

Deixis analysis of the Son of Bigfoot movie script: Pragmatic functions and implications for English language teaching

 Fider Saputra T^{1*},  Muhammad Ihsan Tarmizi²,  Sinta Octaviana³

¹Diploma in Sanitation, Poltekkes Kemenkes Palembang, Indonesia

²Diploma in Medical Laboratory Science, Poltekkes Kemenkes Palembang, Indonesia

³Diploma in Epidemiology Surveillance, Poltekkes Kemenkes Palembang, Indonesia

*e-mail: fidersaputra@poltekkespalembang.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Pragmatic competence requires language users to interpret expressions whose meanings depend on the context in which an utterance occurs. Deictic expressions are particularly important because their interpretation changes according to the speaker, addressee, location, and time of the communicative event. This study investigates the types and pragmatic functions of deixis found in the animated movie script *Son of Bigfoot* (2017), directed by Ben Stassen. The study employed a descriptive qualitative design and analyzed dialogue utterances containing person, spatial, and temporal deictic expressions. The data were collected through repeated viewing of the film and close reading of the accompanying transcript, followed by coding and contextual interpretation using Yule's pragmatic framework. Twenty-one representative data units were identified, consisting of 12 instances of person deixis, 4 instances of spatial deixis, and 5 instances of temporal deixis. Person deixis was the most frequent category, with first-, second-, and third-person forms functioning to establish participant roles, identity, interpersonal alignment, and conflict. Spatial deixis anchored characters and events to proximal and distal locations, while temporal deixis organized events in relation to the moment of speaking. The findings indicate that deixis in the script is not simply a grammatical phenomenon but a contextual resource for constructing character relationships, narrative orientation, emotional distance, and temporal progression. The study further suggests that movie scripts can provide authentic materials for teaching pragmatic interpretation in English language education because learners can examine how apparently simple words such as I, you, he, here, there, now, and expressions referring to past time acquire meaning through context.

Keywords: deixis; movie script; pragmatics; son of bigfoot; utterance context



Submitted: 29 April 2026 | Accepted: 29 May 2026 | Published Online: 30 June 2026

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.xxxxx/xxxxx.xxxx.xxx> | Published by Derajat Ilmu Ananta



INTRODUCTION

Meaning in communication cannot always be understood from linguistic forms alone. Speakers routinely use expressions whose interpretation depends on the circumstances in which they are produced. A pronoun such as I, for example, does not have one fixed referent; its referent changes according to who produces the utterance. Similarly, here identifies a location relative to a relevant deictic center,

whereas now identifies a temporal point associated with the speech event. Such expressions demonstrate the close relationship between linguistic form and context and constitute one of the central concerns of pragmatics.

Deixis is an important topic in pragmatic analysis because it provides a systematic way of examining how speakers locate people, objects, places, and events in relation to a communicative situation. Yule (1996) describes deixis as a form of linguistic pointing in which interpretation requires attention to the context of utterance. Levinson (1983) likewise treats deixis as a major interface between language structure and contextual interpretation. From this perspective, expressions such as I, you, this, there, and now cannot be interpreted adequately by examining their lexical meanings in isolation. Their referents and functions emerge from the relationship between the utterance and the speech situation.

In ordinary face-to-face communication, deictic interpretation is supported by physical presence, gesture, shared knowledge, gaze, and other contextual cues. Audiovisual texts create a related but distinctive environment. In a film, viewers receive linguistic information through dialogue while simultaneously observing characters, settings, movements, objects, and changes in time and space. Consequently, deictic expressions may work together with visual information to establish where a character is, who is being addressed, which person is being discussed, and when an event occurs. A movie script captures the verbal component of this interaction, but its pragmatic interpretation can be enriched when the script is considered in relation to the audiovisual context.

Previous studies have demonstrated that deixis is productive in film and television dialogue. Research on *Zootopia*, for instance, has examined deictic expressions in selected scenes of an animated movie script, while studies of *Enola Holmes* and other films have reported the prominence of person deixis in character interaction. More recent research on animated films has similarly found that personal deixis can dominate dialogue and contribute to the representation of relationships and emotional interaction. These studies demonstrate the usefulness of film scripts as pragmatic data, but they also indicate that frequency-based categorization alone does not fully explain why a particular deictic form is meaningful in a specific narrative context.

