heavily relies on the principle of the temporal proximity of expressions. In linguistic analysis, this term is commonly used to explain the acceptability or unacceptability of a construction based on its adjacent position, such as case marking.

The general concept of adjacency pairs finds application in various linguistic domains. Under the adjacency principle, seemingly unrelated expressions can acquire meaning (Steedman, 1996). For example, consider the following exchange: John: "Have you had your lunch?" Jane: "Marry is on her way." Although the response may initially appear unrelated, it is understood as directly answering John's question within the adjacency turn. We can infer that Jane's response means "I haven't had my lunch yet because I'm waiting for Mary to join me. She is on her way, by the way." Similarly, when Udin's mother calls out from the restroom saying, "Udin, the phone. I am in the rest room!", Udin readily recognizes that his mother is questioning him to respond to the phone call.

At the syntactic level, we can illustrate this phenomenon with examples where the first object can influence the second (1a-b), but the reverse is not true (2a-b) as seen in the following sets of sentences:

- (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, this pattern becomes evident in the observation that the first object has the ability to affect the second object, while the reverse does not hold true:

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

The concept of adjacency may possibly be used to the spatial component of signs. For example, when an advertising states 'Selera pemberani' (braveman taste) with an illustration of a pack of cigarettes, we are asked to relate the man's courage jumping towards a speeding train with smoking cigarettes, adhering to the adjacency principle. In the example of the "Soto sasak - Ibu Baiq - Rp. 10000" ad (Figure 7), adjacency implies that Ibu Baiq is the product being offered for sale. However, the anticipated meaning is that the object being sold is the soup, not Ibu Baiq. The advertisement is not being shown correctly. How do we interpret such a deviation? In the broader setting of the signs, this divergence operates as a tool for gaining the viewer's attention. By analogy, the appeal of a spring bed is based on the notion of a beautiful woman enjoying a lovely dream on it, rather than the bed itself. The woman, like Ibu Baiq, is not for sale. The woman in the dream, as well as Ibu Baiq, serve as pleas to devote attention to the item.



Figure 7. *Soto Sasak Ibu Baiq* commercial ads

The common notion is that the price, which is typically Rp. 10000, refers to the price of the soup being served. Nonetheless, the advertising successfully captures the reader's attention owing to its deft use of language concepts. In regards to syntactic organization, we anticipate that Rp. 10000 would adhere to the adjacency principle, that states that what is meant by the linguistic element should correspond to the nearest element in the construction. The price of Rp. 10000 should correspond to Ibu Baiq, adhering to the adjacency principle. This unorthodox interpretation ('tariffs') draws attention. Furthermore, phonological principles impact our perception of the price as relating to Ibu Baiq 'tariffs' besides the adjacency principle. The noun phrase "*Ibu Baiq*" is highlighted extra emphasis by being highlighted with double underlines. Conventionally, double underlines indicate emphasis, and thus, the information that ensues is ideally connected to the doubly underlined element rather than the previous one.

The linguistic analysis of the Ibu Baiq private advertising campaign may be additionally laid out through the principle of grammatical relation. The contrast between grammatical and psychological issues is essential to it (Miller, 2002). In the sentence "The dog chases the cats," the dog is the grammatical subject. It is the NP which appears first directly before the verb and coincides with the agreement between the subject and the verb. In a similar vein, "The cats are being chased by the dog." There are two distinct items. In this case, the subject of grammar is the cats (in the same way as it is in the comparable active sentence). In the line "The cats the dog chases," however, we have two distinct topics. The dog serves as the grammatical subject, while the cats serve as the psychological topic. The cats have earned the status of a psychological topic since they represent the message's beginning point, marking the creatures about whom the speaker desires to communicate. It is a distinct condition because of the emphasis on the beginning point and the speaker's attention on promoting their objectives. The advancement of the cats to the first place is referred to as foregrounding. As in the English scenario, we regard Ibu Baiq in the advertising to be the "grammatical subject" and Soto Sasak to be the psychological subject. Our natural and unbiased assumption would be to interpret Ibu Baiq as the subject, the entity worth Rp. 10000. This indicates the text's unmarked/expected reading. Nonetheless, the text is supposed to be interpreted in the other direction, which necessitates our view of the psychological subject as having a central (pivotal connection) to the predicate Rp. 10000. The advertising successfully attracts our attention in its own right by deviating from the unmodified reading of the language and effectively emphasizing the psychological "subject" matter.

Our linguistic interpretation is inextricably linked to and contains pragmatic values. Based on societal conventions, it is exceedingly unusual for a lady to give herself to other people for a fee (an adult-themed idea that tends to remain personal adhering to conventional standards).

