

## Fillers in Finals of National School Debating Championships

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i1.603>

\*Yuni Rahmawati<sup>1</sup>, Alief Noor Farida<sup>2</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Universitas Negeri Semarang

Corresponding Author: [yunirahmawatii@students.unnes.ac.id](mailto:yunirahmawatii@students.unnes.ac.id)

### A B S T R A C T

Fillers, such as “uh” and “uhm,” played a crucial role in spontaneous spoken communication. Despite their importance, research on fillers in debate competitions remained limited, with most studies focusing on classroom contexts. This study aimed to examine the types and functions of fillers used in National School Debating Championships (NSDC) 2023 and 2024, as well as to highlight the pedagogical implications of fillers in debate contexts. The research employed a descriptive qualitative case study approach, analyzing utterances containing fillers from the debate finals of NSDC 2023 and 2024. The findings revealed that lexicalized fillers, such as repetitive phrases, were used more frequently than unlexicalized fillers. Additionally, fillers served five functions: hesitation, mitigation, time-creating, empathizing, and editing-term devices. These insights highlighted the importance of incorporating fillers into English teaching and learning to enhance fluency and confidence. By understanding how to use fillers strategically, students could improve their speaking skills, particularly in high-pressure environments like debates.

**Keywords:** fillers, debate, national school debating championship, spoken language

#### Article History:

Received 11<sup>th</sup> December 2024

Accepted 10<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Published 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2025



## INTRODUCTION

Communication plays a pivotal role in human interaction. It is a process of sharing information with others, aiming to make others understand one's goals and intentions (Soyunov et al., 2016; Ussolichah et al., 2021). As the main tool of communication, language uses signs like words and gestures to foster written and spoken interactions in society (Purba et al., 2021; Yusuf et al., 2022). Through communication, people are able to exchange messages and negotiate meaning effectively (Ya-Ni, 2007 cited in Mareza et al., 2021).

In oral communication, messages are conveyed not only through words but also through several other components linked to spontaneous spoken language, such as repetitions, clarifications, hesitations, false starts, and fillers (Alkhelaiwi, 2023). Spoken interactions often occur in real-time, giving speakers limited time to think their responses (Meylana et al., 2022). This immediacy aligns with Chafe's (1994, cited in Nugroho & Rasmodjo (2020) suggestion that spontaneity and naturalness often follow spoken language.

Fillers, described as pauses or words that do not alter the meaning of a sentence, are a phenomenon in face-to-face communication (Baalen, 2021; Fikriyah, 2022). In Mulyohatono and Sianipar (2022), it is stated that Kahar (2018) categorized *uh*, *um*, a false start, repetition, parenthetical remark, and lengthening as filled pauses. Sugiura et al. (2020) found that during the vocalization of fillers, there was greater high gamma augmentation in the association cortex. Speakers used filler as a behavioral marker to indicate that they tried to recall, select, or search a relevant word.

Fillers are widely used outside academic contexts, such as in public speaking, podcasts, and interviews. Firiady & Mahendra (2019) found that TED Talk speakers frequently used

phrase fillers and sound fillers to connect ideas, fill gaps while searching for words, and gain attention. Similarly, fillers were identified in speeches by Barack Obama (Kharismawan, 2017) and Emma Watson (Indriyana et al., 2021). In podcasts, Alkhelaiwi (2023) identified fillers in a Saudi English language podcast, while Setyowati and Setyawan (2023) analyzed fillers in the Dive Studios podcast. In addition, fillers were also found in interviews, including those with EFL and ESL speakers (Purba et al., 2021), Agnes Monica (Aliyah & Hestrian, 2021), and Prabowo Subianto (Susilowati & Kusumaningtyas, 2024).

Filler is often seen as one of the speech errors or speech disfluencies. Sanjaya & Nugrahani (2018) found filled pauses as the most frequent type of disfluency in group presentations by English Education Master's students. Similarly, Sholihah Ts (2019) found that silent pauses dominated among first-semester students, while third-semester students predominantly made filled pauses during speaking class interactions. Tampubolon & Lubis (2021) noted that filled pauses ranked second among nine types of speech errors in a podcast video, due to nervousness, hesitation, haste, and lack of concentration as the causes. Furthermore, Sari et al. (2023) found that senior high school students produced some kinds of speech errors including filled pauses, repetition, and stutters, caused by anxiety, nervousness, and low confidence.