The present study focuses on *Son of Bigfoot* (2017), an animated film directed by Ben Stassen. The film provides a useful setting for pragmatic analysis because its narrative involves family identity, interpersonal conflict, searching and rescue, movement through different environments, and references to events that occur before and during the central action. These narrative characteristics require characters to repeatedly identify themselves and others, locate people and places, and situate events in time. Deictic expressions consequently contribute to more than reference: they help viewers reconstruct the communicative situation and follow shifts in character perspective.

The study is also motivated by an educational consideration. Pragmatic competence is necessary for English learners because understanding an utterance requires more than recognizing vocabulary and grammatical structure (Mao et al.,

2026; Taguchi, 2024; Thuy-Dung & Liu, 2025). Learners need to determine who a pronoun refers to, what location a spatial expression indicates, and which temporal interval is being invoked. Film dialogue offers an accessible source of contextualized language in which such interpretation can be demonstrated. By examining deictic expressions in an authentic audiovisual narrative, students can observe how contextual meaning is constructed in interaction rather than treating pronouns and adverbs as isolated grammatical items.

Although previous studies have examined deixis in a range of movie scripts, the present study addresses *Son of Bigfoot* with an emphasis on the pragmatic functions of the identified forms. Rather than treating frequency as the final result, the analysis connects each category to participant identification, spatial orientation, temporal organization, interpersonal relations, and narrative development. This approach is intended to show how a relatively small set of deictic forms can perform important discourse work in an animated family narrative.

Accordingly, this study has two objectives. First, it identifies the types and forms of deixis occurring in the *Son of Bigfoot* movie script. Second, it explains the pragmatic functions of those deictic expressions within their immediate dialogue and broader narrative context. The study is guided by two research questions: (1) What types of deixis are found in the *Son of Bigfoot* movie script? and (2) How do the identified deictic expressions function pragmatically in the characters' interactions?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatics and Context

Pragmatics is concerned with how language is interpreted and used in context. Unlike an analysis that focuses only on the semantic content encoded by linguistic forms, pragmatic analysis considers how speakers and hearers construct intended meaning by using contextual information, shared knowledge, and assumptions about the communicative situation (Hansen & Terkourafi, 2023; Triyono & Dirham, 2023). Context is particularly important when an expression is underspecified without reference to the speech event. The meaning of *I*, for example, cannot be determined without identifying the speaker, while *you* requires identification of the intended addressee.

The contextual nature of pragmatic interpretation is especially visible in dialogue. A character's utterance may contain a short expression whose referent is immediately available to participants but ambiguous to a reader who encounters the sentence without its surrounding scene (Bourgeois & Bousfield, 2026). Film viewers normally solve such ambiguity by integrating dialogue with visual information, previous conversation, character identity, and setting. Deictic analysis provides a useful method for examining the relationship between language and the situational environment represented in film discourse.

Deixis

Deixis refers to linguistic expressions whose interpretation depends on contextual coordinates. Yule (1996) introduces deixis through the idea of pointing

with language and distinguishes person, spatial, and temporal deixis. Person deixis identifies participants in a speech event; spatial deixis indicates location in relation to a deictic center; and temporal deixis locates events relative to the time of speaking. Levinson (1983) provides a broader classification that also includes discourse and social deixis. The present study adopts Yule's three-category framework because the original draft is specifically designed around person, spatial, and temporal deixis and because these categories are sufficiently represented in the selected data.

Deictic expressions are context-sensitive rather than inherently fixed in reference (Carstensen, 2023). First-person pronouns such as I and we are interpreted from the speaker's perspective, second-person forms such as you from the addressee's perspective, and third-person forms such as he, she, they, and it typically refer to entities outside the speaker-addressee pair. Spatial expressions such as here and there similarly depend on a location that functions as the relevant center of orientation. Temporal expressions such as now and references to previous years depend on a temporal point established by the communicative event.

The concept of a deictic center is useful for explaining why the same form can refer to different entities or locations in different utterances. In dialogue, the center may shift from one character to another as turns change. Such shifts are particularly important in narrative dialogue because the audience follows multiple speakers and must continuously update the referential frame. Person deixis can therefore signal changes in participation and alignment, while spatial and temporal deixis can help viewers reconstruct the setting and sequence of events.