4. Conclusion

In its endeavor to shed light on the linguistic dynamics within text that create a lasting impression, this paper delves into the fundamental principles of language and contextual factors in the process of grabbing the readers' attention. It is worth noting that the differences between marked and unmarked nouns is similar to a form of manipulation observed in commercial signage, wherein both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of the text are violated. Linguistically, to emphasize the prominence of a product, signages are found to deviate from the normal syntactic structure, constituting a violation of linguistic form. This violation extends to the graphological system, encompassing variations in spelling and the use of logographic elements. Consider, for instance, the signage promoting the sacrifice of animals, which introduces ambiguity in the interpretation of a 50-meter distance and utilizes the logograph of an 'arrow' pointing towards a goat. Such linguistic violations are strategically employed to contradict the reader's expectations (motivated violation). Moreover, these violations transcend the linguistic realm by challenging the normal societal expectations associated with standard values. For instance, in capturing the reader's attention, advertisers foreground the virtues of 'laziness' and 'ignorance' (budayakan MALAS mencuci). This deliberate focus on 'laziness' aims to disrupt the reader's conventional expectations (unmarked concept) regarding hygienic behavior (clean living). In doing so, commercial advertisements effectively challenge the reader's expectations, creating a dramatic impact on potential customers and their perception of the promoted product.

Overall, the result of this study is believed to contribute in highlighting the contribution of language landscape (ecology) for both practical (commercial purpose) and academic concerns in linguistic study. On the practical level, the study contributes to the providing of empirical

evidence on how advertisers manipulate the image of their product through linguistic play. There is an interplay between this practical exposure of linguistic landscape and the interest in academic study of the language expression of commercial signages (for instance). The contribution of linguistic landscape is expected both in providing 'teaching materials' and the conceptual/theory building (Mehan, 1979). The result of this study is expected to broaden student perspective especially on the availability of sources of study and thus bring real empirical 'stock' of language data into classroom situation. Furthermore, the high competition in commercial rivalry for potential customers triggers 'productivity' in elaboration, exploration, and exploitation of linguistic expressions, which ultimately open access for 'diverse' source of material for researching.

Acknowledgements

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to the University of Mataram's Rector who kindly provided the funding for this article. Furthermore, we would like to acknowledge and appreciate the assistance rendered by several of our peers within the Department of Language and Art Education, whose contributions have greatly contributed to the development of this manuscript.

References

- Ahmadi, N., Mahyuni, M., & Saputra, A. (2021). Metaphorical expression of meatball and the naturalization of meatball conceptualization. In *2nd Annual Conference on Education and Social Science (ACCESS 2020)*, Vol. 556, 183-188. Atlantis Press (Springer Nature). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210525.070>
- Andrews, E. (1990). *Markedness theory the union of asymmetry and semiosis in language*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv120qs2w>
- Callies, M. (2009). *Information highlighting in advanced learner English the syntax-pragmatics interface in second language acquisition*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.186>
- Casagrande, J. B. (1966). Language universals in anthropological perspective. In J. H. Greenberg (Eds.), *Universals of language* (pp. 279-298). The MIT Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776>
- Cuddon, J. A. (1998). *The penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. Penguin Books.
- Gorter, D. (Ed.). (2006). *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599170>
- Greenberg, J. H. (1966). *Language universals: With special reference to feature hierarchies*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Leech, G. (2013). *Language in literature style and foregrounding*. Routledge.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5526.001.0001>
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics Vol 2*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165693>
- Mahyuni, M., & Ahmadi, N. (2021). *Linguistic and cultural analysis: Issues in languages and cultures*. Ruas Media.
- McCarthy, J. J. (2002). *A thematic guide to optimality theory*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613333>
- McCarthy, J. J. (2007). What is optimality theory? *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(4), 260-291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00018.x>
- Mehan, H. (1979). "What time is it, Denise?" Asking known information questions in classroom discourse". *Theory into Practice*, 18(4), 285-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405847909542846>
- Miller, J. (2002). *Introduction to English syntax*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Noel, B. R. (2016). *Analyzing sentences, An introduction to English syntax* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Steedman, M. (1996). *Surface structure and interpretation*. The MIT Press.
- Tomic, O. M. (Ed.). (1989). *Markedness in synchrony and diachrony*. Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110862010>
- Zhang, H. Y. & Tian, F. (2015). Study on markedness in linguistics. *Sino-US English Teaching*, September 2015, 12(9), 667-671. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2015.09.004>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).