Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues, 8 (1) page 73 – 86, 2025
ISSN: 2615-3920 EISSN: 2685-4473 | DOI: 10.21043/jetli.v8i1.31267

Indexicality in EFL Classroom Learning: A Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis

Muh Fajar[1], Alaudy Hendy Intakha[2], Heny Sulistyowati[3]

[1,2] English Language Education, University of PGRI Jombang, Indonesia
[3] Indonesian Language Education, University of PGRI Jombang, Indonesia

Contact:	Muh Fajar		fajarstkipjb@gmail.com

How to cite:

Fajar, M., Intakha, A. H., & Sulistyowati, H. (2025). Indexicality in EFL classroom learning: A critical classroom discourse analysis. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, *8*(1), 73–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v8i1.31267

ABSTRACT

This study examined dialogues between a lecturer and his students in an EFL classroom learning to find out indexicality. It employed a qualitative technique. The data were dialogues by the lecturer and his students at English Department of the higher education institution in Jombang when they were involved the learning process of the Classroom Discourse class. There were two instruments in this study, they were the researcher himself and documentation. In terms of indexicality, the participants used personal deixis o strengthen his position on the issues faced by the lecturer when the utterance is addressed and forces the audience to accept his views. In addition, the shift in deixis "I" to "We" throughout the classroom learning interaction could also be an attempt to ensure that students were persuaded. The use of the sign "We" which is predominantly indexical by the lecturer convinces students to believe that the learning delivered in class is a collective statement and not a personal statement. Furthermore, the lecturer employed politeness to keep his relationship with his students well. Thus, it could be concluded that indexicality in this study had two kinds of relations, they were equal and unequal relations. Equal relations were represented using positive deixis and positive politeness, whereas unequal relations were represented by negative deixis and negative politeness.

KEYWORDS:
Indexicality;
Critical classroom discourse analysis;
Deixis;
Politeness

ARTICLE HISTORY:
Received:
March 4, 2025
Accepted:
June 5, 2025

Introduction

The most crucial aspect of human life is communication. It becomes crucial in developing positive relationships with people. Humans communicate with one another to express feelings, send messages, and other things, and satisfy their needs. Language as a communication tool is essential in conveying messages and thoughts. It also explains the topic of conversation for participants in social communication events. It is able to describe interpersonal relationships between participants, whether they are in an equal relationship or one participant dominates the other participants.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). Published by Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues (JETLI).
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0), which permits to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. It also allows remixing, transforming, and building upon the material for any purpose.

Language is the evolution of the most fundamental form of inter- and intra-human communication. It is also the most advanced type, despite being the simplest. Communication becomes heavily dependent on non-verbal cues such as gestures. Nonverbal communication could be through dancing and other types of visual art, such as painting and sculpture, but language is the pinnacle of pure, articulate communication. Sometimes a person uses language in a communication event to influence the feelings and thoughts of other people (Josiah & Oghenerho, 2015), which states that when a conversation occurs between the speaker and the listener, language has a vital function in conveying an understanding of what is going to be conveyed by the speaker through the utterances delivered. Regarding this assertion, an intriguing phenomenon occurred throughout the learning process when the lecturer and the student's English department of the higher education institution in Jombang interacted during in-class instruction. Their problematic behaviors and standing as equals or unequal may have contributed to their diverse interactions with other participants and in every situation. The equal or unequal connections that were taking place in a class learning discourse analysis in 2023 could be examined using the critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA) theory. Some linguistic indicators can be applied to measure indexicality, such as deixis and politeness.

This study examined how the lecturer and students use indexicality in the classroom learning process. Of the causes, this study investigated the linguistic and cultural expressions made by lecturers and students, as well as the real dominance of a lecturer over his students by deceptive or manipulative arguments about the local culture to support or assume the validity of the lecturer's viewpoint. In order to respond to these problem statements, several underlying concepts are used. The concepts of indexicality that could be seen from the standpoint of linguistic forms and cultural diversity are brought together in the current study. Silverstein (2003) stated that indexicality describes the relationship between linguistic elements or characteristics and semiotic meaning. Depending on factors like context, speaker and listener, and relationships between speakers, the researchers may have several or numerous indexical interpretations. The phenomenon in class language learning can be examined as a part of critical classroom discourse studies (CCDA) that explore the development of situated identities portrayed in classroom interaction that are included in the data, bridging the gap between the micro and macro levels of social frames.