Person Deixis

Person deixis concerns the participants involved in a speech event. First-person forms encode the speaker, second-person forms encode the addressee, and third-person forms generally identify entities other than the speaker and addressee (Reshef Kera, 2026). Although these forms may appear grammatically simple, their pragmatic interpretation can be complex because the referent is determined dynamically. A shift from I to you, for example, changes the deictic center and simultaneously establishes the relationship between the participants.

In narrative dialogue, person deixis can also contribute to characterization and interpersonal meaning (Niswa, 2021). Repeated first-person forms may foreground personal agency, responsibility, resistance, or emotional involvement. Second-person forms can direct attention toward an interlocutor and may occur in questions, commands, accusations, reassurance, or requests. Third-person forms can introduce absent participants into the current discourse, allowing characters to discuss people who are not physically present. Studies of movie scripts have repeatedly identified person deixis as a prominent category, suggesting that participant reference is central to conversational storytelling.

Spatial and Temporal Deixis

Spatial deixis establishes the location of a referent relative to a deictic center (Reuter et al., 2022). Expressions such as here and there are interpreted according

to the relevant spatial perspective. Proximal forms generally indicate closeness to the speaker, whereas distal forms indicate greater distance. In film dialogue, spatial deixis can be particularly meaningful because the audience can visually inspect the setting while interpreting the verbal reference. A word such as *there* may therefore direct attention toward a location that is simultaneously visible, remembered, or narratively important.

Temporal deixis organizes events relative to the speech time (Salsasyifa & Supri, 2025). Forms such as *now* indicate the current point of the utterance, while expressions referring to past or future intervals locate events away from that point. Temporal deixis is useful in narratives because characters frequently recount earlier events, refer to future consequences, or demand immediate action. The pragmatic force of a temporal expression may therefore extend beyond chronological reference. For example, *now* can create urgency, while a reference to a distant past can provide background for present conflict.

Deixis in Movie and Animated Film Discourse

Movie dialogue provides a productive source for pragmatic research because it represents interaction in a highly contextualized form. Studies of *Zootopia*, *Enola Holmes*, *All Too Well*, *The Last Letter from Your Lover*, and *Hotel Transylvania* have used qualitative or descriptive approaches to identify deictic expressions in film dialogue (Irmanistanti et al., 2024; Puspa et al., 2021; Surakarta et al., 2025; Wigraha et al., 2022). Several of these studies report person deixis as the most frequent category, while others emphasize how spatial, temporal, discourse, or social deixis contributes to narrative interpretation. The recurrence of person deixis across different films suggests that participant orientation is a fundamental feature of scripted interaction.

Animated films are particularly useful for this type of analysis because they frequently rely on dialogue to establish family relationships, conflict, identity, and movement across settings. In *Son of Bigfoot*, character interaction involves searching for family members, negotiating conflict, and referring to people and events that are not always present in the immediate scene. Deictic forms consequently provide linguistic links between what characters say and what viewers need to infer about the story world.

The present study differs from a purely frequency-oriented approach by interpreting the pragmatic role of the identified expressions. Frequency is used to show distribution, but contextual interpretation is treated as the central analytical step. This allows the analysis to address not only what deictic forms occur but also what communicative work they perform in the interaction and how they contribute to narrative comprehension.

METHODS

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design. A qualitative approach was selected because the purpose of the study was to identify deictic expressions and interpret their contextual and pragmatic functions rather than to test a causal hypothesis. The analysis focused on the relationship between linguistic

forms and the communicative situations represented in the film. Quantitative counts were used descriptively to show the distribution of the identified categories, while the principal analytical work involved contextual interpretation.

Data and Source of Data

The primary data consisted of dialogue utterances containing person, spatial, or temporal deictic expressions in *Son of Bigfoot* (2017), directed by Ben Stassen. The secondary textual source was the movie script/transcript used to support identification and transcription of the dialogue. The film itself was also consulted repeatedly so that the interpretation of each selected expression could be related to the scene, participating characters, physical setting, and narrative situation. The unit of analysis was an utterance containing at least one expression that could be interpreted as person, spatial, or temporal deixis within its context.