On the other hand, filler can function as one of the communication strategies to solve speaking challenges. Soyunov et al. (2016) highlighted their frequent use among bilingual students to manage hesitation, nervousness, fear of making mistake, and lack of confidence in giving their opinion. Widyaningrum et al. (2020) showed that fillers commonly employed as stalling or time-gaining strategy. Mareza et al. (2021) and Widiastuti et al. (2021) reported that both students and teachers used fillers in classroom. Syamsudin et al. (2024) found that fillers helped EFL learners overcome speaking challenges, boosted their self-confidence, and increased their motivation to participate in discussions.

Numerous studies have investigated fillers used frequently by students, instructors, teachers, and lecturers. Fatimah et al. (2017), Lomotey (2021), and Sarira et al. (2023) examined the types and functions of fillers, while Arrasul et al. (2024) analyzed the types and influencing factors of fillers. Mahendra & Bram (2019) investigated gender differences in using fillers among instructors. Susilowati & Wafa (2023) confirmed EFL teacher's use of fillers as discourse markers alongside lexical phrases, adverbs, and conjunctions. Studies by Adini et al. (2021) and Afriyanti & Andini (2020) focused on fillers in microteaching class, while Mulyohartono & Sianipar (2022), Fitriati et al. (2021), and Vrika & Diananseri (2022) investigated fillers in student conversations. Additionally, Stevani et al. (2018) and Yusuf et al. (2022) examined fillers in student presentations. These studies showed that fillers were commonly used across various educational settings and played an important role in spoken communication.

In Indonesia, the use of self-correction and repair strategies, including fillers, is an essential skill for students, especially those in Phase F (11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade) as outlined in the Emancipated Curriculum. The Ministry of Education emphasizes that phase F students should be able to use English to express opinions on social issues, discuss youth-related topics, and evaluate perspectives across cultural context while employing self-correction, repair strategies, and use non-verbal elements to enhance the communication. Fillers, as a part of self-correction and repair strategies, naturally occur during speaking activities like expressing opinions. A common medium for such activities is debates.

The use of fillers in debates has been confirmed by several researchers (e.g. Muchsani, 2023; Soyunov et al., 2016; Saidah et al., 2020; Diyales et al., 2022). Muchsani (2023) found that fillers were used in the presidential debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. Additionally, Soyunov et al. (2016) specifically found that high school students produced fillers as a communication strategy in casual classroom debates. Similarly, Saidah et al. (2020) and Diyales et al (2022) found that fillers were the most frequently used as communication strategy by learners in debate when they faced communication problems. These studies focus on the use of fillers by non-student individuals in presidential debate and students in

non-competitive debate settings. Therefore, I aim to analyze how students used fillers in competitive debate situations that were live-streamed.

As we can see, there are limited research studies on fillers used in debate, specifically debate competition. Most studies have focused on fillers produced by students in classroom contexts. In fact, students also produce fillers in debate competitions as they speak spontaneously and may face nervousness. Therefore, this study tries to fill that gap in filler studies to provide a deeper understanding of fillers in debates and contributing to the scientific literature focusing on fillers analysis. Moreover, the findings will assist teachers, instructors, and debate coaches in developing strategies to help students use fillers appropriately during debates. It will also help students use fillers in a considerate amount in debate competitions, ensuring their speech remains clear and meaningful, as Wardani (2022) argues that excessive use of fillers indicates a lack of mastery over the topic being presented. This study tries to answer three questions:

1. What are the types of fillers produced in the National School Debating Championships?
2. What are the functions of fillers produced in the National School Debating Championships?
3. What are the pedagogical implications of the findings in the English teaching and learning?

## METHOD

This study examined the types and functions of fillers using descriptive qualitative case study approach through content analysis. The qualitative method was descriptive in that it investigated the meaning, procedure, as well as comprehension that was obtained from words or images (Cresswell, 1994). The descriptive qualitative method was applied as the data was descriptively interpreted using the researcher's perspective. The objective data were collected, classified, and analyzed using the theory of Rose (1998) and Stenstrom (1994) as the theoretical framework. After analyzing the data, the interpretation of the current phenomena was made to finally present a conclusion.