CCDA attempts to include discourse analysis in the classroom because kids from different households may be viewed as miniature communities. This is due to the fact that CCDA examines post-structural and postcolonial discourse views (Kumaravadivelu, 1999). Furthermore, the notion that class discourse is a discourse study that looks at classroom scenarios that are comparable to those in actual society is one of the assumptions upon which CCDA is predicated. Each participant must therefore have political motivation, a created social problem, and, of course, a cultural background that forms and influences it (Babaii et al., 2018). As a result, CCDA is also supported in terms of how the cultural capital in the classroom may influence and influence the relationship between instructors and students in educational environments. The learning community in the classroom is a miniature community; therefore, everything that exists in actual society is present there. Such circumstances must occur in class if racial disparities, social stratification, and gender differences exist in real society. CCDA experts include the classroom in the context of how the class is structured, which considers various factors related to the linguistic environment in addition to learning motivation. The linguistic setting demonstrates how conversations between participants, such as lecturers and students, inside or outside of the classroom.

To demonstrate how to connect the micro-social and macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon, indexicality is required. Indexicality establishes a link between social significance and language structure. For example, a variation can suggest that the speaker is of a particular ethnicity or from a specific place. According to Silverstein, there are "orders of indexicality" that "relate between micro-social to the macro-social frames in any sociolinguistic study." as stated by Silverstein (2003). There is a correlation between each level of meaning as linguistic elements evolve and shift, shifting language from one order to another. It introduces the idea of indexical order, which is essential to any empirical study of the fundamentally dialectical realities of indexicality.

The ability of linguistic and nonlinguistic indicators to point to context-specific elements is known as indexicality. It is a general phrase that refers to all the contexts—spatiotemporal, historical, discursive, social, interactional, and others—in which communication activities are placed. Indexicality has a significant role in the interpretation of existing indicators. Discourse that is expressed orally, in writing, or visually could be used to index time and location, situation frames, interactional norms, roles, and other contextual factors, Silverstein (2003). The pragmatic premise that one must comprehend the function of every communicative act in context in order to comprehend its meaning is supported by the idea of indexicality. As settings change, meanings also do. The phrase "this is my dog, Buddy," for instance, could signify several different things. The dog in question could be a real dog, a photograph of a dog, or even a person whose friend expresses how close they are by utilizing a slang phrase that could be heard in some modern hip-hop songs. Buddy could be the name of whatever "my dog" is, or it could stand for the person being addressed. When, how, why, and by whom a speech is utilized determines its meaning. Also, it depends on how the statement is taken. The concept of indexicality explains how interactants employ context-specific information to give specific meanings to the signs they use. Indexicality could be examined through CCDA by employing deixis and politeness as two of the discourse indicators to uncover the rank of interaction, providing their dialogues as contextual meaning between the lecturer and students in the classroom.

Deixis is used to describe several grammatical elements, including the use of demonstrative and personal pronouns, "now" and "here" adverbs, and demonstrative and personal pronouns. Levinson (1983) states that "deixis concerns how language encode or grammaticalize characteristics of the context of utterance or speech event and consequently concerns ways in which interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of the context of utterance." Deixis is also a sort of referencing that is related to the speaker's context, with the most fundamental contrast between deictic phrases being "near speaker" and "distance from speaker," Yule (1996). The closest speaker or "proximal terms" in English are "this," "here," and "now." "That," "there," and "then" are "distal words" or terms that are away from the speaker. The phenomenon where specific words and phrases in a speech require contextual information is discussed. It, in addition, is a term or phrase that requires context in order to be taxed.

Deixis refers to the linguistic qualities used to identify the time, place, or people involved in a communication encounter. Deixis typically serves as pointers or navigators in speech. There are three types of deixis according to Dylgjeri and Kazazi (2013). Personal deixis is used to indicate persons (her, him, them, and I) as well as objects such as this, that, and those. Spatial deixis directs attention to a specific place, and temporal deixis designates a time. It is also thought that, in order to interpret all of these deictic phrases, understanding who, when, and where the speaker is referring to is necessary.

