

DEIXIS USED BY AN ENGLISH TEACHER IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION: A PRAGMATIC STUDY IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Afifah Amalia Putri¹, Setia Muljanto², Muhamad Taufik Hidayat³

^{1,2,3} Institut Pendidikan Indonesia Garut (IPI Garut)

Alamat e-mail : ¹afifahamalia16@gmail.com,

²setiamuljanto@institutpendidikan.ac.id, ³muhamadtaufik@institutpendidikan.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Language constitutes the primary medium through which teachers and students construct meaning in educational settings. Among the most fundamental pragmatic properties of classroom language is deixis, expressions whose interpretation depends entirely on the context of utterance. The present study investigates the types of deixis employed by an English teacher during classroom interaction at a senior high school in Garut, West Java, and examines why a specific type prevails. A qualitative descriptive approach was used, with data gathered through passive participant observation and audio-visual recording across two lesson sessions on conjunction and narrative text. All deictic expressions in the teacher's utterances were classified into five categories based on Levinson's (1983) framework: person deixis, time deixis, place deixis, discourse deixis, and social deixis. A total of 299 deictic tokens were identified. The data contained all five types of deixis. Person deixis was the most dominant with 164 occurrences (54.8%), followed by time deixis with 51 (17.1%), discourse deixis with 32 (10.7%), place deixis with 26 (8.7%), and social deixis with 24 (8.0%). This is due to the interpersonal nature of instructional discourse, the teacher's inclusive use of first-person plural forms, and the code-mixing between English and Indonesian which broadened the range of personal reference expressions. The findings suggest that personal reference is the dominant vehicle of pedagogical communication in the English classroom.

Keywords: *classroom interaction, deixis, EFL, Levinson, pragmatics, teacher talk*

ABSTRAK

Bahasa merupakan medium utama yang digunakan guru dan siswa dalam membangun makna di lingkungan Pendidikan. Salah satu fitur pragmatic paling mendasar dalam Bahasa kelas Adalah deikis, yakni ekspresi yang penafsirannya bergantung sepenuhnya pada konteks tuturan. Penelitian ini mengkaji jenis-jenis deikis yang digunakan seorang guru Bahasa Inggris dalam interaksi kelas di SMA di Garut, Jawa Barat, serta menelaah mengapa jenis tertentu mendominasi. Pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif diterapkan, dengan data dikumpulkan melalui observasi partisipatif pasif dan rekaman audio-visual pada dua sesi pembelajaran yaitu conjunction dan sesi teks narrative. Seluruh ekspresi deiktis diklasifikasikan menggunakan kerangka lima kategori Levinson (1983). Total 299 token deiktis ditemukan, terdiri dari 141 token pada pertemuan pertama dan 158 pada pertemuan kedua. Kelima jenis deiksis ditemukan dalam tuturan guru. Deiksis persona mendominasi dengan 164 kemunculan (54,8%), diikuti deiksis waktu 51 (17,1%), deiksis wacana 32 (10,7%), deiksis tempat 26 (8,7%), dan deiksis sosial 24 (8,0%). Dominansi deiksis persona disebabkan oleh sifat interpersonal interaksi kelas,

penggunaan konsisten persona pertama jamak inklusif oleh guru, dan alih kode antara bahasa Inggris dan Indonesia. Temuan ini mengindikasikan bahwa referensi personal berfungsi sebagai wahana utama komunikasi pedagogis dalam kelas bahasa Inggris.

Kata Kunci: interaksi kelas, deikis, EFL, Levinson, pragmatic, tuturan guru

A. INTRODUCTION

Language is the main tool through which human beings communicate meaning, negotiate relationships and transmit knowledge. In the classroom context, language mediates every dimension of the teaching and learning process, from delivering instructional content and managing learner behavior to building social bonds between teacher and students. Within this communicative space, one of the most pervasive pragmatic features of language use is deixis. Deictic expressions are those whose reference cannot be identified without knowledge of the context in which the utterance occurs, namely who is speaking, to whom, where and when (Levinson, 1983). The study of deixis is thus situated at the crossroads of linguistics and context, making it a particularly fruitful lens through which to explore language in educational contexts.

