



Deictic Interpretation in TOEFL Reading: Strategies and Challenges of EFL Students.

Sitti Aisyah¹

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare¹
sitiaisyh0998@gmail.com¹

Muajiz Muallim²

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare²
muajizmuallim@iainpare.ac.id²

Cynic Tenedero³

Graduate Programs, Technological University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines³
cynicjazmintenedero@gmail.com³

Munawir⁴

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare⁴
munawir@iainpare.ac.id⁴

Received: April 22, 2026
Revised: May 29, 2026
Accepted: May 29, 2026

***Corresponding author:**
Sitti Aisyah, Institut
Agama Islam Negeri
Parepare

Abstract

This study aims to explore the understanding of English language education students of the phenomenon of Deixis in the TOEFL reading text and identify the factors that influence the understanding. As a crucial pragmatic competence in academic literacy, Deixis acts as a bridge that connects text with context. This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach by involving students of the English Language Education Program, IAIN Parepare, as informants. Data were collected through the TOEFL reading test and stimulated recall interview to reveal students' cognitive processes. The results showed that students' understanding was at a mechanistic-literal level. Students demonstrate a good understanding of the Deixis persona because of its concrete and explicit nature of reference. However, a significant decrease in understanding occurs in temporal Deixis and Discourse Deixis; students tend to experience chronological confusion and difficulty tracking abstract references that cross paragraph boundaries. The proximity approach strategy, which is the tendency to choose references based on physical proximity in the text, is the dominant method used by students when dealing with ambiguity. These findings indicate that the main barriers for STEM students are limited vocabulary, short-term memory load (cognitive overload), and dependence on surface reading strategies (surface reading).

Keywords: Deicic, TOEFL Reading, EFL Students, Qualitative Study.

Introduction

From the perspective of higher education, reading comprehension is an essential skill for students to be proficient in, and it is measured by the Reading Comprehension section of the TOEFL. For students of English Language Education, this test section is a significant challenge, as they are expected to demonstrate their understanding of complex discourse beyond vocabulary recognition. Students often face high stakes, as this score frequently serves as a prerequisite for scholarships and university graduation (Putri & Syarif, 2021). From field observations, it was noted that students face major challenges in this test section, especially with complex discourse, which is commonly used in the reading comprehension section of the TOEFL examination. This difficulty is further exacerbated because identifying the meaning of unfamiliar words consistently becomes the most taxing sub-skill for students (Lubis & Irmayana, 2019), a problem closely linked to a general lack of effective reading strategies and text-decoding skills (Nanda & Azmy, 2020).

One factor affecting reading comprehension, which remains under-researched in the context of academic texts (Al-Khasawneh, 2025; Khandamova & Ibodulloeva, 2023), is students' inability to track word references or to interpret deictically. In previous research by Septia et al. (2022), it was found that students' inability to recognize pronoun referents is a significant challenge to reading comprehension. Moreover, the error rate of students in dealing with the "pronoun reference" type of reading comprehension was identified to be 82% by Maizarah (2019).

Although universal challenges in the reading section of the TOEFL, such as vocabulary and time management, have been extensively studied, there is a gap in the research on the interpretation of deictic expressions. Past research on deictic expressions has generally centered on the use of deictics in the speaking section of the test or in simple narrative texts, but there is no qualitative research on the cognitive process of students' difficulty in interpreting deictic expressions in the strict academic language used in the reading section of the TOEFL test.

For example, Research on the use of deictics in English language assessment has also reflected varying methodologies and conclusions. Al-Khasawneh (2025) study on the use of deictics in the IELTS speaking test used a quantitative method and found that the use of personal deictics dominated, without considering the aspect of text comprehension. On the other hand, Khandamova & Ibodulloeva (2023) used a qualitative method to examine the use of spatial deictics in university texts and found that the use of spatial deictics is very dependent on the context of the participants. However, the study was limited to narrative texts and did not consider the complexity of academic texts.