Furthermore, analysis of politeness as another discourse indicator in CCDA has a significant role in the communication event to uncover the indexicality of the phenomenon. The "core" of politeness research was developed by Brown and Levinson's "face" theory, which examined how people engage in everyday conversation. The social relationships amongst event participants may also be reflected in it. There are four types of politeness tactics, according to Brown and Levinson (1987). They are both on and off the record. The two types of on-record tactics are face-saving and face-threatening (bald on-record). Additionally, there are two types of face-saving behavior: good and negative. Cutting (2002) also stated that the 'face' of the person addressed can be acknowledged through this theory. Cutting (2002) also stated that politeness strategy employed linguistic expression showing the speaker's attitude, whether the speaker maintained his space or showed his solidarity as the manifestation of his language use. Furthermore, a speaker can negotiate their language use that is adjusted to the participants' faces. Geertz in Wardaugh (2006) states that the status and familiarity of the participants, both speaker and hearer, in the social relations played important roles in influencing the language use of each participant. Thus, before one speaks to another, he/she must decide on an appropriate speech style. Cutting (2002) added that positive politeness is aimed at maintaining positive face by employing some strategies, such as showing solidarity and closeness, friendship appeals, making hearer(s) feel good, and emphasizing common goals between participants in the communication events that were matched with the hearer's interests, wants, and needs. Conversely, negative politeness pays attention to negative face by making distance between participants by recognizing each other's territory.

This study was aimed at investigating indexicality existed in the dialogues between the lecturer and students at English department of The higher education institution in Jombang and the use of CCDA theory is very appropriate to apply because it has several tools for its operation, including deixis and politeness that can be used to uncover how the real relationship between participants in a communication event whether the power relations are equal or not.

Method

The researcher employed a qualitative technique suited for the study objectives since it aimed to evaluate the degree of indexicality between the English Department instructor and the students at the higher education institution in Jombang. The data for the study comes from observations of indexicality made by the lecturer and students during a class discussion at a higher education institution in Jombang. There were 26 students in a classroom discourse class who were involved in this study. The researcher only made three observations in three meetings of the learning process and recorded two students who responded to the lecturer's questions in each learning process, then transcribed and analyzed.

The researcher employed content analysis to analyze the data by adapting a Litosseliti (2010) model to properly identify and understand the data as in the following procedures (1) the indexicality of the lecturer and students was observed, documented, and categorized into the classroom discourse communication of the lecturer and students; (2) the data were coded; then, (3) the researcher analyzed indexicality among the participants in terms of lecturer's and students' deixis and politeness to examine their relations whether they were equal or not by applying the theories of CCDA.

Three levels of data observation were made possible by the CCDA approach: descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory. In-depth knowledge of the research process and an

awareness of how power and solidarity dynamics manifest in classroom interactions were both facilitated by the stages of analysis. Fairclough (2010) states that the initial step in analyzing the text's linguistic features is description. The text is arranged according to grammatical rules, meaning, and lexical features. The second step is interpretation, when the discourse events are examined and comprehended in light of their surroundings. Therefore, the circumstances that influenced the formation of those communicative occurrences were considered while analyzing the lecturer's utterances connected to the usage of indexicality. Explanation is the third step. In order to observe and document how the lecturer's dynamics in making utterances reflected society and how those outside influences shaped his actions, thoughts, and behaviors, his discursive exchanges were compared with the social setting.

Results

This part analyzed the research findings and discussed the findings in order to answer the problems raised in the introduction chapter. This could be started by observing the dialogue between the lecturer and students in class learning, then found indexical in the form of the use of several deixis by them, which are adjusted to different situations and contexts. Thus, the analysis of these findings shows linguistic variables that facilitate the meaning behind their use of deixis, especially related to how lecturers display different levels of intimacy with students as their audience by positioning themselves in certain ways. In the speech event, the linguistic choices by lecturers could be said to activate different modes of persuasion that allow lecturers to position themselves differently with their students in relation to the learning event in class. The linguistic choices reflected in the use of deixis allow us to decode different positioning related to the linguistic choices used by participants in the learning event in class.