Levinson (1983) defines deixis as the encoding or grammaticalisation of aspects of the utterance context by

languages and argues that it is the most transparent relationship between language and context. Similarly, Yule (1996) says that deictic expressions are devices which point to things, and anchor utterances in their situational context, and are therefore important for face-to-face conversation. Within Levinson's framework, deixis is classified into five types. Person deixis encodes the participatory roles of individuals in a speech event. Place deixis encodes spatial location relative to the speaker. Time deixis encodes temporal reference relative to the moment of utterance. Discourse deixis refers to portions of the ongoing discourse itself. Social deixis encodes social relationships and identities among participants.

Classroom interaction is a particularly rich environment for deictic expression. The teacher, as the main organizer of classroom discourse, creates utterances containing many deictic indicators throughout all the phases of the instruction. Winanta, Rochsantiningih, and Supriyadi

(2020) have demonstrated that teacher talk contributes to the quality and character of EFL classroom interaction at the senior high school level. The language choices made by the instructor have a direct impact on student involvement and participation. Nasir, Yusuf and Wardana (2019) found also that teacher talk in Indonesian EFL classes is dominated by several kinds of speak. Each kind of talk has a different instructional purpose. This body of work has increasingly focused on the pragmatic dimension of teacher communication and in particular the significance of deixis.

Jumaedah, Saleh and Hartono (2020) found that the teachers' use of deixis directly improves the students' understanding of teacher talk in EFL contexts, highlighting the pedagogical value of deictic choices in the classroom. Mayori, Putra, and Suarnajaya (2020) observed that all five varieties of Levinsonian deixis were found in the utterances of international and local English teachers in Indonesian vocational high schools. They also found that person deixis was the most dominate type in both groups. Timbu, Balik, and Kartini

(2024) also showed that person deixis was the most dominant kind in EFL classroom interactions at the university level, where the first and second person forms represented the collaborative and dialogic nature of learning. Social deixis is considered to be important in organizing the interaction in EFL classroom at primary school level in Java, especially with the usage of honorific forms and addressee categories (Rohmaniyah, Pratama, and Yuliasri, 2023).

Although the studies are increasing, there are still limited studies that investigate English teacher discourse at the senior high school level in Indonesia from a deictic perspective. Most previous study has focused on either vocational schools, written texts, or non-classroom discourse such as speeches and film dialogue. At textual level, Indriastuti, Pulungan and Natsir (2023) found five types of deixis in students' descriptive text writing at senior high school, where spatial deixis dominate the written production. This is in stark contrast to the dominance of person deixis in spoken teacher talk. Another unique communicative problem in

Indonesian senior high school classrooms is that English teachers often mix English and Bahasa Indonesia in one lecture. Siddiq, Kustati, and Yustina (2020) found that Indonesian EFL teachers employ code-mixing and code-switching to bridge the language barrier and scaffold students' understanding. This practice naturally enlarges the repertoire of deictic expressions available to the teacher in one lesson session. Likewise, Mafulah, Basthomi, Cahyono, and Suryati (2023) found that the interactions among teachers and students in Indonesian EFL classrooms are impacted by the multilingual communicative norms of the learning environment that force teachers to employ both languages to maintain understanding and engagement.

Against this backdrop, the present study examines the deictic expressions produced by an English teacher during classroom interaction at a senior high school in Garut, West Java. It addresses the following research question: What types of deixis are used by an English teacher in classroom interaction, and why does a particular type dominate? The

study draws on Levinson's (1983) theoretical framework and analyses data from two observed lesson sessions. It is anticipated that the findings will contribute empirical evidence to the pragmatics of classroom discourse and offer practical insight into the linguistic patterns that underpin effective teacher communication in the Indonesian EFL.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive approach. The qualitative orientation is appropriate because the aim is not to measure variables or test hypotheses, but to identify, classify, and interpret naturally occurring linguistic phenomena within their authentic communicative context. Creswell (2014) notes that qualitative research seeks to understand and interpret meaning as constructed by individuals within real-world social situations. The descriptive design enables a systematic characterization of the types of deixis found in the data and an explanation of the distributional patterns that emerge from close analysis of the corpus.