Data Collection

Data were collected through document analysis and repeated viewing. First, the researcher watched the movie to become familiar with the characters, storyline, settings, and major interactional events. Second, the transcript was read repeatedly while the corresponding scenes were checked against the audiovisual presentation. Third, utterances containing potential deictic forms were identified and recorded. Fourth, the expressions were classified according to Yule's (1996) categories. Finally, the researcher examined the surrounding dialogue and scene context to determine the referent and pragmatic function of each expression.

Data Analysis

The analysis followed an iterative qualitative procedure consisting of data organization, condensation, categorization, contextual interpretation, and conclusion drawing. Initially, candidate expressions were compiled from the transcript. Repeated or contextually irrelevant items were screened so that the final dataset represented 21 deictic data units. The selected units were then categorized as person, spatial, or temporal deixis. Person deixis was further divided into first-, second-, and third-person forms. Spatial deixis was examined in terms of proximal and distal orientation, while temporal deixis was interpreted according to its relationship with the moment of utterance and the temporal interval represented in the dialogue. Each item was subsequently interpreted by considering who was speaking, who was being addressed, what or whom was being referred to, where the interaction occurred, and when the referenced event took place.

Trustworthiness was supported through repeated reading and viewing, comparison between transcript and audiovisual scenes, peer debriefing, and expert consultation. Repeated viewing was important because a deictic form can be difficult to interpret when detached from the scene. Checking the transcript against the film also reduced the possibility of treating an isolated textual form as self-explanatory. The interpretation was additionally reviewed through discussion of the categorization and contextual function of the selected data.

FINDINGS

The analysis identified 21 representative data units containing deictic expressions in *Son of Bigfoot*. Following Yule's (1996) framework, the data were grouped into three categories: person deixis, spatial deixis, and temporal deixis. Person deixis occurred most frequently with 12 items (57.14%), followed by temporal deixis with 5 items (23.81%), and spatial deixis with 4 items (19.05%). The distribution indicates that participant reference is the dominant deictic function in the selected dialogue, while references to location and time occur less frequently but remain important for establishing the narrative context.

Table 1. Distribution of Deixis Types in "Son of Bigfoot" Script

No.	Category	Subcategory/Form	Frequency	Percentage
1	Person deixis	First person (I, me, my, we)	4	19.05%
		Second person (you, your)	3	14.29%
		Third person (he, him, they, it)	5	23.81%
2	Spatial deixis	Proximal/distal (here, there)	4	19.05%
3	Temporal deixis	Present/past references (now; past-time expressions)	5	23.81%
Total			21	100.00%

Person Deixis

Person deixis was the most frequent category, accounting for 12 of the 21 representative data units. The distribution consisted of four first-person forms, three second-person forms, and five third-person forms. The dominance of person deixis indicates that much of the pragmatic work in the selected dialogue involves identifying participants and managing relationships among speakers, addressees, and other characters. In a family-centered narrative, this function is particularly important because identity and interpersonal conflict are central to the development of the story.

First-person deixis directly encodes the speaker as the referential center. In Data 1 (Scene 0:59:10), Dr. Harrison states, "You'll never get what you want for me, I'll fight you every step of the way." The pronoun I identifies Dr. Harrison as the source of the commitment expressed in the second clause. Pragmatically, I does more than identify a participant: it foregrounds personal agency and resistance. The utterance presents the speaker as an active participant who is willing to oppose the antagonist. The deictic form therefore contributes to characterization because the speaker takes explicit responsibility for the action represented by the fight.

First-person reference also makes the speaker's perspective immediately available to the interlocutor and audience. The interpretation of I changes whenever the speaker changes, so viewers must continuously update the deictic center as dialogue moves between characters. This shifting center is a basic feature of conversational narrative and helps viewers distinguish individual perspectives. In this sense, person deixis contributes to the organization of the dialogue as well as to the representation of character identity.

Second-person deixis identifies the intended addressee. In Data 5 (Scene 1:00:11), Wilbur asks, "Adam, are you sure about this?" The form you refers to Adam,

who is explicitly named in the same utterance. The use of second-person deixis creates direct interpersonal orientation because the question is constructed around the addressee's state of knowledge or confidence. Pragmatically, you place Adam at the center of the requested response and turn the utterance into an interactional move seeking confirmation.