The Indexicality in the Utterance

The way learners interpret that language is greatly influenced by indexicality. It entails realizing that, depending on the situation, some statements can have several meanings. For instance, depending on the context, the pronoun "you" can refer to several people, which, if not appropriately contextualized, can cause confusion. Furthermore, research on indexicality might provide light on how students interpret the meaning they encounter in class. Table 1 below shows indexicality reflected in the use of pronouns found between the lecturers and students in the discourse class:

Table 1. *Deixis found in classroom learning (data 1)*

Deixis	Lecturer	Students	Percentage
I	2		08,3
We	5	4	37,5
You	3	2	20,8
My	3	2	08,3
Our		5	20,8
Sir	1		04,1
Total	**11**	**13**	**100**

Table 1 describes the various deixis uttered by the lecturers and students in their interaction in the learning process in the class. There are six deixis that were found in different frequencies. They are “I, We, You, Our, My and Sir”. The highest frequency is the deixis “We” (37.5%), and there is other 5 deixis were also found, they are deixis “I, You, Our, My and Sir”.

Several data findings indicate the existence of indexicality in the dialogue between lecturers and students in classroom learning in the English Language Education study program at the higher education institution in Jombang in the 2023-2024 academic year in the classroom discourse class. These utterances contain indexical people marked by the words 'we' and 'ours'. In this case, when uttering these utterances, the lecturer must be aware that his utterances could be well understood by his students as an audience. Students could understand his utterances both directly and indirectly. Thus, when the lecturer says the word "we" it could mean that the lecturer says the word 'we' is an inclusive word 'we', in which both the lecturer as the speaker and the students as the intended party are included. The lecturer uses the word 'we' to show the meaning of closeness to the students. Here, 'we' is described as lecturers and students. The indexical word of other people found in this utterance is the word 'we', which also shows an inclusive possessive pronoun that refers to the intimacy between the lecturer and students in classroom learning.

Furthermore, the table also showed that the lecturer used a basic example of personal deixis, which refers to the individuals involved in a discourse, the pronoun "I". It clearly establishes the speaker as the point of reference in communication by designating them personally. Knowing when and how to utilize "I" can help one better understand how others communicate their identity, viewpoint, and agency in conversation.

By utilizing the pronoun "I," a speaker declares their identity and involvement in the discourse. People can directly convey their thoughts, feelings, and experiences with this pronoun. Saying "I” for instance, makes it obvious what the speaker's position and personal opinion are. By highlighting individual experiences and feelings, the pronoun "I" expresses a subjective point of view. This encourages students to comprehend the lecturer's point of view, which can lead to a more personal and relatable dialogue. Pronouncing things with a deixis "I" suggests that decisions and actions are the lecturer's own. It enables him to own up to the words.

The research data revealed that lecturers have influenced or controlled the selection of appropriate languages employed in their interactions with students, as seen by the deixis that they use with their students. As previously mentioned in the study's background, the theory of CCDA was used to classify research data into the domains of power and solidarity; nevertheless, a more thorough analysis is necessary, taking into account the lecturer's ideology and the social context of communication events. This suggested that research findings involving indexicality, as shown in the use of deixis and politeness techniques, should not be examined in isolation but rather need to be connected to other fields of study, including critical classroom discourse analysis and ideology (CCDA).

Additionally, the following information from a class discussion between a lecturer and students could be used to examine whether there are equal or unequal relationships between them, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. *Class discussion between a lecturer and students*

No	Lecturer / Student	Conversation
1	Lecturer	'Hello…everyone…., how are you today?'
2	Students	'we are fine, sir'.
3	Lecturer	'Assalamualaikum and salam sejahtera…all of you, ok today?'
4	Students	'Ok, Sir. Of Course,'
5	Student 1	'I have a question, sir'….
6	Lecturer	'Ok, what do you want to ask about?
7	Student 1	'What about our discussion of reviewing articles in Journal?
8	Lecturer	'Ok, you make groups, then, browse article and review it based on the questions that must be answered and then present it'
9	Students	Yes, sir, we do best'.
10	Lecturer	'Thank you and don't let us forget that next week you must be ready for the presentation'

From the conversation in Table 2, it could be explained that the choice of words in a communication message determines the position, redefining the relationship between the various social actors and participants involved in the speech event. During the classroom learning, the lecturer displays several uses of marked registers, such as the words "we" and "ours". Thus, the lecturer introduces a more informal deixis with everyday expressions and uses referential indices to refer to the relationship between the two participants. Likewise, the lecturer uses referential indices to refer to his students, including them in the moment of speech in forming the relationship between the participants and the tone of his speech.