The subject of this study is a single English teacher working at a state senior high school in Garut, West Java, Indonesia. The teacher was selected through purposive sampling on the basis that she is an active English teacher who conducts regular classroom sessions generating sufficient interactional data for pragmatic analysis. Both the teacher's identity and the name of the school are kept anonymous in accordance with research ethics principles.

Data were drawn from two naturally occurring lesson sessions: Meeting 1 (M1) on the topic of conjunction and Meeting 2 (M2) on the topic of narrative text. Data collection was conducted through two complementary techniques, namely passive participant observation and audio-visual recording. The researcher was physically present in the classroom throughout both sessions without intervening in the interaction. All teacher utterances were recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Audio-visual documentation ensured the completeness and accuracy of the data and minimised the risk of distortion during transcription.

The researcher served as the primary instrument of study, in keeping with the role of the human instrument in qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 2014). Supporting instruments comprised an audio-visual recorder, a verbatim transcription sheet and a coding sheet designed to identify each deictic phrase by type, subcategory, referent, and contextual purpose in the educational session. The coding sheet was based on Levinson's (1983) five-category taxonomy. Each detected token was given a separate code for its sequence, meet and deixis type. The codes are (N//M/TYPE), where N is a sequential number of the token in the data set, M is the meeting session (M1 or M2) and TYPE is the deixis category (e.g., PD for Person Deixis, TD for Time Deixis, PlaD for Place Deixis, DD for Discourse Deixis, SoD for Social Deixis).

Qualitative data analysis was conducted using the interactive model of qualitative data analysis by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) involving three iterative steps. In the first step, data reduction, the transcribed utterances were scanned for utterances with deictic phrases.

Second stage was data display . Identified expressions were placed into the coding sheet and classified by type , subcategory , referent and instructional function . In the third stage, conclusion drawing and verification, distributional patterns were analysed to answer the study question with particular reference to the reasons behind the dominance of a particular type of deixis. Reliability of data was obtained by doing constant observation on both instruction periods. Because the teacher employed both English and Bahasa Indonesia throughout the lessons, deictic expressions from both languages were included in the analysis, given that Levinson's (1983) framework is language-neutral in its application.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the teacher's utterances across two lesson sessions yielded a total of 299 deictic tokens: 141 from Meeting 1 (M1) and 158 from Meeting 2 (M2). All five types of deixis identified by Levinson (1983) were found in the data. Table 1 presents the overall distribution.

Table 1. Distribution of Deixis Types in Teacher Utterances

Deixis Type	M1	M2	Total	%
Person Deixis (PD)	82	82	164	54.8
Time Deixis (TD)	20	31	51	17.1
Place Deixis (PlaD)	8	18	26	8.7
Discourse Deixis (DD)	18	14	32	10.7
Social Deixis (SoD)	13	11	24	8.0
Total	141	158	299	100

1. Person Deixis

Person deixis is a way to represent the roles of individuals in a speech event, distinguishing the speaker (1st person), the addressee (2nd person) and any other referent (3rd person) (Levinson, 1983). It was the most prevalent deixis in this survey with 164 tokens (54.8%). The split of subcategories is seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Subcategories of Person Deixis

Subcategory	Expression	N
1st Person Plural	we, kita, our	42
2nd Person Sing/Plural	you	32
2nd Person Plural	kalian	18

Subcategory	Expression	N
1st Person Singular	I, saya	17
3rd Person Non-human	it, its	15
3rd Person Female	she, her	10
2nd Person Singular	kamu	10
2nd Person Possessive	your	8
3rd Person Singular	dia	5
3rd Person Nominal	girl, perempuannya	3
1st Person Plural (Object)	us	1
3rd Person Plural	they	1
Total		164

a. First Person

First person singular (I, saya) appeared 17 times, used by the teacher to share personal experiences during the social opening phase and to position herself as an individual participant in classroom interaction.