This study analyzed the use of fillers by participants in the finals of NSDC 2023 and 2024. The researcher focused on debates because of the limited existing studies in this field and her interest in exploring fillers in competitive situations. The researcher chose debates by Indonesian students as debate can be medium for achieving one of the learning outcomes outlined for phase F (11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade) students.

The data source was taken from the YouTube video entitled "Final | National Schools Debating Championship 2023: Speak of Your Mind, Speak for Indonesia" in Pusat Prestasi Nasional channel and "Grand Final National Schools Debating Championship 2024" in Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya channel. For the data collection instrument, the researcher developed it through a combination of both theoretical understanding and practical considerations of the research topic. The analysis was focused on fillers used by the debate participants in their argument presentations. There were six debate participants in each video, so there were twelve participants in total.

Observation was done to collect primary information. As the data source were videos, the researcher used AI tool called Desgrabador for transcriptions. The researcher observed the written transcriptions to find the fillers which were then organized in tables modified from Wardani (2022) using Ms. Excel. After that, the data was analyzed in a qualitative manner using the theories of Rose (1998) and Stenstrom (1994). Later, the researcher interpreted the findings based on the research questions.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Fillers play an important role in spoken communication. Rose (1998) categorized fillers into two types: lexicalized fillers, which in the form of words or phrases (e.g., *like, look, I*

think), and unlexicalized fillers, which are wordless sounds (e.g., *uh*, *uhm*). Additionally, Stenstrom (1994) identified five functions of fillers: hesitation, mitigation, time-creating, empathizing, and editing-term devices. These theoretical frameworks provided a foundation to understand the varied uses of fillers in different settings, including debates, where spontaneity and quick-thinking are essential.

Based on these theories, the researcher tried to investigate the types and functions of fillers used by participants in the finals of National School Debating Championships (NSDC) 2023 and 2024. By applying Rose's (1998) and Stenstrom's (1994) theories, this study aimed to explore how fillers are used strategically or unconsciously in live-streamed, competitive, and high-pressure speaking environments. The findings focused on types and functions of fillers produced by debate participants. Moreover, the pedagogical implications was also served so that this study could be a help for teachers and students.

### Types of Fillers Produced in NSDC 2023 and 2024

To answer the first research question, which concerned the types of fillers that appeared in the grand-finals of NSDC 2023 and 2024, the author referred to Rose's (1998) theory, which categorized fillers into two types: lexicalized fillers and unlexicalized fillers. Both types of fillers were used by the participating students.

Table 1. Types of fillers

| Types Of Fillers      | Frequency   | Percentage  |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Lexicalized fillers   | 849         | 71.29%      |
| Unlexicalized fillers | 342         | 28.71%      |
| <b>TOTAL</b>          | <b>1191</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Table 1 implied that the students who were grand finalists in the NSDC used both types of fillers, namely lexicalized and unlexicalized fillers. The use of lexicalized fillers was more dominant, accounting for 71.29% of the total fillers produced. In contrast, unlexicalized fillers were used less frequently, with a percentage of around 28.71% and an occurrence of 342 times. The total of fillers was 1191 which produced by twelve speakers.

Table 2. Lexicalized fillers

| No           | Lexicalized Fillers          | Frequency  |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 1            | Repetitions of words/phrases | 393        |
| 2            | like                         | 311        |
| 3            | right                        | 92         |
| 4            | I think                      | 28         |
| 5            | look                         | 7          |
| 6            | yeah                         | 4          |
| 7            | and those kind of stuff      | 4          |
| 8            | for example                  | 3          |
| 9            | so                           | 3          |
| 10           | yes                          | 2          |
| 11           | okay                         | 1          |
| 12           | kek                          | 1          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                              | <b>849</b> |