The data also could be explained that the lecturer gave another group member time to ask her about the composition of the work. The lecturer was clearly managing the topic of conversation and regulating, or directing, the exchange by clearly outlining for the class what is deemed an acceptable response, thereby maintaining a position of authority even though the turns are spread fairly.

Furthermore, the lecturer's solidarity with his students can be examined by referring to Table 3, as demonstrated in the following conversation when a student could not attend class due to illness:

Table 3. *Class discussion between a lecturer and students*

No	Lecturer / Student	Conversation
1	Lecturer	'Hello…everyone…., how are you today?'
2	Students	'we are fine, sir'.
3	Lecturer	'Assalamualaikum and salam sejahtera…all of you, ok today?'
4	Students	'Ok, Sir. Of Course,'
5	Student	'I have a question, sir'….
6	Lecturer	'Ok, what do you want to ask about?
7	Student	'What about our discussion of reviewing articles in Journal?
8	Lecturer	'Ok, you make groups, then, browse article and review it based on the questions that must be answered and then present it'

The data showed that he was aware that most of the students were Muslim; the lecturer in the interaction above used both Indonesian and the Muslim greeting, "Assalamualaikum." His use of rather neutral Indonesian throughout his speech indicates that he is attempting to win over his pupils' hearts. The exchange also demonstrates how the lecturer initially greeted the class to pique their interest. Examining professors' salutations to their students from a cultural standpoint differs significantly from other viewpoints. As a result, when analyzing the lecturer's chosen tactic in their interactions with students, the researcher must exercise caution in order to ascertain whether their relationships are equal.

From the conversation above, it could also be understood that the lecturer showed his empathy to the student who was sick until she was absent from the class. He employed deixis “Assalamualaikum“ to show his feelings of closeness among them, which became a very intimate or close communication event, so that between the two participants, there is an equal relationship in the sense that there is no lower or higher relationship. However, in this case, the lecturer does not only produce good and purposeful speech. He must be driven by some kind of function in his mind. Thus, an illocutionary act is carried out, which is intended to show closeness. At the same time, by producing this speech, perhaps his students knew his feelings and supported whatever action the lecturer took. In this situation, the lecturer produces speech assuming that his students as listeners understood what he meant.

Furthermore, the politeness strategy could also be explained by the fact that the lecturer was generally assumed to know that the principles of norms in classroom learning are a miniature of society. When he used that speech, he certainly considered the background or what was on his mind to be applied. In conveying the message of closeness to his students, the lecturer tried to be more straightforward, clear, and simple. The consequences of the resulting speech choices could be interpreted as actions towards other people's faces (public self-image). So, he is considered to be taking actions that promote a close and useful relationship between the lecturer and the students. So, to increase the possibility of this closeness, he used positive politeness and avoided using negative word choices, with which he pays attention to the positive face of his students as his interlocutors. The tendency to use positive politeness forms that emphasize the closeness between lecturers and students could be said to be a solidarity strategy. Therefore, in his speech, the lecturer uses inclusive nouns such as 'we' and 'ours'.

Discussion

Through indexicality, it was possible to examine how the lecturer used his words in class to both align the supporters (in-group members) to demonstrate solidarity and polarize the opponents (out-group members) to demonstrate dominance. The research looked at his speech to see if it alluded to power or solidarity, as was said in the Introduction on the nature of their relationship in his utterances during class instruction. Since Van Dijk (2004) claimed that indexicality may create the addressees’ identity to include or exclude them from groups of the speaker, the first used positive lexis to demonstrate his solidarity with the addressees, which could be called an equal relation, and negative lexis to demonstrate his power, which could be called an unequal relation. Thus, in this discussion, the researcher discussed the indexicality of the research problems by presenting the supporting theories of deixis and politeness.

Equal Relation in the Use of Positive Deixis

As presented in data 2, the researcher could indicate that a lecturer's favorable indexicality to the students was influenced by the solidarity he used as his discursive structure in his class learning utterances. Assuming that his in-group consisted of moderate Muslims and Indonesians, he used indexicality with "good" attribution to the addressees. The strong prevalence of Indonesian culture, language, and mottoes was indicated by the positive indexicality. To gauge his level of solidarity with the Indonesian people, his English indexicality was divided into two sections. This divide has two meanings: a powerful meaning and a fair meaning. Fair meaning was intended to show the degree of solidarity is fair, and strong meaning showed the high solidarity meaning. The high solidarity could be exercised through adverbs with the meaning of comparative and most.