"Alhamdulillah I'm fine, I'm so fine."
 (04//M1/PD)

First person plural, realised as we in English and kita in Indonesian, constituted the single largest subcategory with 42 tokens. In Levinson's (1983) terms, the relevant distinction here is between inclusive we, which encompasses both speaker and addressee, and exclusive we, which encompasses the speaker and third parties only. In the present data, both we and kita were used almost exclusively in the inclusive sense, positioning the teacher and students as a joint learning community. It should be noted that we and kita are counted as separate tokens because they are two distinct lexical realisations, one in English and one in Indonesian, occurring in different code-switching moments. The bilingual nature of the data means that the same pragmatic function is performed by two formally different expressions.

"Kita cek sama-sama supaya setiap orang tahu jawabannya."
 (Let us check it together so that everyone knows the answers.) (43//M1/PD)

b. Second Person

Second person expressions, comprising you (32), kalian (18), kamu

(10), and your (8), totalled 68 tokens and represented the second largest cluster within person deixis. Levinson (1983) identifies the second person as the canonical deictic form for encoding the addressee role. In classroom discourse, this function spans a range of instructional acts. You was used when the teacher addressed students in English, either collectively or individually. Kalian served as the Indonesian equivalent for group address, carrying a more formal register than kamu. Kamu appeared in direct, informal exchanges, typically when the teacher addressed a specific student to check work or manage individual behaviour. The possessive form your referred to something belonging to the students, their answers, their work, their time, personalising the instructional directive.

"Febi can you read the first?"

(49//M1/PD)

"Kamu kemarin ke mana?"

Kenapa tidak nulis?"

(Where were you yesterday?

Why did you not write?)

(133//M2/PD)

c. Third Person

Third person forms, including it/its (15), she/her (10), dia (5), girl/perempuannya (3), and they (1),

functioned in two distinct contexts. In M1, it was used anaphorically to refer to grammatical concepts under discussion. The form us (1 token) is classified as first person plural object, functioning as an inclusive addressee form within the same pedagogical we-construction discussed above.

"It could combine the sentence, combine the clause."

(45//M1/PD)

In M2, the teacher told a local legend inside the narrative text lesson, and she/her and dia were used as cohesive devices in the narrative by tracking the female protagonist over numerous consecutive utterances. This finding is congruent with the findings of Timbu, Balik, and Kartini (2024) who also found that the third person forms in EFL classroom interaction often have an anaphoric rather than a referential role.

"She not far from the water."

(28//M2/PD) [Note: This

utterance is grammatically

incomplete — the copula is

absent — reflecting the

informal, spontaneous

register of narrative teacher

talk. The deictic function of

she is nonetheless

unambiguous in context.]

2. Time Deixis

Time Deixis Time deixis is the temporal reference relative to the time of utterance, including the past, present and future points of reference (Levinson, 1983). A total of 51 tokens (17.1%) were found. Table 3 shows the distribution of subcategories.

Table 3. Subcategories of Time Deixis

Subcategory	Expression	N
Present	today, now, sekarang, hari ini, ayeuna	25
Past	yesterday, kemarin, tadi, dulu, long time ago, suatu hari, then	16
Future	tomorrow, nanti, minggu depan, selasa depan	10
Total		51

a. Present Time Deixis

Present time expressions (25 tokens) were used to anchor instructions and classroom activities to the immediate moment, signalling that the required action was to take place without delay.

"Oleh karena itu sekarang, we check it together."
 (Therefore now, we check it together.) (41//M1/TD)

b. Past Time Deixis

Past time expressions (16 tokens) functioned in two distinct ways across the two sessions. In M1, proximal past markers such as *kemarin* and *tadi* referred to recent real-world events like the long weekend or to points made earlier in the same lesson. In M2, distal past markers such as *long time ago*, *dulu*, and *suatu hari* located the teacher's narration of a local legend within the narrative text lesson in a remote, unspecified past, a convention common to oral storytelling traditions that the teacher was modelling for students.

"long time ago, konon katanya gitu ya."
 (Long time ago, so the story goes.) (42//M2/TD)

c. Future Time Deixis

Future time expressions (10 tokens) were used predominantly at the closing phase of each lesson to communicate upcoming obligations, such as the announcement of an upcoming test and submission deadlines.