The table above highlighted the frequency of lexicalized fillers used by grand-finalists of NSDC 2023 and 2024. They used a significant number of lexicalized fillers, which were 849. Lexicalized fillers were actual words or phrases. The most frequently used lexicalized fillers was the repetition of words or phrases, occurring 393 times. This indicated that speakers often repeated themselves, possibly to buy time while organizing their thoughts. The word "like", occurring 311 times, was the second most commonly used lexicalized filler by the participants. Other fillers, such as "right" and "I think" also appeared frequently, serving functions such as seeking agreement or attention and make the utterances less harsh. "Look", "yeah", and "and those kind of stuff" were less common, where each used fewer than ten time. Rare fillers, such as "kek", "yes", and "okay" were found observed only once or twice,

indicating their minimal usage in the overall data. Here were some examples of how lexicalized fillers were used in debates:

- (1) S.2023.1 : “**They can ... they can** still do things like export and import so they even receive any sort of harm that They're actually experiencing in the current status quo.”
- (2) S.2024.1 : “But then again, the world under opposition would constantly **stick** uh... **stick** on one feature for example.”
- (3) S.2024.2 : “... where you need to pay more to get the best benefits or how there are **like** more discounts or vouchers that you can use ...”
- (4) S.2024.2 : “... irrationality in spending, panels, **right?**”
- (5) S.2023.3 : “**I think** you let bigger countries ...”

In the examples, students used lexicalized fillers because "they can," "stick," "right", "like", and "I think" were words or phrases. These lexicalized fillers helped maintain the flow of speech and provide time for the speaker to think about their next point.

Table 3. Unlexicalized fillers

| No           | Unlexicalized Fillers | Frequency  |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1            | uh                    | 331        |
| 2            | uhm                   | 6          |
| 3            | aa                    | 4          |
| 4            | eerrr                 | 1          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                       | <b>342</b> |

Unlexicalized fillers were non-words sounds used to filled pauses. "Uh" was the most frequently used unlexicalized filler by the grand finalists of NSDC 2023 and 2024. This was followed by "uhm", "aa", and "eerrr." Here were some examples of how unlexicalized fillers were used:

- (6) S.2023.4 : “... but mostly it only considers **uh** spectrum of solders that defending the good side ...”
- (7) S.2024.2 : “We say that this is such a **eerrr** this case does not make sense ...”
- (8) S.2023.6 : “... is only **uhm** worst case that ...”
- (9) S.2024.2 : “... we say that this is such a eerrr this case does not make sense ...”

We could see in these examples that the fillers were wordless or in the form of sound, which was why they were categorized as unlexicalized fillers. The use of unlexicalized fillers “uh” and “eerrr” in these examples illustrated their role in managing hesitation and clarifying error during spontaneous speaking.

This study showed that all speakers in the debate used fillers. They used fillers as strategy in facing difficulties. It was similar to what Soyunov et al. (2016), Saidah et al. (2020), and Diyales et al. (2022) found, where learners used fillers as the main strategy in debate setting. Speakers used fillers mainly to fill the pause when they were hesitant or needed to think the next utterances. They also used fillers because they wanted to make the communication kept going. Besides, fillers were used to clarified the previous utterances that they said because there were errors. Therefore, we could say that speakers for three reasons and it aligned with Celce-Murcia’s (1995, in Fitriati et al. 2021) suggested, that students used fillers due to three factors: psycholinguistic factors, where they use fillers to overcome

problems in achieving communicative goals; interactional factors, where students used fillers as a repair mechanism; and communicative maintenance, where students used fillers to keep the communication going.

In addition, this research showed that both types of fillers were used by the debate participants. It was similar with Muchsani (2023) where he found that both lexicalized and unlexicalized fillers were used in the presidential debate. In this study, the lexicalized fillers frequently used were repetitive words or phrases. Meanwhile, the unlexicalized filler used dominantly was “uh”. A factor that might influence the use of “uh” was because it was simple and easy sound to produce so speakers did not have any difficulty in pronouncing the filler.

### Functions of Fillers Produced in NSDC 2023 and 2024

To answer the second question, the researcher referred to Stenstrom (1994) in categorizing filler functions. There were five functions of fillers, they are mitigation, hesitation, time-creating, empathizing, and editing-term devices. These function categories highlighted the various roles that fillers played in making speech more fluid, particularly in debate situations that required spontaneous thinking.