The example also illustrates how deictic forms interact with explicit noun phrases. Although Adam is named, you maintains the grammatical and pragmatic orientation toward the addressee. This combination reduces ambiguity for the audience while preserving the natural structure of spoken interaction. In film dialogue, such redundancy can be useful because viewers process information rapidly while attending simultaneously to images, action, and speech.

Third-person deixis was the most frequent person subcategory, with five representative items. In Data 8 (Scene 0:47:16), Shelly states, "He died a long time ago. You know that." The pronoun he refers to Dr. Harrison, who is not the current speaker or addressee and is absent from the immediate conversational setting. The expression introduces an absent participant into the discourse. Pragmatically, the third-person form allows Shelly to discuss a person whose identity is relevant to the current interaction without shifting the participant roles of the conversation.

The example also shows that third-person deixis can carry narrative information. The reference to he is connected to the history of the characters and to the family-related conflict that motivates the story. The expression becomes meaningful because the audience can reconstruct the referent from the surrounding narrative. Thus, third-person deixis contributes to cohesion by linking the present utterance with information established elsewhere in the story.

Spatial Deixis

Four spatial deictic instances were identified. The relevant forms include proximal and distal expressions such as here and there. Spatial deixis is interpreted from the position of the relevant deictic center, normally the speaker or the location established by the interaction. In a film, spatial deixis is especially important because visual representations of setting and movement accompany dialogue.

In Data 13 (Scene 0:51:24), Adam warns, "There are a hundred agents in the forest looking for dad." The word there functions as a distal spatial marker in the context of the utterance. It directs attention toward a location associated with the agents and the forest. The pragmatic function is therefore orientational: the expression helps establish where the relevant people are located relative to the current conversational position. At the same time, the statement increases the narrative sense of threat because the referenced location is associated with agents searching for Adam's father.

In Data 14 (Scene 0:56:54), Adam says, "I just came out here to find my family, I'm sorry." Here functions as a proximal spatial marker. Unlike there, which creates distance from the deictic center, here associates the location with Adam's immediate situation. The expression links the character's action to the physical environment in which he is speaking. It also contributes to the explanation of motivation: Adam

identifies his immediate location as the place from which he is attempting to find his family.

The contrast between there and here illustrates the relational nature of spatial deixis. The forms do not simply label fixed geographical locations. Their interpretation depends on the position from which the character conceptualizes the scene. This relational quality makes spatial deixis valuable for narrative analysis because changes in location can also represent changes in the characters' immediate circumstances.

Temporal Deixis

Five temporal deictic instances were identified. These expressions locate events in relation to the time of speaking and help characters distinguish immediate action from earlier events. Temporal reference is particularly important in a narrative because characters frequently move between present action and memories or descriptions of previous events.

In Data 17 (Scene 1:18:20), Tina urges, "You're gonna be late for school. Now get up!" The temporal adverb now identifies the moment of speaking as the relevant temporal point. In pragmatic terms, now does more than indicate present time. It creates immediacy and strengthens the urgency of the directive get up. The expression connects temporal reference with interactional force: the action is expected to occur immediately rather than at an unspecified later time.

Data 21 (Scene 0:48:09) provides a different temporal orientation. Eastman remarks, "Your son happens to show up at the first Bigfoot sighting in the 10 last years?" The reference to the previous ten years establishes a temporal interval preceding the current utterance. The expression allows the speaker to connect the present event with a longer historical period and thereby emphasizes the unusual timing of the son's appearance. Temporal deixis in this case supports narrative evaluation because the present event becomes meaningful when measured against the preceding period.

The two examples demonstrate that temporal deixis can serve both referential and pragmatic functions. Now establishes immediacy and urgency, whereas a past interval provides background and contrast. Temporal expressions help viewers understand not only when an event occurs but also why its timing matters within the narrative.

DISCUSSIONS

The findings demonstrate that deixis in *Son of Bigfoot* operates as a system for anchoring dialogue to participants, locations, and temporal points. The overall distribution shows a clear prominence of person deixis, which represents more than a grammatical preference. The narrative is built through interaction among characters, and every exchange requires the audience to determine who is speaking, who is being addressed, and which other characters are being discussed. This finding is consistent with previous studies of movie dialogue that have reported person deixis as a dominant category.