It might imply that the lecturer's actions were inextricably linked to his philosophy of preserving a positive classroom environment. Even so, the repeated clauses in grammar have a decent meaning in surface structure since they lack a supporting part of speech, like an adverb or comparative that emphasizes a point. As a result, the repeating clause serves to emphasize and clarify how crucial their students are to the success of their educational journey. He also realized that this indexicality generates a strong feeling in the students that they have a strong social bond. The lecturer controls what is considered a plausible answer or not, as seen in data 2, and he has a clear goal with the interaction, which is to call attention. Furthermore, he puts pressure on students to produce answers that fulfil this goal. In this sequence, it is evident that the lecturer is restricting students in terms of what they can say or do. Even though this excerpt mostly consists of the same participants, there are more signs of power asymmetry in this excerpt than in the previous one. By connecting this to Fairclough's three limitations, it is demonstrated that the lecturer is putting restrictions on the kinds of statements that can be made by using their subject positions as "lecturer" and "students" as well as their social relationships to exert power. The speaker accomplishes this by skillfully directing the conversation and making judgments about what constitutes a reasonable response. Throughout the entire learning process in a classroom, the lecturer assigns turns, selects the topics and activity type, and decides what constitutes an acceptable answer or not, thus taking advantage of an existing power imbalance.

The use of contextual expressions implies a level of intimacy between the lecturer and his/her students. Due to the nature and setting of communicative events like this, it is rarely a topic of conversation and does not allow other interlocutors to interact clearly with the students as participants in the communication event. Student participation is usually limited, and their choice to collaborate in constructing meaning is to get closer so that they have access to interact more intimately with their lecturer. Thus, the effect produced by speaking directly to students and discussing general student affairs is a discursive strategy used by the lecturer. The students played the role of interlocutors who built good relationships and intimacy with their lecturers. Vocatives and pronouns allow the lecturer to involve other participants more actively in the learning communication event in the classroom. It can be seen that the lecturer used the deixis “we” in his/her speech, which shows a different way to create good relationships with students through the inclusive deixis “we”.

Unequal Relations in the Use of Negative Deixis

The data indicated that lecturers felt responsible for keeping a good atmosphere in the classroom. The students used the deixis ‘sir’ to communicate with the lecturer to show that the lecturer is the person who needs to be honored. The indexicality of ‘sir’ was aimed at

softening the language to make their relations very warm. This is an important starting point for exploring the idea of inviting all his students. The indexicality of ‘sir’ in these utterances was created to inform that students contributed to the tension in a class. The lecturer showed his pride in being a friend as well as the leader in a class, whose presence could make learning better.

Naturally, when the lecturer used person deixis, he negotiated a word choice that matched the students by addressing them with the deixis "you." The lecturer then gave the students an assignment to strengthen their relationship. The lecturer's use of deixis in front of the students produced the impression that he was extremely close to them, and when he greeted them in line with their values and beliefs, the students frequently gave him a warm reception. The fact that he was connected to the students impressed them. The speaker made some statements in the classroom about how power can be gained when he expressed his gratitude to the kids by using the English deixis "you" in addition to the phrase "Ok, what do you want to ask about?" The professor used the deixis "you" to indicate that he extended a cordial greeting to each student. His presence in the classroom seemed to be really appreciated by the children. In communication, the phrase "Assalamualaikum and how are you, today?" can be referred to as a positive politeness tactic. Malinowski (1999), the strategy's primary goal is to keep participants' social interaction during communication events. Consequently, the lecturer said those to illustrate the tone of togetherness.

Intended meaning of the Indexicality.