Table 4. Filler's functions

| Filler's Functions | Frequency   | Percentage  |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mitigation         | 45          | 3.78%       |
| Hesitation         | 195         | 16.38%      |
| Editing-term       | 109         | 9.15%       |
| Empathizing        | 104         | 8.73%       |
| Time-creating      | 738         | 61.96%      |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | <b>1191</b> | <b>100%</b> |

From the table above, we could see that students used all five functions of fillers in the NSDC. The most common function was creating device, with the percentage of occurrence was 621.96% of the total occurrences or 738 times. It was followed with hesitation device in the second position that were used 195 times or 16.38%. Editing term were used 9.15% while empathizing device 8.73% of the total occurrences. The least frequent function was mitigation device that were used 45 times or 3.78% of the total occurrences.

#### Time-creating devices

Most fillers functioning as time-creating device appeared as repetition words or phrases. Below were the examples of fillers as time-creating device:

(10) S.2023.2 : “but **under uh under** these instances we take on and rip away their benefit intergenerationally because their contribution goes above ...”

(11) S.2024.6 : “... and it will be solved when you use cashless because this is the problem that **the government uh the government** create ...”

Both examples revealed that fillers functioning as time-creating device often appeared in the form of repetitive of words or phrases. This repetition allowed the speakers to pause for a moment while maintaining the flow of their speech. In doing so, they gained some time to gather their thoughts and decide on the next part of their argument. This strategy might be useful in high-pressure situations, such as debates, where speakers were expected to respond quickly and articulate their ideas clearly. Repeating words or phrases, the allowed them to think critically about their arguments without breaking the rhythm of their speech.

#### Hesitation devices

Hesitation fillers helped speakers pause to think what to say next. The researcher found that students mostly function filler “uh” as a hesitation device. Here were some examples:

(12) S.2024.6 : “... they **uh** realize that exactly because it's becoming a complex process ...”

(13) S.2023.1 : “Moving on then, **uh** why is it important to to to consider this argument under our side”

The fillers “uh” in both utterances were produced by students because they needed time to say the next words or sentences. This occurred because they were not entirely confident or certain about what they wanted to say next. By inserting “uh,” the speakers created a brief pause that allowed them to gather their thoughts and avoid silence, which might have disrupted the flow of their speech. This behavior reflected the natural tendency of speakers to rely on hesitation fillers when they experienced uncertainty or need additional time to articulate their next words clearly.

### *Editing-term devices*

As it was normal for speakers, including the debate participants, to make mistakes or errors in spontaneous speaking, they used fillers to correct the errors they make. Below were some of the examples.

(14) S.2023.5 : “... there will be no human rights violations or there will be no killings **uh** unjustified killings in times of war”

(15) S.2023.3 : “... we don't have to actually bake.. **uh** bring a good facilities for soldiers to actually give them good foods, to actually give them a proper treatment ...”

Editing-term devices were mostly found in the form of “uh”. Speakers used fillers “uh” as they realized that they made speech errors or needed to make correction to their utterances. The filler acted as a signal that allow them to pause briefly and correct their errors or clarified their speech. By using “uh”, speakers could address mistakes or clarify their intended message without disrupting the overall flow of their communication.

### *Empathizing devices*

Fillers were used by the debate participants to get or check attention from the listeners. Some examples of fillers as empathizing devices:

(16) S.2024.5 : “ ... the fact that you have the confidence in the market you would likely to buy more and spend more, **right?**”

(17) S.2023.8 : “**Look**, in the current status quo we already acknowledge Soldiers to different ways, respecting War veterans ...”

Fillers “right” and “look” in the utterances above were used check if the listeners paid attention. These fillers served as interactive devices that could make the audience focus on the speaker’s speech and encouraging engagement. Moreover, speakers tried to established connection with the audience, ensuring their messages were being followed and understood.

### *Mitigation devices*

Finalists of the NSDC 2023 and 2024 also used fillers to be a politeness device or to soften the statement so that it less direct or harsh. This use of fillers helped to avoid causing offense. Below were some examples of fillers as mitigations devices.

(18) S.2024.3 : “... **I think** irrationality is not equal with a random decision that you have”

(19) S.2024.8 : “... in both of the house you still poor **for example**, at least we are not counting penny every day ...”