The interactional structure of the film can explain the predominance of person

deixis. Dialogue is organized through turns, and turn-taking continuously changes the deictic center (Dancygier, 2021; Wigraha et al., 2022). When one character says I, the referent is the current speaker; when another character takes the next turn, I refers to a different individual (Pfeiffer & Weiss, 2022). The interpretation of you similarly depends on the addressee (Schubert, 2025). Such shifts are fundamental to the construction of character relationships (Horton & Waller, 2024). In *Son of Bigfoot*, where family identity and conflict are important narrative elements, participant reference becomes particularly salient because characters must repeatedly distinguish themselves, their relatives, and other involved parties.

The findings also indicate that person deixis contributes to characterization. First-person expressions can foreground agency and commitment, as shown in Dr. Harrison's statement containing I. The speaker does not merely describe an event but presents himself as the person responsible for resisting the antagonist. Second-person expressions, meanwhile, establish direct interpersonal orientation. Wilbur's use of you in asking Adam whether he is sure about the plan positions Adam as the person whose judgment matters at that moment. Third-person forms allow characters to bring absent participants into the conversation, thereby connecting current interaction with information about the wider story world.

These observations support the view that deictic expressions should not be treated as empty grammatical substitutes for nouns. Their pragmatic meaning emerges from the relationship between linguistic form and communicative context (Dinia Ningsih & Megawati, 2022). A pronoun can simultaneously identify a participant and contribute to interpersonal positioning. The analysis of film dialogue benefits from examining the referential and interactional functions of person deixis together.

Spatial deixis provides a second layer of narrative anchoring. The contrast between there and here illustrates how characters establish spatial perspective. There creates a distal orientation toward the forest and the agents associated with it, while here places Adam within his immediate environment. Such forms are particularly meaningful in audiovisual discourse because the physical setting is represented visually. The verbal expression and the visual image can therefore reinforce each other, allowing viewers to connect linguistic reference with the represented space.

The pragmatic function of spatial deixis also extends to emotional and narrative distance. In the example, the referenced location is connected with agents searching for Adam's father. The distal orientation contributes to the perception of danger by placing the threatening group outside the speaker's immediate position. In contrast, Adam's explanation foregrounds his current location and personal involvement. Although spatial deixis does not automatically encode emotion, its interpretation in a narrative can become associated with emotional positioning because locations themselves are narratively meaningful.

Temporal deixis contributes to narrative progression by connecting present dialogue with previous or immediate events. The expression now in Tina's directive establishes an immediate temporal frame and intensifies the expected action. The

reference to the previous ten years in Eastman's utterance creates a much broader temporal frame and allows the present event to be evaluated against a historical interval. These examples demonstrate that temporal expressions help characters manage the temporal scale of discourse, moving between immediate action and background history.

The findings are broadly comparable with recent research on film deixis. Studies of *Hotel Transylvania* (Surakarta et al., 2025), for example, report a prominent role for personal deixis in representing relationships and identity, while research on other films identifies spatial and temporal expressions as resources for establishing narrative context. However, the present analysis emphasizes that frequency alone is insufficient to explain the significance of these forms. The same category can perform different pragmatic work depending on the utterance and scene. A stronger analysis combines distribution with contextual interpretation.

A further implication concerns the relationship between written scripts and audiovisual context. A script contains the linguistic sequence, but the interpretation of deictic forms can depend on information supplied by the film. A word such as *here* may be difficult to interpret from text alone if the location is not described explicitly. Repeated viewing was therefore important in the present study. The researcher did not treat the transcript as an isolated written text but used the audiovisual scene to reconstruct the deictic situation.

The findings also have implications for pragmatic theory. Deixis demonstrates the interface between linguistic structure and contextual meaning because the same form can acquire different referents when the deictic center changes. In narrative dialogue, these shifts occur repeatedly and are essential for audience comprehension. The results reinforce the theoretical position that deictic interpretation requires attention to the speech event and its participants rather than lexical form alone.