Although universal challenges in the TOEFL reading section, such as vocabulary and time management, have been extensively studied, a gap remains regarding how students interpret deictic expressions within strict academic language. Previous research has often overlooked this cognitive process, focusing instead on different methodologies and contexts. For instance, Al-Khasawneh (2025) utilized a quantitative method to examine deictics in the IELTS speaking test, concluding that personal deictics dominated without considering text comprehension. Conversely, Khandamova & Ibodulloeva (2023) employed a qualitative approach to analyze spatial deictics in university texts; however, their findings were limited to narrative contexts and did not account for the complexity of academic discourse. Consequently, qualitative research exploring the cognitive difficulties students face when interpreting deictic expressions in the rigorous academic texts of the TOEFL reading section remains absent.

To evaluate how EFL students interpret deictic expressions in complex TOEFL reading texts, this study establishes an integrated theoretical framework bridging discourse cohesion and cognitive linguistics. Grounded in foundational pragmatics, deictic interpretation is not merely a mechanical decoding task. Levinson (2010) and Yule (2020) define deixis as the primary linguistic manifestation of how language structures connect with their immediate contextual orientations. Therefore, successful text comprehension within high-stakes tests requires readers to actively utilize deictic devices to capture intended meaning and decode implicit textual connections beyond literal surface forms.

From a discourse cohesion perspective, deictic expressions, specifically discourse and temporal deixis, serve as structural tools to track interconnected ideas across paragraph boundaries. Corrales (2019) emphasizes that mastering these cohesive devices is critical for academic literacy because they act as navigation links, enabling readers to relate new statements to preceding anaphoric anchors or subsequent cataphoric references. Although Corrales's study lacked specific TOEFL instruments, its structural premise applies directly here: when students lack the pragmatic competence to map these textual landmarks, their decoding of the text's macro-structure collapses, leading to fragmented reading comprehension.

However, resolving textual cohesion inherently depends on the reader's internal cognitive mapping. To account for this mental dimension, this framework integrates a cognitive linguistic lens from Yuan (2023), which posits that deictics such as "this" and "that" indicate conceptual and psychological distance configured within the reader's working memory. Unifying Corrales's (2019) discourse view and Yuan's (2023) cognitive view reveals that tracking abstract references in TOEFL texts poses a dual-process challenge: students must decode textual discourse cohesion while simultaneously updating abstract reference shifts within their cognitive mental space. This unified framework provides a robust template to analyze the linguistic errors and underlying cognitive hurdles experienced by English Education students at IAIN Parepare.

Despite the many studies conducted on the two areas of TOEFL text and Deixis theory independently, there are considerable gaps within the current academic body of knowledge that need to be addressed. Some studies have already analyzed the challenges of understanding TOEFL texts as a whole, while others have also investigated the application of Deixis within an oral examination setting and even basic narratives. Up to this point, however, no study has yet made a concerted effort to apply Deixis analysis as part of the reading comprehension test within TOEFL. The current study aims to bridge this gap in the literature by not only identifying the types of Deixis in academic texts, but also studying how students cognitively comprehend them.

Thus, in light of the above, the research questions of this study are as follows: How do English Education students of IAIN Parepare interpret various types of deictics, namely person, place, time, and discourse, in the reading section of the TOEFL test? What are the specific challenges students encounter in interpreting deictics, and what factors contribute to such challenges? These research questions are intended to investigate the cognitive process of the research subjects in their interaction with the text.

This study aims to investigate students' strategies, patterns, and linguistic-educational obstacles in deictic interpretation, thereby contributing to linguistics and pragmatics within standard texts. The urgency of this research is underscored by the fact that deictic expressions in rigorous academic texts often carry complex, multi-layered reference shifts rather than simple situational pointers. For instance, when a TOEFL reading passage states, "This perspective, however, was later challenged by the latter

group," students frequently fail to map the spatial and discourse deixis (this and the latter). This cognitive failure aligns with empirical evidence showing that identifying references and decoding low-frequency vocabulary within tight time constraints constitutes a prominent hurdle for English Education students during the TOEFL reading section (Febriani et al., 2019). Misinterpreting these markers directly leads to an inversion of the author's core argument. Practically, these findings will assist educators in developing targeted discourse-mapping strategies to enhance students' reading comprehension and TOEFL scores.

Research Methods

This part outlines a methodology adopted for analyzing students' knowledge about Deixis. In this context, there is a need to discuss the research design, sampling criteria, tools of data collection, and techniques of interaction involved in ensuring the accuracy of results.