"Jadi pertemuan minggu depan insyaallah kita ulangan."
 (So next week's session, God willing, we will have a test.) (129//M1/TD)

3. Place Deixis

Place deixis encodes spatial location relative to the speaker's position at the time of utterance, typically contrasting a proximal pole with a distal pole (Levinson, 1983). A total of 26 tokens (8.7%) were identified, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Subcategories of Place Deixis

Subcategory	Expression	N
Proximal	di sini, sini, here	17
Distal	di situ, ke sana, there, itu	9
Total		26

a. Proximal Place Deixis

Proximal expressions (17 tokens) directed students' attention towards the immediate instructional space, including the whiteboard, the textbook, and materials within the classroom.

"Ada 2 kemungkinan di sini yaitu kata 'does' dan 'do'."
 (There are 2 possibilities here: the words 'does' and 'do'.) (69//M1/PlaD)

b. Distal Place Deixis

Distal expressions (9 tokens) referred to locations beyond the teacher's immediate position. In M1 these pointed to specific items on the whiteboard at a distance from where

the teacher stood; in M2 they located events within the setting of the local legend narrated as part of the narrative text lesson, demonstrating the role of place deixis in constructing narrative space.

"kalau kalian ke sana itu pemakaman luas."
 (If you go there, it is a vast cemetery.) (65//M2/PlaD)

4. Discourse Deixis

Discourse deixis refers to expressions that point to portions of the unfolding discourse, either to what has already been said (anaphoric) or to what is about to be said (cataphoric) (Levinson, 1983). A total of 32 tokens (10.7%) were found across two subcategories, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Subcategories of Discourse Deixis

Subcategory	Expression	N
Proximal (anaphoric/cataphoric)	ini, this	22
Distal (anaphoric)	itu, that, before, after that	10
Total		32

a. Proximal Discourse Deixis

The proximal form ini (this) made of 22 tokens and was mainly utilized in the grammar explanation stages, referring to linguistic constructs that were visible on the whiteboard or being introduced verbally at that moment in the discourse.

"Ini sesuatu yang diawali dengan article."
 (This is something that begins with an article.)
 (59//M1/DD)

b. Distal Discourse Deixis

Distal discourse deictic expressions, itu, that, before, and after that, totalled 10 tokens and were used anaphorically to refer back to topics, explanations, or narrative content already introduced in the preceding discourse, sustaining thematic coherence across lesson phases.

"is there any story similar with that?"
 (67//M2/DD)

5. Social Deixis

Social deixis encodes social identities of and interactions between participants in a speech event, including difference of position, difference of role, and difference of relative social standing (Levinson, 1983). Levinson distinguishes between relational social deixis, which

encodes the link between speaker and addressee, and absolute social deixis, which encodes the social position of a participant in respect to another. The total number of tokens discovered is 24 (8.0%) as stated in Table 6.

Table 6. Subcategories of Social Deixis

Subcategory	Expression	N
Self-reference (Relational)	Ibu	19
Addressee Social Category (Absolute)	students, girls, boy, laki-laki	4
Social Group Reference	orang Sunda	1
Total		24

a. Self-Reference: Ibu

The most salient social deictic was Ibu, the Indonesian honorific for a female teacher or respected female senior, which the instructor employed to refer to herself 19 times throughout both sessions. The instructor regularly used her social title, not the first-person pronoun I or saya. This is a pattern of relational social deixis that

encodes and simultaneously maintains the hierarchical teacher-student relationship that is distinctive of Indonesian educational culture. This finding is in line with Rohmaniyah, Pratama, and Yuliasri (2023) who found that honorific forms are an important part of social deixis in Indonesian EFL classrooms that act to sustain civility and to support role-based social structure.

"Belum diperiksa...keburu libur kemarin, Ibu belum sempat."

(Not yet checked... the holiday came first, Ibu has not had the chance.)
(40//M1/SoD)

The teacher maintained the use of Ibu even in informal personal narratives and moments of epistemic uncertainty, indicating that social role identity is sustained consistently regardless of the register of the interaction.