The examples above showed that fillers were used to mitigate the speaker’s utterances so that it did not hurt the addressee’s feelings. They also helped reduce the potential harshness of the messages and allow speakers to communicate more wisely.

This study showed that speakers used fillers for all five functions from Stenstrom’s (1994) theory. It was different with what Muchsani (2023) found, where there were only three functions used namely mitigating (“well”, “I mean”), empathizing (“well”, “you know” “okay”, “look”), and hesitating (“uh”, “um”, “aay”). In the current study, debate

speakers used fillers such as “uh” and “uhm” to think the next utterances as they were hesitant. Then, in mitigating their speech they used fillers such as “I think”, “like” and “for example”. To invite the listener’s focus, debate speakers used fillers such as “right” and “look”. As they made some mistakes in their speaking, they used “uh” to clarified their prior statement. Moreover, they used “like” and repetition of words or phrases or clauses to give some time for them to think about what to say next. Furthermore, this study revealed that speakers used fillers mostly to function as time-creating devices. It was in contrast with Muchsani (2023) as in his research there was no fillers functioning as time-creating device. It also differed from Fitriati et al. (2021) that found fillers mostly functioned as empathizing device.

### **Pedagogical Implications**

This study highlighted important pedagogical implications for English language teaching and learning. One key finding was the need for English educators to integrate fillers into their lessons as part of self-correction and repair strategies. By doing so, educators could help students navigate the challenges of spoken communication and enhance their fluency. This aligned with the objectives of Phase F in the Emancipated Curriculum, which emphasized the ability to express opinions on social issues, discuss youth-related topics, and evaluate perspectives. The curriculum also encouraged students to employ self-correction, repair strategies, and non-verbal elements like gestures, speech rate, and tone to ensure effective communication across contexts.

Educators were able to destigmatize the use of fillers and portray them as tools rather than defects by acknowledging that they are normal parts of speech. Educators helped students understand when and how fillers could be used as time-creating devices, hesitation markers, mitigating devices, editing term devices, or means of maintaining conversational flow. Students were able to balance naturalness and clarity in their speaking by developing this awareness and being more intentional in their speech. Additionally, filler discussions helped students adjust their communication style in various contexts by exposing them to cultural variations in spoken language.

Finally, learning about fillers really helped students improve their speaking skills. By understanding the different types and uses of fillers, students could figure out how to make their speech sound better and more confident. For example, knowing how to use fillers like “uh” or “like” in a debate or public speaking helped students buy time to think while still keeping the audience’s attention. Instead of overusing fillers or using them in the wrong way, students learned to use them naturally and effectively. This made them feel more prepared and confident when speaking in real-life situations.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

In this study, two videos of the National Debating School Championship (NSDC) finals were analyzed: NSDC 2023 and NSDC 2024. The findings indicated that there were two types of fillers used: lexicalized fillers, which were used 849 times, and unlexicalized fillers, which were used 349 times. The most dominant unlexicalized filler was “uh” that appeared 331 times while the most frequently used lexicalized fillers were repetitions of words or phrases that were produced 393 times.

Furthermore, it was found that debate participants used fillers for five functions proposed by Stenstrom (1994): hesitation, time-creating, mitigation, editing-term, and empathizing devices. The time-creating device was the most frequently achieved function by students using fillers. This differed from previous study (Muchsani, 2023) where only three functions were found, and time-creating was not one of them.

It was crucial for students, particularly debate participants, to understand the use of fillers in speech. Fillers could be a strategy for dealing with difficulties in speaking.

However, it was equally important to use fillers in moderation, as excessive use might make the speaker appear uncertain about their opinions. Therefore, they should practice extensively before participating in debates.

We could conclude that the findings of this study had implications for English language teaching and learning. By normalizing the use of fillers and teaching students their various functions, educators could enhance students' fluency and confidence in spoken communication. The approach aligned with one of the Emancipated Curriculum's learning outcomes, which emphasized the use of self-correction, non-verbal elements, and effective communication. However, it was also important to note that fillers should be used strategically to make speech more natural and effective.