1. Research types

The study used qualitative methodology with a case study design. A case study design was selected because the research aims to delve into the cognitive processes and perceptions of students when understanding deictics. The study concentrated on one phenomenon: cognitive barriers in following references to academic articles (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) (Ilhami et al., 2021).

2. Research Data Sources

Research data were classified as primary (transcripts of stimulated recall interviews and student answer sheets) and secondary (TOEFL reading passages and the theoretical deictics).

3. Research Population and Sample

The research subjects were students in the English Language Education Program at IAIN Parepare, selected through purposive sampling. The selection began with 3-5 initial informants, selected based on the following inclusion criteria: active student status, completion of the Semantics and TOEFL Prediction courses, and a TOEFL score < 500. The sample size was then expanded to approximately 8 participants to ensure data saturation.

4. Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was conducted in flexible locations according to the participants' preferences to ensure naturalistic conditions. Data collection integrated two main techniques:

- a. Task-Based Interview: Direct observation of student interaction during the completion of TOEFL worksheets.
- b. Stimulated Recall: Having respondents recall their cognitive reasoning while identifying particular deictic expressions (he, there, that, this) after the task was done (Gass & Mackey, 2009).

5. Data Analysis Techniques

The analysis of data was interactive in nature and involved the utilization of the Miles & Huberman approach, which entailed the use of the following strategies:

- a. Data Reduction: Using transcriptions in conjunction with coding of data using different forms of deictics (P, S, T, D) and constraints (linguistic, educational, cultural).
- b. Data Display: Presenting results via comparative table displays and textual presentations using verbatim evidence.
- c. Conclusion/Drawing Conclusions: Analyzing prominent patterns and verifying results using source triangulation and member check to establish the validity of the research data.

Results and Discussion

Result

1. Students' Interpretation of Deixis

Most respondents (virtually all) succeeded in answering the problem concerning person deixis (e.g., questions No. 1 and 3). As observed, not less than seven out of eight students responded correctly and logically to the said category. In Question 3, the student needs to ascertain what the pronoun "He" refers to in the following sentence:

"Camp David was established by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1942. He found the site particularly appealing in that its mountain air provided relief from the summer heat of Washington..." (TOEFL Reading Worksheet)

"The pronoun 'He' in the second paragraph refers to ..." (Questions No.3)

WJ elaborates on the process involved by saying, *"look for the closest male subject"* (stimulated recall). This kind of expression was similarly expressed by NW, who said, *"I chose it because it was the closest to the reference asked"* (stimulated recall). The same approach is adopted by NAR, where it chooses the nearest noun since, in the opinion of her, *"it is the closest to the word related to the problem"*. According to the findings presented, WJ, NW, and NA chose the same response, "Franklin", using almost the same method of finding the nearest object. The reason for such convenience is that there exists a clear grammatical connection between the pronoun and the human subject mentioned above, and therefore, the student does not require conducting extensive pragmatics.

Conversely, in the Deixis Temporal and Discourse, confusion may occur among students due to the presence of non-concrete references. A total of six out of eight students were not able to follow the time point accurately. For instance, in questions No. 7 and 10,

"Later, President Dwight David Eisenhower renamed the location Camp David after his grandson David Eisenhower." (TOEFL Reading Worksheet).

"The word 'Later' indicates a shift in which type of deixis?" (Questions No.7).

NW students indicated that *"a change in the timeline poses problems"* (stimulated recall); likewise, WJ confessed that it was *"difficult to perceive changes in the course of time"* (stimulated recall), and therefore, it was necessary to review the previous paragraph to find out the plot. In actuality, some students tend to classify the word "Later" as person deixis. The informants clearly indicate that time shift is one of the significant problems that disrupts their comprehension and makes them reread or guess.

Also, it is extremely challenging for students to comprehend Abstract Deixis within Discourse because the referent does not pertain to one specific noun but rather an entire concept or event that has been mentioned earlier. It was mentioned in question number 10, where the text was:

"Camp David has been used for a number of significant meetings. In 1943, during World War II, President Roosevelt met with Great Britain's Prime Minister Winston Churchill. In 1959, at the height of the Cold War, President Eisenhower met there with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev; in 1978, President Jimmy Carter sponsored peace talks between the Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, and the President of Egypt, Anwar el-Sadat in the retreat at Camp David". (TOEFL Reading Worksheet)

"The word "the retreat" in the final sentence (line 17) refers back to..." (Questions No.10)

WJ admits her difficulties by saying, *"Don't know the meaning of 'the retreat', random guessing."* (stimulated recall). However, despite recognizing that the discourse reference is abstract since it refers to "the totality of ideas of the previous section". For her part, NA reveals that since abstract referents are very difficult to determine, she chooses only those

nouns that are physically closest to the matter. This inability to trace abstract references indicates that students have not been able to build a strong cognitive reference frame to connect information between different paragraphs.