"Ada yang tahu? Lupa, Ibu."
(Does anyone know? Ibu forgot.) (20//M2/SoD)

b. Addressee Social Category and Social Group Reference

Forms such as students, girls, boy, and laki-laki (boys), totalling 4 tokens, represent absolute social deixis addressing participants according to their social category rather than individual identity. These expressions functioned as participation management tools, inviting specific gender groups to contribute when one group had been silent.

"Next yu laki-laki dari tadi diem aja."

(Next, you boys have been quiet all this time.)

(105//M1/SoD)

One token involved a reference to a broader social group, orang Sunda (Sundanese people), which the teacher used during the legend narration within the narrative text lesson in M2 to establish a shared cultural reference point between herself and the students, connecting the lesson content to local identity.

6. Discussion: The Dominance of Person Deixis

The dominance of person deixis (54.8%) is in line with the previous findings of other similar research in the Indonesian and other Asian EFL contexts. Mayori, Putra, and

Suarnajaya (2020) found that person deixis was the dominant type in foreign and local English teachers' utterances in vocational high schools. Timbu, Balik, and Kartini (2024) found that 70.48% of all deictic tokens were person deixis in EFL classroom interaction at the university level. These converging findings across school levels and institutional contexts indicate that the predominance of person deixis in classroom discourse is not incidental but an index of structural aspects of instructional communication that are stable across places.

Three intersecting explanations account for this dominance in the present study. To begin with, classroom interaction is structurally interpersonal at its core. Every instructional speech act, whether it involves giving a directive, nominating a student to respond, checking comprehension, or providing feedback, involves at minimum a speaker and an addressee, generating first and second person reference as a structural necessity. Yule (1996) observes that deictic expressions function as pointing devices anchoring utterances to their

situational context, and in classroom discourse this anchoring is overwhelmingly oriented toward persons rather than places, times, or discourse segments. In contrast to written academic discourse, which may be depersonalised, spoken classroom interaction is fundamentally dialogic. As Nasir, Yusuf and Wardana (2019) note, teacher talk in Indonesian EFL classrooms is shaped by the constant need to manage the reciprocal relationship between teacher and students. Winanta, Rochsantiningasih, & Supriyadi (2020) also observed that the teacher speaking patterns in the senior high school level were characterized by a high degree of interpersonal directness, where the teacher often directs actions and evaluates student replies. Jumaedah, Saleh, and Hartono (2020) also found that this personal orientation in teacher talk immediately influences students' understanding and participation because personal reference provides immediate relevance for the recipient.

A second explanation is the teacher's strategic preference for inclusive first person plural forms, *we* and *kita*, which amount to 42 out of

164 person deixis tokens. The instructor herself is encoded within the same pronominal reference as the students, thus framing learning as a shared, rather than a transferred, effort. Winanta, Rochsantiningsih, and Supriyadi (2020) found that senior high school experienced EFL teachers tend to make the language choices that lessen the power difference between teacher and students. The frequent usage of inclusive we in the present data is in line with this pattern.

The third explanation is the teacher's technique of code-mixing, which enriches the diversity of person deictic statements that can be found in the same lesson. In a monolingual English classroom, the personal reference paradigm is limited to I, we, you, your, he, she, it and them. In this bilingual classroom, the paradigm extends to include saya, kita, kalian, kamu, dia, and Ibu, each with different pragmatic nuances that are lacking in the English-only system.

Siddiq, Kustati, and Yustina (2020) demonstrated that Indonesian EFL teachers employ code-mixing primarily to reduce language barriers and clarify meaning, functions that are inherently interpersonal and therefore

consistently mediated through first and second person reference. This expansion of the personal reference inventory naturally increases the overall frequency count for person deixis as a category and explains a substantial portion of its quantitative dominance over the other four types in the data.

D. CONCLUSION

This study analysed the deictic expressions produced by an English teacher across two senior high school lesson sessions, drawing on Levinson's (1983) five-type framework. A total of 299 deictic tokens were identified. Three principal conclusions are drawn.