Referring to the results of the analysis of the findings of indexicality reflected in the use of deixis by lecturers and students in the event of learning communication in student lectures in the English education study program at The higher education institution in Jombang in the 2023-2024 academic year as noted in data 1, data 2 and data 3, the feeling of happiness encourages lecturers to produce utterances that indicate closeness to their students. This is based on the findings of indexicality, speech acts, and politeness strategies; the intended meaning is to make their students and themselves aware of the closeness of this relationship. Obviously, something must have happened that made them very happy. In this case, the lecturer tried to 'talk' to his students, which actually made them seem happier and more intimate (Fatmawati & Ningsih, 2024). However, on the other hand, lecturers need to maintain relationships with their students in order to strengthen this step by responding to statements asking students as listeners to 'repay the lecturer's kindness by giving a good response too. Lecturers produce this utterance needed to achieve the goal of making the relationship with students better and the learning situation more enjoyable. This provides background information that influences the way the lecturer delivers his utterances in expressing his views throughout the communication event. In addition, this background information also provides benefits in showing the need to connect other utterances produced in the dialogue.

In the dialogue, the lecturer implies through the inclusive pronoun “we” that he and the students are doing the action together, thus making the students participate not only in the learning event in the class but also in the goals, achievements, and agenda of the discourse in general. This deictic choice allows the lecturer to position himself in relation to his students in a more intimate way (Darong, 2024). In addition, the things they do together are praiseworthy achievements, such as giving the students the possibility to shape their own future. Referential and identity indexes involve different participants, forming relationships between them. Messages in classroom learning discourse could display the nuances of the

identity of a person or group of people in a speech community, for example, by indexing cultural practices, objects, words, phrases, customs, and so on.

The lecturer employed linguistic expressions that refer to a group by uttering the deixis ‘we’. The researchers may not answer the questions that are being explained, but they explained and informed them about the background of the study. In this study, indexicality and deixis are frequently used in a nearly interchangeable manner. Both, on their own, are related to similar outcomes, namely contextually relevant references. Deixis is very important since it highlights participation at a specific time and place. With such an example, every text appeared as a disorganized, disconnected group of words. The text bears the significance of the current context in most of the deixis references that link it to the context in question.

Deixis is a type of reference that is based on the meaning of a linguistic sign relative to the extralinguistic context in which the sign is located. It provides context in relation to the speaker. This deictic reference occurs when a linguistic sign receives some of its meaning from the context itself. Referring to Levinson's theory (1983), deixis includes person, place/space, and temporal time. Throughout his speech, the lecturer predominantly utters the word 'we' (first person plural) as a person deixis. This analysis is carried out based on the division of three basic parts involving role participants in the speech event, such as speakers and recipients, as the rules proposed. The indexical sign 'we' as this person is followed by 'our', 'we' indicates the first-person participant in the speech as listed in Table 1. Outside the context, it is not known who 'we', 'our' are. However, if associated with the context, these indexicality signs make sense. In his speech, the lecturer often uses the person index sign 'we', which states that the speaker must be a member of a group of people in an unlimited number.

So, what the lecturer means by saying "we", is intended as an inclusive "we", which includes both the speaker and the intended party. The lecturer used the word "we" to describe both parties, namely the lecturer and his students, as inclusive recipients. This inclusive indexical sign shows a sense of belonging to a group. Both the lecturer and his students have the same feelings, beliefs, and attitudes towards the issues in classroom learning. The word 'we' refers to the lecturer and his students in the community. He and his students’ groups who have the same feelings refer to pronoun deixis. By considering the situation where learning in class is the main issue, the issue of equality may be more adequate and effective in referring to all students with different backgrounds. As a result, his words and delivery had an impact on the students' thought processes, which is referred to as the lecturer's hegemony over the pupils. In this sense, the term "hegemony" refers to the instructor's need for students to support their consideration of "the interests and tendencies of groups over which hegemony is to be examined," as proposed by Gramsci (1971).

Equipped with the indexical sign of the person 'we', the possessive adjective functioned as an inclusive indexical sign. The lecturer emphasized the sense of belonging to the armed forces. Also, the object pronoun ‘we’ has the same function as 'we' and acts as an inclusive person indexical sign. However, when compared to other uses of the word 'we' by the lecturer, there is a contrast between the position of students as both the intended party and the external party, instead of saying “Thank you and don't let us forget that next week you must be ready for the presentation”. In the data, the lecturer only said, "Don't let us forget". The action of not forgetting is exclusive in the first action, but inclusive in the second action.