Out of the eight respondents, six of them openly stated that they used the Proximity Approach strategy, in which the references are made according to the proximity of the physical location of the text (nearest noun) instead of the logical reasoning of language.

SW students confessed that there is *"no strategy at all, but simply finding it out due to its being the closest."* (interview). Likewise, MR confessed, *"because I don't understand the meaning, so I choose the closest."* (stimulated recall). This is also true for MC, who explained that if she was perplexed, she would resort to her *"instincts or source of answer"* (stimulated recall). Indeed, the application of such a strategy shows that the students' reading comprehension is at the literal-mechanical level, wherein they simply locate information surrounding the keyword.

2. Factors Affecting Students' Understanding

As pointed out, the main impediments to comprehension of Deixis in TOEFL Reading passages include vocabulary issues or lexical difficulties. In this case, students who lack proper mastery of the vocabulary used in the academic context will immediately interrupt the Deixis tracing process when they come across unfamiliar phrases.

WJ stated, *"The problem lies more in the lexical aspect (not knowing the meaning). I was bombarded with dizzying words"* (interview). This is reinforced by MM, who notes, *"many terms or words are unknown in meaning, so it is difficult to determine an answer"* (interview). Without an adequate lexical understanding of keywords (such as "retreat"), students have no basis for pragmatic analysis, so the connection between text and context is broken.

Apart from the lexical problem mentioned above, the length of text in the TOEFL test creates a burden on the short-term memory of Students. The lengthy texts often force students to overlook the story plot or the previously read material.

NA revealed, *"The text is very long, therefore I tend to forget the content of the text"* (interview). NW also added *"often forget, especially if it's about skipping paragraphs, so it must be read again"* (interview). The limited memory capacity is used up to understand word-for-word, so when the Deixis reference appears in different paragraphs, the student fails to relate the information to the previous data.

Syntax is another important element in view of the differences in grammatical structure between Indonesian and English. It becomes difficult for students to comprehend the sequence of events owing to the presence of lengthy academic sentences within the TOEFL text.

"Indonesian and English grammar differ greatly," stated SW (interview). *"It becomes quite difficult to understand."* According to AD, *"get dizzy with much text and complicated... forget about the content of the text, have to keep going backwards and forwards."* (interview). Syntactical complexity compels students to engage in extensive analysis, making it difficult for them to identify the referent of the Deixis.

The challenges, therefore, tend to push the learners towards giving up the systematic techniques in favor of following their instincts. Though the students may have acquired useful techniques for answering TOEFL questions, they end up being ineffective and forgetting the techniques in the heat of the moment. Consequently, most of the respondents opted for guessing or choosing the word that was repeated the most in the previous sentence.

MCK confesses that she tends to depend on his instincts or sources of answers (interview). MR, on the other hand, went with the answers derived from *"the most common*

words appearing in the previous sentence." (interview). Although most of the students may be familiar with various techniques to improve their reading skills, such as skimming and scanning, they are perceived to be inefficient in tackling abstract academic texts, hence reverting to mere guessing.

In summary, the understanding of students' knowledge does not depend on one factor alone, but on the interaction of lexicon, memory capacity, and navigation skills within the entire context. Failure to deal with these obstacles makes students remain at the fragmentary stage of comprehension of information. The closeness approach tactic, or the choice of reference materials depending on their proximity to the text, is a realistic yet shallow measure that students adopt to cope with the challenge. The instructional approach must shift from exercise completion to pragmatic instruction.

Discussion

This section presents an in-depth analysis of the research findings regarding students' understanding of deixis in TOEFL Reading passages. The discussion is structured to address the research question by integrating field data with relevant linguistic and educational theories.