From an educational perspective, the findings suggest that movie scripts can be used to teach contextual interpretation in English. Teachers can ask students to identify deictic forms, determine their referents, and explain how the referents change when the speaker changes (Mendes & Martins, 2022; Susanto, 2026). Students can also compare *here* and *there* or *now* and *past-time* expressions and explain why each form is appropriate in its scene. Such activities can move instruction beyond identifying grammatical categories toward developing pragmatic awareness.

The pedagogical value is particularly relevant for EFL learners because deictic expressions may appear simple but can become difficult when context is removed. Learners may recognize the vocabulary of *I*, *you*, *here*, *there*, and *now* but still misunderstand the intended referent (Elisabeth et al., 2024). Film-based tasks can address this problem by requiring learners to use multiple sources of contextual evidence, including dialogue, character identity, setting, movement, and previous turns. In this way, pragmatic analysis can be integrated with listening, speaking, reading, and critical interpretation.

At the same time, the study has limitations. The dataset consists of 21

representative data units selected from one animated film, and the analysis is limited to the three categories included in Yule's framework. The study therefore does not claim to represent all deictic phenomena in the film or in animated cinema generally. In particular, discourse and social deixis, which are recognized in broader frameworks such as Levinson's, were not the primary focus of the present analysis. Future studies could examine a larger corpus of animated films, compare different genres, or investigate how deictic expressions interact with discourse and social deixis.

Future research could also combine qualitative interpretation with systematic corpus methods. A larger dataset could quantify every occurrence of deictic forms and then select representative cases for detailed pragmatic analysis. Another possible direction is multimodal analysis, in which verbal deixis is examined together with gesture, camera position, character movement, and visual framing. Such an approach could provide a fuller account of how audiovisual narratives construct deictic perspective.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined deixis in the Son of Bigfoot movie script using Yule's pragmatic framework. The analysis identified 21 representative data units consisting of 12 person deictic expressions, 4 spatial deictic expressions, and 5 temporal deictic expressions. Person deixis was the most frequent category, indicating the central role of participant reference in the film's dialogue. First-person forms foregrounded speaker identity and agency, second-person forms oriented utterances toward addressees, and third-person forms introduced or maintained reference to participants outside the immediate speaker-addressee relationship. Spatial deixis functioned to orient characters and viewers toward locations relative to the deictic center, while temporal deixis located events in relation to the moment of speaking and contributed to narrative sequencing and urgency. The analysis demonstrates that these forms are not merely grammatical devices. Their interpretation depends on contextual information, and their pragmatic function is connected to character interaction, spatial orientation, temporal organization, and narrative development. The study contributes to pragmatic analysis of animated film dialogue by combining categorical identification with contextual interpretation. It also has pedagogical implications because movie scripts provide contextualized examples through which English learners can develop pragmatic awareness. Teachers can use deictic expressions to help students practice reference resolution, perspective taking, spatial orientation, temporal sequencing, and contextual comprehension. Future research should extend the dataset, examine discourse and social deixis, and incorporate multimodal features of audiovisual communication.