The first-person indexical signs found in the speech are ‘I’. In this speech, the lecturer used his pronoun as a representative of himself as a lecturer who is in a different position from his students. This reveals a momentary change in mood that reflects certain emotions,

giving the impression that he wants to personalize certain emotions caused using 'we' to mark the important position of students as important publics who have the right to speak for other participants. Furthermore, the lecturer mentions 'you' as a second-person indexical sign. Based on the context, we could immediately know who the lecturer is who uses the word 'you'. Additionally, the lecturer believes that this is the proper thing to do in order to impart moral principles, concepts, and values to the pupils. Conversely, as the data shows, he made certain statements in his lecture about solidarity in response to the question, "Are you ok today?" from his students. Using personal deixis, the instructor in this macro unit defined informality as a casual register of colloquial idioms, common terminology that serves as an "invitation to intimacy." It indicates that he was looking for signs of a "high involvement style" in his interpersonal interactions.

Conclusion

This study aimed to reveal indexicality between the lecturer's and students' utterances in their dialogues in the learning process of the Classroom Discourse class. The results of the investigation into these matters could be summarized as follows. In terms of indexicality, the participants who used personal deixis seemed to strengthen their position on the issues faced by the lecturer when the utterance is addressed and forces the audience to accept their views. In addition, the shift in deixis "I" to "We" throughout the classroom learning interaction could also be an attempt to ensure that students were persuaded. The use of the sign "We," which is predominantly indexical by the lecturer, serves to convince students to believe that the learning delivered in class is a collective statement and not a personal statement. Furthermore, the lecturer employed politeness to keep his relationship with his students well. Thus, it could be concluded that there were two kinds of relations they were equal and unequal relations. Equal relations were represented by the use of positive deixis and positive politeness, whereas unequal relations were represented by negative deixis and negative politeness.

Acknowledgement

We extend our immense gratitude to the Research and Community Service Institution at the University of PGRI Jombang for allowing us to conduct research on students in the English Language Education Department at the Faculty of Teaching and Pedagogy.

References

Babaii, E., Parsazadeh, A., & Moradi, H. (2018). The question of power in language classes from a critical discourse analysis perspective once a student, always a student? *Pragmatics and Society*, *8*(4), 542–570. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.8.4.04bab

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness; Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/highereducation/books/politeness/89113EE2FB4A1D254D4A8D2011E542E4

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse; A resource book for students*. Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203994597

Darong, H. C. (2024). Conversational analysis: Types and function of speech acts in EFL classroom interactions. *JOLLT (Journal of Languages and Language Teaching)*, *12*(3), 1191–1206. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i3.11001

Dylgjeri, A., & Kazazi, L. (2013). Deixis in modern linguistics and outside. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *2*(4), 87–96. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2012.v2n4p87

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social researchNo Title*. Routledge.

Fatmawati, F., & Ningsih, R. (2024). Politeness in expressive speech acts: A cyber pragmatics approach. *JOLLT (Journal of Languages and Language Teaching)*, *12*(4), 1721–1738. https://doi.org/DOI:https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i4.12620

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (eds.)). International Publishers. https://ia600506.us.archive.org/19/items/AntonioGramsciSelectionsFromThePrisonNotebooks/Antonio-Gramsci-Selections-from-the-Prison-Notebooks.pdf

Josiah, U. E., & Oghenerho, G. (2015). Pragmatic analyses of Martin Luther King (Jr)'s speech:" I have a dream"–An introspective prognosis. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(17), 43–52. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/23587

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(3), 453–484. http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-8322%28199923%2933%3A3%3C453%3ACCDA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313

Litosseliti, L. (2010). *Research methods in linguistics*. Continum. https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=efQlEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Litosseliti,+Lia.+(2010).+Research+methods+in+linguistics.+London:+Continuum.&ots=WJcnq9wdTn&sig=J0AG1a-Lhr2EexEz27VaczjvJxw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Litosseliti%2C Lia. (2010). Re

Malinowski, B. (1999). On phatic communion. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 302–305). Routledge. http://www.phil.muni.cz/angl/thepes/thepes_01_03.pdf

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication*, *23*, 193–229. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0271530903000132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2

Van Dijk, T. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 466–485). Blackwell. https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2015-Critical-discourse-Analysis.pdf

Wardaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Fifth Edit). BlackWell Publisher. https://lmsspada.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/pluginfile.php/549225/mod_resource/content/1/1006648_82038_wardhaugh_r_an_introduction_to_sociolinguistics.pdf

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. https://www.academia.edu/60254109/Yule_George_Pragmatics

This page intentionally left blank