1. Interpreting Deixis in the TOEFL Context

On an analytical basis, the interpretation of Deixis by students in the TOEFL texts remains at the literal or mechanistic level because the students can easily determine grammatically explicit references, but find it difficult when the context of the text demands an extension of meaning or even a change of the time dimension of the reference. Such difficulty reflects the difference between linguistic competence and pragmatic competence.

The ability of students to understand the deictic persona is rooted in the direct connection between grammatical descriptions and their references, where definitive expressions require a deictic "link" to associate the expression with a prominent reference (Ahn, 2025). In TOEFL texts, the use of personal pronouns such as "he" and "she" tends to be very proximal or physically close to the entity to which it refers (Yule, 2020), a concrete characteristic that contributes to the success of 7 out of 8 University students in the task. Pragmatically, Deixis analysis relies heavily on the communicative intentions of the speaker as well as the relationship between language and context (D. Saffah & Hameed Al-Hindawi, 2021), so that the connection between pronouns (I, you, he, she, they) with the previously mentioned subjects makes it easier for students to identify references precisely.

On the contrary, a major reduction in comprehension appears in spatial and temporal Deixis, as learners are usually confused in establishing abstract and/or metaphorical references. Such barriers may be attributed to the difference in the logic of the structure of the first and second languages slowing the processing of deictic elements (Vaysi & Salehnejad, 2016) as well as students' focus on basic meanings of lexical items without taking into consideration the change in their psychological space, e.g. with "this" and "that" (Yuan, 2023). The greatest barriers are posed by temporal Deixis and discourse, where references to time are dependent on the event and not the current time of the speaker (Stapleton, 2017). This fact is illustrated by the difficulty encountered by most participants in recognizing the reference point in time in scholarly writings. It can be suggested that the participants lack a sufficient "deictic navigation network" (van Schuppen et al., 2019) due to the cognitive complexity associated with the multidimensional nature of time.

The core challenge in Discourse Deixis emerges when learners struggle to comprehend abstract pointers to particular sections of the discourse under discussion

(Levinson, 2010). The incapacity to comprehend abstract pointers like "the whole previous concept" or "the incident" means that learners have not achieved high-order processing (high-order processing) because of hindrances in tracing cross-paragraph references following the author's discourse (Mahmudova, 2023; Verhoeven et al., 2011). Due to insufficient pragmatic skills, students perceive the deictic device as a mere grammatical construction rather than a linking component within the text in its context (D. Saffah & Hameed Al-Hindawi, 2021). Thus, the comprehension of any text entails combining low-order processes, such as word identification, with interpreting the context comprehensively (Verhoeven et al., 2011).

The high prevalence of the application of the proximity approach in identifying reference tracking approaches illustrates how much students' understanding is still highly influenced by the orientation of the text's physical space. According to Barkasa (2026), the application of suitable cognitive strategies is vital for reading comprehension; nevertheless, in this case, choosing references according to physical proximity is a compensatory mechanism to make up for poor vocabulary acquisition and syntactic comprehension. It indicates that while students attempt to apply techniques such as skimming, they cannot identify meaning without adequate deictic navigation (Muh. Said & Munawir, 2022). In this regard, this issue proves that despite efforts to apply skimming, students find it difficult to understand if they do not have a solid pragmatic knowledge base (Vaysi & Salehnejad, 2016).

2. Challenges and Influencing Factors

Lexical issue in a limited vocabulary was the main factor causing a domino effect of failing to solve Deixis-related questions from the TOEFL text. This issue stems from the fact that students' inability to master the required vocabulary means that they will not be able to comprehend references made via pronouns since they do not comprehend the meaning of the terms surrounding such elements (Badu, 2020). According to the definition provided by Ahn (2025), every definite expression must have an element called the "linker," linking it to its grammatical reference. This process will fail to occur when students do not comprehend the meaning of the key terms because the link between them and their reference would not be established, hence making pragmatic mapping impossible (Sunubi, 2022). As a result, instead of contextually deep processing, students tend to use the proximal approach—that is, determining references based only on the physical proximity of words in the text, as a form of compensation for linguistic deficits and lack of strong structural foundations (Muallim, 2025; Muh. Said & Munawir, 2022).