## REFERENCES

- Adini, D. S., Riza, A., & Afriyanti, R. (2021). Pause filler used by students in microteaching class. *Ekasakti Educational Journal*, 1(1), 83–90. <https://doi.org/10.31933/eej.v1i1.181>
- Afriyanti, R., & Andini, D. S. (2020). Fillers used by male and female students in practice teaching performance of micro teaching class. *TELL-US Journal*, 6(1), 13–36. <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2020.v6i1.3541>
- Aliyah, S. L., & Hestrian, R. A. P. (2021). An analysis of fillers used by Agnes Monica with Build Series' interview. *Curricula: Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.22216/curricula.v6i2.276>
- Alkhelaiwi, S. (2023). Uh and um in the native and non-native speech of guests on a Saudi English-language podcast. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(7), 1620–1631. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpsls.1307.03>
- Arrasul, A. R., Mangendre, Y., Akbar, F., Hardianti, S., & Mangandre, Y. (2024). Learners' fillers in English. *Applied Research in English Education*, 2(1), 20–31. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/AREE>
- Baalen, I. V. (2001). Male and female language: Growing together?. Retrieved from [http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/hsl\\_shl/van%20Baalen.htm](http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/hsl_shl/van%20Baalen.htm)
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative, approaches*. SAGE.
- Fatimah, G. S., Febriani, B., & Apollonia, R. (2017). An analysis of fillers used by lecturer and students in EFL classroom interaction. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 1(2), 43–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/jall.v1i2.1735>
- Firiady, M., & Mahendra, A. W. (2019). A study of fillers uttered in English public speaking. *ELTR Journal*, 3(2), 136–148. <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v3i2.98>
- Fikriyah, H. (2022). *The comparison between a Korean-American and an Indonesian singer on the use of fillers in spontaneous conversation* (Undergraduate thesis). Etheses UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Fitriati, S. W., Mujiyanto, J., Susilowati, E., & Akmilia, P. M. (2021). The use of conversation fillers in English by Indonesian EFL Master's students. *Linguistic Research*, 38, 25–52. <https://doi.org/10.17250/khisli.38..202109.002>
- Indanna, S. P., Arasuli, A., & Damayanti, I. (2022). An analysis of women's language features used by the three Indonesian female travel bloggers. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 6(4), 578–597. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.6.4.578-597>
- Indriyana, B. S., Sina, M. W., & Bram, B. (2021). Fillers and their functions in Emma Watson's speech. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 10(1), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v10i1.1350>
- Kharismawan, P. (2017). The types and the functions of the fillers used in Barack Obama's speeches. *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, 1(1), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.2017.010112>
- Lomotey, C. F. (2021). Fillers in academic discourse: an analysis of lectures from a public university in Ghana. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejals.v3i2.248>