All five types of deixis were present in the teacher's utterances, each occurring across multiple subcategories. Person deixis encompassed first person singular (I, saya), first person plural realised as we in English and kita in Indonesian as two distinct lexical forms serving the same inclusive function, second person forms (you, kalian, kamu, your), and third person forms (it, she, dia, they). Time deixis distributed across present references (sekarang, today), past references (kemarin, tadi,

long time ago), and future references (nanti, tomorrow, minggu depan). Discourse deixis was realised through proximal (ini, this) and distal (itu, that, before) forms. Place deixis contrasted proximal (di sini, here) and distal (di situ, ke sana, there) locations. Social deixis appeared as relational self-reference through the honorific Ibu, absolute addressee categories (students, girls, laki-laki), and social group reference (orang Sunda). The diversity of these subcategories reflects the multidimensional communicative demands of classroom interaction, in which the teacher must simultaneously manage content delivery, learner participation, temporal structuring, spatial orientation, and social relationships.

Person deixis was the most dominant type, accounting for 164 tokens (54.8%). This dominance is attributable to three converging factors: the inherently interpersonal structure of instructional discourse, which generates first and second person reference as a functional necessity; the teacher's consistent use of inclusive first person plural to co-construct a shared learning community; and the bilingual code-

mixing practice, which multiplied the inventory of personal reference expressions across English and Indonesian. These patterns suggest that in the Indonesian EFL senior high school classroom, personal reference functions as the primary vehicle of pedagogical communication through which content instruction, learner management, and social bonding are simultaneously accomplished. From a pedagogical standpoint, these findings suggest that teacher education programs should raise awareness of deictic choices as intentional communicative tools. Training teachers to use inclusive person deixis strategically and to recognize how code-mixing expands the deictic repertoire may contribute to more effective and relationally sensitive classroom communication in the Indonesian EFL context.

This study is limited by its single-subject, two-session design, and the findings should not be generalized beyond the immediate context. Future research is encouraged to examine multiple teachers across a range of experience levels and subject types, to incorporate student-produced deictic

expressions alongside teacher talk, and to extend the observational corpus in order to build a more comprehensive account of deixis as a resource for pedagogical communication in Indonesian EFL classrooms.

REFERENCES

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Indriastuti, M. O., Pulungan, A. H., & Natsir, M. (2023). The use of deixis in students' writing of descriptive texts. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 4(4), 995-1004. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v4i4.862>
- Jumaedah, N., Saleh, M., & Hartono, R. (2020). The effect of teachers' use of deixis on students' understanding of their talk. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 361-365. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i1.36684>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mafulah, S., Basthomi, Y., Cahyono, B. Y., & Suryati, N. (2023). Exploring Indonesian EFL teacher-student interactions in online learning. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(2), 686-703. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.23804>
- Mayori, W., Putra, N. A. J., & Suarnajaya, I. W. (2020). A comparative study of deixis used by foreign and local English teachers in vocational high school. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 4(3), 240-246. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v4i3.26277>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nasir, C., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Wardana, A. (2019). A qualitative study of teacher talk in an EFL classroom interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 525-535.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15251</p> <p>Rohmaniyah, R., Pratama, H., & Yuliasri, I. (2023). The use of social deixis in EFL classroom interactions at SD Islam Al Azhar 60 Pekalongan Jawa Tengah. <i>International Journal of Research and Review</i>, 10(4), 506-512.</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230462</p> <p>Siddiq, R. A., Kustati, M., & Yustina, L. S. (2020). Teachers' code mixing and code switching: Insights on language barriers in EFL classroom. <i>Al-Ta'lim Journal</i>, 27(1), 80-91.</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v27i1.606</p> <p>Timbu, M. E. I., Balik, L. M., & Kartini, M. (2024). The use of deixis in EFL classroom interaction: A pragmatic study of sixth-semester students of the English Education Study Program at Nusa Nipa University. <i>KLAUSA: Kajian Linguistik, Pembelajaran Bahasa, dan Sastra</i>, 8(2), 14-24.</p> | <p>https://doi.org/10.33479/klausa.v8i2.1079</p> <p>Winanta, A., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Supriyadi, S. (2020). Exploring EFL classroom interaction: An analysis of teacher talk at senior high school level. <i>ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities</i>, 3(3), 328-343.</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v3i3.11061</p> <p>Yule, G. (1996). <i>Pragmatics</i>. Oxford University Press.</p> |
|--|---|