Cognitively, deixis interpretation relies heavily on the reader's ability to construct mental space and map the psychological distance between themselves and the author (Yuan, 2023). In cognitive linguistics, the understanding of expressions such as this and that is based not only on the physical distance of objects in the text, but also on conceptual proximity in the reader's mind; when the student feels unfamiliar with the topic of the TOEFL text, the psychological distance increases and makes it difficult to identify the author's perspective. This condition is exacerbated by an overload on short-term memory (short-term memory overload), in which the student's mental capacity is depleted only to understand basic language units (Verhoeven et al., 2011). Due to differences in the logic of structure between the mother tongue and the target language that trigger overlapping mental translation processes (Vaysi & Salehnejad, 2016), students finally tend to choose surface strategies such as proximity approach—determining references based on physical proximity of words—as an effort to compensate for the weak mastery of language structure systematically (Muallim, 2025; Muh. Said & Munawir, 2022).

Syntax challenges indicate a critical issue in second language processing (L2 processing). The complexities in the structures of the academic sentences in the TOEFL texts make it hard for students to process grammatical information. Vaysi & Salehnejad (2016) explain that the disparities in the logical structures of the mother tongue and the target language affect L2 processing by making it challenging for the students to distinguish whether the deictic pronoun relates to the main subject or an additional object in a lengthy sentence. It indicates that students are still at the lower-level processing stage, whereby they focus on understanding the surface structures. Consequently, they fail to engage in higher-level processing of the text, which requires them to construct a situation model (Verhoeven et al., 2011). Therefore, their inability to cope with the complexities in the syntax results in cognitive fatigue, leading them to depend on intuition.

In the last place, the predominance of surface reading over deep reading is related to the compensation mechanism that occurs cognitively. According to Barkasa (2026), "The application of correct cognitive strategies" is the essential factor for successful reading. Nevertheless, this finding reveals that the subjects had a tendency to adopt proximity, which is a surface strategy and refers only to text closeness in order not to get into the complications of making inferences (Muh. Said & Munawir, 2022). Although this method is quick, it is prone to misconstruing since deictic relations crossing paragraph limits or shifting to psychological spatial-temporal dimensions are ignored (Yuan, 2023).

Conclusion

The research results showed that the comprehension of the ELF students regarding the Deixis phenomenon in the TOEFL passage belongs to the category of mechanistic literal interpretation. Despite the fact that the learners had enough skills to interpret person deixis because of its concrete and proximal references, they faced many problems while interpreting temporal and discourse Deixis. The inability of the learners to handle the time reference and discourse Deixis shows that the learners cannot develop a deictic navigation network to comprehend the cohesion of academic texts (van Schuppen et al., 2019).

Interdisciplinary barriers are those that prevent such understanding, including language, cognitive, and strategic factors. The lexical barriers play a crucial role as the key triggers that disrupt the linkage between grammar and its reference (Ahn, 2025). This situation is complicated by cognitive overload caused by syntactically intricate sentence structures, compelling students to heavily depend on short-term memory (Verhoeven et al., 2011). Students will be forced to give up their deep reading methods (deep processing) and resort to surface methods (surface strategy), such as the proximity method or selecting a reference based on physical proximity (Muh. Said & Munawir, 2022). These results have reaffirmed the significance of developing pragmatic skills and deictic navigation strategies in English literacy instruction among college students.

Author Contribution Statement

Author 1 acted as the initiator and conceptor of the article; Author 2 contributed to the analysis and interpretation of the data; Author 3 served as the validator of the data and analysis results; Author 4 contributed to the data collection and critical revision of the article. All authors approved the final content of the article and are responsible for all aspects of this research.

Statement of Interest

All authors declare that they have no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest relevant to this research.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or nonprofit sectors.