- Mahendra, A. W., & Bram, B. (2019). Filler utterances of instructors in elt context. *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 7(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v7i2.999>
- Mareza, P., Gani, S. A., & Samad, I. A. (2021). The investigation of classroom communication strategies used by English department lecturers. *English Education Journal*, 12(4), 558–576. <https://doi.org/10.24815/eej.v12i4.19878>
- Meylana, A., Fitriati, S. W., & Alif, W. N. H. (2022). Students' tendency in using fillers in situations of randomly appointed to answer oral questions. *The proceedings of the English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation*, 11(1), 111–121.
- Muchsani. (2023). Examining the use of fillers in a presidential debate: a case of Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, 4(1), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.37905/jetl.v4i1.24273>
- Mulyohartono, C. F., & Sianipar, Y. O. (2022). An analysis of pauses in conversations by students of the faculty of letters and languages, Universitas Kristen Indonesia. *Dialektika Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya*, 9(2), 132–142.
- Nugroho, B. G. S., & Rasmodjo, V. R. (2020). An analysis of students' spoken fillers in Instagram videos assignment: a case study. *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya* 18, 16, 78–83.
- Purba, R., Herman, H., Manullang, V. R. M., & Ngongo, M. (2021). Investigation of decoding fillers used in an English learning talk show "English with Alice." *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i1.5352>
- Pusat Prestasi Nasional. (2023, October 6) *Final: National Schools debating championship 2023 "Speak of your mind, speak for Indonesia!"* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/aG3QAo4Aedk>.
- Rose, R. L. (1998). *The communicative value of filled pauses in spontaneous speech* (Thesis). Brimingham: Brimingham University.
- Saidah, N.R., Munir, A., & Anam, S. (2020). Communication strategies used by EFL learners intask-based English debate. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEAA) Journal*, 3(2). 414–425. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leaa.v3i2.1254>
- Sanjaya, A., & Nugrahani, V. (2018). Speech disfluency in groups' presentations of English education Master's program students. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 21(1), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210102>
- Sari, A. N. P., Talib, A., & Faradiba, S. (2023). An analysis of speech errors made by students at SMA negeri 8 Makassar. *Journal of Excellence in English Language Education*, 2(3), 267–274.
- Sarira, P., Mahmud, M., Affandi, A., & Burhamzah, M. (2023). The existence of fillers in converting the written language to spoken language. *Borneo Journal of English Language Education*, 5(1), 1–13.
- Setyowati, U., & Setyawan, A. H. (2023). Linguistics and English language teaching journal fillers used by speakers on Dive Studios podcast. *Linguistics and English Language Teaching Journal*, 11(2), 131–137.
- Sholihah Ts, A. (2019). The dominant errors of speech production committed in speaking class interaction. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v7i2.1671>
- Soyunov, B., Rochsantiningasih, D., & Suparno. (2016). Communication strategies used by students of English conversation club of Sragen bilingual boarding school. *English Education Journal*, 5(1), 41–49.
- Stenström, A. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London: Longman.
- Stevani, A., Sudarsono, & Supardi, I. (2018). An analysis of fillers usage in academic presentation. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 7(10), 1–9. <https://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v7i10.29227>

- Sugiura, A., Alqatan, Z., Nakai, Y., Kambara, T., Silverstein, B. H., & Asano, E. (2020). Neural dynamics during the vocalization of 'uh' or 'um.' *Scientific Reports*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68606-x>
- Susilowati, E., & Kusumaningtyas, E. D. (2024). Fillers as communication strategies uttered by Prabowo Subianto in his interview as president-elect at the Qatar economic forum. *Journal of English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 29–44.
- Susilowati, E., & Wafa, Z. (2023). Discourse markers used in EFL teacher talk: a pragmatic perspective. *Journalistics (Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 3(1), 37–47.
- Syamsudin, S., Istiadah, I., Syafiyah, S., Cahyono, A. E., & Mulyono, S. (2024). Utilizing fillers for addressing speaking challenges, improving self-confidence and motivation in EFL learning. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(4), 1327–1334. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i4.21629>
- Tampubolon, R. I. A., & Lubis, S. (2021). Speech error in “get real giving thanks with Sam Kim ep #22 by Dive Studios” video podcast. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 5(2), 568–578. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v5i2.4516>
- Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya. (2024, June 24). *Grand final national schools debating championship 2024* [Video]. YouTube. [https://youtu.be/i9xPg37f\\_n8](https://youtu.be/i9xPg37f_n8).
- Ussolichah, A. N., Indra, A., Rahayu, H. D., & Wulansari, A. (2021). Discourse marker analysis in Avengers: Endgame movie. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 5(2), 94–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/jall.v5i2.5503>
- Vrika, R., & Diananseri, C. (2022). The use of fillers in the casual conversation. *Research in English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 47–54.
- Wardani, R. K. (2022). *An analysis of fillers in speaking performance of the eleventh graders at senior high school of Kartikatama Metro*. Metro
- Widiastuti, N. L. A., Tantra, D. K., & Padmadewi, N. N. (2021). An analysis of communication strategies in speaking. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 9(2), 127–133. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v>
- Widyaningrum, L., Faridi, A., & Saleh, M. (2020). The relationship between communication strategies and language proficiency among the english department students of IAIN Kudus. *English Education Journal*, 10(4), 504–602. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i4.40035>
- Yusuf, I., Pakaya, U., & Bay, I. W. (2022). Pauses and repetition on students' proposal presentation. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, 3(2), 76–91. <https://doi.org/10.37905/jetl.v3i2.17143>