REFERENCES

- Bourgeois, S., & Bousfield, D. (2026). *Pragmatics in contested interpretation: Varied audiences, varied implicatures, varied inferences*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Budiarta, I. W., & Gaho, R. (2021). Deixis analysis on *Zootopia* movie script: A pragmatic study. *Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijoltl.v6i3.682>
- Carstensen, K.-U. (2023). Attentional semantics of deictic locatives. *Lingua*, 296, 103626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103626>
- Dancygier, B. (2021). Fictive deixis, direct discourse, and viewpoint networks. *Frontiers in Communication*, 6, 624334. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.624334>
- Dinia Ningsih, P., & Megawati, F. (2022). Deictic expressions used by Lera Boroditsky in TED Talks channel. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 4(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.4951>
- Elisabeth, M., Timbu, 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. *Sastra Journal of Linguistics*, 8(2).
- Gustiana, R., & Adawiyah, S. S. (2025). An analysis of deixis in the *Fast X* movie (2025). *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.31539/pj9xgz79>
- Hansen, M. B. M., & Terkourafi, M. (2023). We need to talk about hearer's meaning! *Journal of Pragmatics*, 208, 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.02.015>
- Horton, L., & Waller, J. (2024). The pragmatics of gaze patterns in a local family sign language from Guatemala. *Languages*, 9(6), 223. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9060223>
- Irmanistanti, A., Musyarofah, L., & Sabat, Y. (2024). Deixis analysis of *The Last Letter From Your Lover* (2021) movie script by Jojo Moyes. *Journal of English Development*, 4(2), 396–408. <https://doi.org/10.25217/jed.v4i02.4690>
- Khoiriyah, Z. N., & Rosdiana, A. (2025). Pragmatic analysis of person deixis and its function in *Encanto*. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v8i2.14879>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mao, L., Kong, B., & Chu, S. (2026). Intercultural communicative competence in translation teaching mediated by artificial intelligence: Cultural schema theory, mediated discourse analysis and intercultural pragmatics. *Acta Psychologica*, 265, 106616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106616>
- Mendes, M., & Martins, M. (2022). (Mis)Guided interpersonal deictic choices in primary school writing under language assessment. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101035>
- Niswa, K. (2021). Pragmatic analysis on deixis to short story of “What the old man does is always right.” *Journal of English Language and Education*, 6(1), 89–99. <https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/index>
- Pfeiffer, M., & Weiss, C. (2022). Reenactments during tellings: Using gaze for initiating reenactments, switching roles and representing events. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 189, 92–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.11.017>
- Puspa, Y. C., Putri, I. G. A. V. W., & Utami, N. M. V. (2021). Deixis found in the utterances by the main character of *Enola Holmes* movie. *ELYSIAN Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 1(3).
- Reshef Kera, D. (2026). Deixis machines and enunciation without a speaker in large language models. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-026-01157-8>
- Reuter, T., Sullivan, M., & Lew-Williams, C. (2022). Look at that: Spatial deixis reveals experience-related differences in prediction. *Language Acquisition*, 29(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2021.1932905>

- Salsasyifa, A., & Supri, I. Z. (2025). Deixis in travel section articles of the “USA Today” online newspaper: A pragmatic study. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 9(1), 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ej lutka. vol9. iss1. 2025. 2655. 455>
- Sanata, A. R., & Bram, B. (2023). Pragmatic deixis in King Charles III’s inauguration speech. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 5(2), 245–261. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v5i2.245-261>
- Schoppa, M. (2025). *Pragmatic and discourse perspectives on deictic reference in contemporary media dialogue*. [Reference details should be verified before submission.]
- Schubert, M. (2025). Pointing at others as an embodied connection device: Linking back to prior talk in multi-party interaction. *Discourse Processes*, 62(4), 257–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2025.2489317>
- Simatupang, V. C., Sembiring, M., & Sitinjak, V. N. (2023). Deixis in *All Too Well* movie script. *Vernacular: Linguistics, Literature, Communication and Culture Journal*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.35447/vernacular.v3i2.838>
- Sitorus, T. K., Gea, J. A., Sari, A. A., & Saragih, E. (2025). Deixis in political discourse: A pragmatic analysis of “What’s behind widespread unrest in Indonesia?” *Journal of English Language and Education*.
- Subekti, M. R. F., & Fauziati, E. (2025). The pragmatic analysis of deixis in *Hotel Transylvania* movie script 2012. *JELITA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature*, 6(1), 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.56185/jelita.v6i1.892>
- Susanto, D. A. (2026). Deixis in action: How university students construct meaning in English classroom interaction: A review study. *Global Synthesis in Education Journal*, 3(4), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.61667/m5desp73>
- Taguchi, N. (2024). Technology-enhanced language learning and pragmatics: Insights from digital game-based pragmatics instruction. *Language Teaching*, 57(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000101>
- Thuy-Dung, N. T., & Liu, M.-C. (2025). Harnessing AI for English writing learners as content creators: Pragmatic strategies, cognitive transformations, and professional applications. *SSRN*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5562206>
- Triyono, A., & Dirham, U. R. (2023). Pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge and its role in linguistic communication. *Journal of Learning and Instructional Studies*, 2(3), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.46637/jlis.v2i2.29>
- Widiarini, I. R. (2025). A pragmatic analysis of deixis in the film *Damsel* (2023). *JALILA: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literary Analysis*, 1(1), 33–40.
- Wigraha, I. G. P. E. A., & Puspani, I. A. M. (2022). The analysis of subtitling strategies used in *Zootopia* movie. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(1), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.8.1.4344.73-78>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.