References

- Ahn, D. (2025). *Definite Expressions with and without Deixis*. 1–17. In N. Webster, Y. Kiper, R. Wang, & S.L. Lyu, Proceedings of the 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (pp.1-17). *Cascadilla Proceedings Project*.
- Al-Khasawneh, F. (2025). A pragmatic analysis of deictic expressions used in the IELTS speaking test. *Training, Language and Culture*, 9(1), 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2025-9-1-65-77>
- Badu, H. (2020). Students' Ability in Reading TOEFL. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, 1(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.37905/jetl.v1i2.72>
- Barkasa, M. (2026). The Practices Of Cognitive Reading Strategies On Freshman Students ' Reading Comprehension: The Case of Addis Ababa University. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*. 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v9i1.16420>
- Corrales, J. G. R. (2019). *Deictics In The Reading Comprehension*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24912/jssh.v1i1.24544213>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th Edition. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt2204s7w.11>
- D. Saffah, D. M., & Hameed Al-Hindawi, D. F. (2021). Deixis: A Pragmatic Perspective. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 8(06), 6488–6496. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v8i06.03>
- Febriani, D., Elfrida, E., & Jayanti, F. G. (2019). Reading Comprehension Problems in the Reading Section of the TOEFL Test. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 3(2), 86. <https://doi.org/10.25157/jall.v3i2.2537>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2009). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ilhami, W. M., Nurfajriani, V. W., Mahendra, A., Sirodj, A. R., & Afgani, W. M. (2021). Penerapan Metode Studi Kasus Dalam Penelitian Kualitatif. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*. 10(9), 462–469. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11180129>
- Khandamova, F., & Ibodulloeva, M. (2023). The Linguistic Function of Spatial Deixis in English Texts. *The Linguistic Function of Spatial Deixis in English Texts Paper / Article Info*. 1(4), 75–79. <https://doi.org/10.1997/nh210640>.
- Levinson, S. C. (2010). *Generative Grammar. A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory, Second Edition*, (1938), 300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415253>
- Lubis, L. R., & Irmayana, A. (2019). Analisis Kesulitan Mahasiswa IPTS Dalam

- Menyelesaikan Soal-Soal TOEFL. *Journal of Education and Development*, 7(3), 118. <https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v7i3.1202>
- Mahmudova, S. A. (2023). Different Considerations About the Concept of Deixis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(7), 1674–1679. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1307.10>
- Maizarah. (2019). Analysis Of Common Difficulties in TOEFL Reading Comprehension (A Case Study on the Second Semester Students of the English Study Program, Islamic University of Indragiri). *English Journal of Indragiri (EJI)*, 3(2), 1–9.
- Muallim, M. (2025). *Word to Sentence: Memahami Struktur Bahasa Inggris dari kata hingga kalimat*. IAIN Parepare Nusantara Press.
- Muh. Said, D. R. S., & Munawir. (2022). The Use of Genre-Based Approach (GBA) in Teaching Reading Comprehension in Terms of Skimming. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, 5(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v5i1.2621>
- Nanda, D. W., & Azmy, K. (2020). Poor Reading Comprehension in EFL Classrooms Among Indonesian Secondary School Students: Scrutinizing the Causes, Impacts, and Possible Solutions. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 8(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v8i1.6771>
- Putri, R. E., & Syarif, H. (2021). Students' Needs for the TOEFL Preparation Course at the University. *Proceedings of International Conference on Language Pedagogy (ICOLP)*, 1(1), 171–182. <https://doi.org/10.24036/icolp.v1i1.37>
- Septia, N. W., Indrawati, I., Juriana, J., & Rudini, R. (2022). An Analysis of Students' Difficulties in Reading Comprehension. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, 2(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.32923/eedj.v2i1.2519>
- Stapleton, A. (2017). Deixis in Modern Linguistics. *Article*, 9, 1–9. <https://publications.essex.ac.uk/esj/article/id/23/>
- Sunubi, H. (2022). *Introduction To Linguistics* (Vol. 16, Number 1). DIRAH.
- van Schuppen, L., van Krieken, K., & Sanders, J. (2019). Deictic Navigation Network: Linguistic Viewpoint Disturbances in Schizophrenia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(July), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01616>
- Vaysi, E., & Salehnejad, L. (2016). Spatial and Temporal Deixis in English and Persian. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS)* ISSN 2356-5926, 3(1), 1405–1414. <https://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/article/view/1430>
- Verhoeven, L., Reitsma, P., & Siegel, L. S. (2011). Cognitive and linguistic factors in reading acquisition. *Reading and Writing*, 24(4), 387–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-010-9232-4>
- Yuan, J. (2023). The Interpretation of Deixis in Cognitive Linguistics: A Literature Review. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 5(2), 01–04. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2023.5.2.1>
- Yule, G. (2020). The Study of Language (George Yule) 7th edition. In *Journal Article* (p. 362). Cambridge University Press.

