Proceedings Borneo International Islamic Conference; Vol. 17. 2026; 499-506
Published by Majmuah Enterprise
eISSN: 2948-5045

An Analysis of Idiolectal Features in Agustiar Sabran's Spontaneous Speech

M. ZAHRUDHIN VERDIANSYAH[a], PUTRI RAFA SALIHAH[b]

Universitas Islam Negeri Palangka Raya, Indonesia
[a]mzverdiansyah@uin-palangkaraya.ac.id, [b]putrirafa03@gmail.com

Abstract

Idiolect refers to the distinctive linguistic characteristics of an individual, which can be observed through recurring patterns in spoken language. This study examines the idiolectal features in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech when discussing forest and land fires (karhutla) in Central Kalimantan. This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach. The data were obtained from two YouTube videos featuring Agustiar Sabran responding to journalists' questions about forest and land fires. The data were collected through transcription and analyzed by identifying, classifying, and interpreting four linguistic features: repetition, fillers and hesitation, self-repair, and language variation. The findings identified 51 occurrences across the four categories: repetition (16), language variation (14), fillers and hesitation (11), and self-repair (10). Repetition was the most prominent feature, functioning to emphasize information, maintain topics, and support speech planning. Fillers and hesitation helped the speaker maintain interaction and retrieve words or expressions. Self-repair reflected the speaker's efforts to replace, clarify, and reformulate utterances, while language variation demonstrated the use of colloquial vocabulary and informal expressions in spontaneous communication. These features illustrate recurring linguistic patterns in Agustiar Sabran's speech and provide insights into his individual language use in the selected interview contexts.

Keywords: Agustiar Sabran, fillers, idiolect, language variation, repetition, self-repair

1. Introduction

Language is not merely a means of conveying information, instead it also reflects individual characteristics and communicative practices. Although speakers of the same language share common linguistic conventions, they may differ in their habitual ways of expressing ideas, organizing utterances, and responding to others. These distinctive patterns are commonly associated with the concept of idiolect, which refers to an individual's particular use of language (Wright, 2018) and denotes individual variety of language unique to a speaker, including characteristic voice quality, lexical choices, syntactic patterns, and speaking style (Chaer & Agustina, 1995). Such characteristics may become particularly observable in spontaneous speech, where speakers produce utterances in real time and may demonstrate repetition, hesitation, self-correction, and variations in linguistic forms. In public communication, the examination of idiolect is particularly relevant, where individuals use language to convey information, explain policies, and respond to public concerns. Public officials, for example, frequently communicate through interviews and media interactions, requiring them to formulate responses spontaneously while addressing potentially sensitive issues. Their speech may reveal recurring linguistic patterns that reflect how they organize and deliver their messages. However, these patterns should not automatically be regarded as intentional rhetorical strategies, since some may emerge naturally from the process of spontaneous speech production. One relevant context for examining such linguistic characteristics is public communication concerning environmental disasters. In Central Kalimantan, forest and land fires (*kebakaran hutan dan lahan* or *karhutla*) have become an important public issue requiring government responses and explanations. In this context, Agustiar Sabran, as the Governor of Central Kalimantan, has participated in media interactions concerning the regional government's response to the fires. His statements provide an opportunity to examine how a public official uses language when explaining government policies, responding to journalists, and addressing public concerns.

Previous studies have examined individual features of spoken language in various Indonesian contexts. For instance, Subiyatningsih (2018) investigated the spoken language of Tri Rismaharini as a public official. She revealed that Tri Rismaharini has idiolect characteristics as being being firm, open, hardworking, and both quick-tempered and cheerful reflected in the language she uses. While Etikasari et al. (2021) examined hesitation phenomena in President Joko Widodo's interview. These studies demonstrate the relevance of examining spontaneous speech in understanding individual and interactional linguistic characteristics. Nevertheless, the present study takes a more focused approach by examining several linguistic indicators selected together within the speech of one regional public official. Drawing on the broader perspective of idiolect markers proposed by Shymko (2025) and relevant studies of spontaneous spoken discourse, this study focuses on four indicators: repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation. These indicators were selected based on their relevance to the characteristics of the collected data and their potential to reveal recurring patterns in the speaker's verbal production. The data consist of two YouTube videos of mass media featuring Agustiar Sabran responding to journalists about forest and land fires in Central Kalimantan; they are *first*, MetroTV channel entitled [HEADLINE NEWS, 01/09] Gubernur Kalteng Ungkap OMC Sulit Dilakukan di Kalteng, and *second*, Tempovideochannel entitled Gubernur Kalimantan Tengah sebut Status Bencana Nasional Belum Diperlukan. By

examining these utterances, the study aims to identify the forms of the four linguistic features, describe their functions in context, and explore the recurring patterns that characterize the selected speech samples. Thus, the study contributes to the discussion of idiolect by illustrating how individual linguistic characteristics can be examined through spontaneous public discourse.

2. Literature Review

Idiolect and Individual Linguistic Characteristics

Idiolect refers to an individual's distinctive use of language, shaped by personal linguistic habits, social experiences, and communicative contexts (Wright, 2018). Individual language characteristics may be observed through vocabulary, syntax, prosody, and recurring speech patterns. Shymko (2025), in a review of idiolect markers, identifies these dimensions as relevant features for examining individual linguistic characteristics. However, the selection of specific markers depends on the research objectives and the nature of the speech data. In this study, idiolect is examined through four selected indicators: repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation. These indicators are treated as observable features that may reveal recurring patterns in the speaker's spontaneous discourse.

Repetition and Fillers in Spontaneous Speech

Repetition is a common feature of spontaneous speech, involving the recurrence of words, phrases, or larger linguistic units. It may occur as a result of speech planning, hesitation, emphasis, or the organization of an ongoing utterance (Maclay & Osgood, 1959; Wouk, 2005). Repetition, therefore, should be interpreted in relation to its immediate linguistic and communicative context rather than regarded merely as unnecessary duplication. In the Indonesian context, Subiyatningsih (2018) identified repetition of ideas as one characteristic of Tri Rismaharini's spoken language as a public official. Similarly, Nurjakia et al. (2021), examining speech in a YouTube talk show, identified repetition as one form of filled hesitation. These findings demonstrate that repetition can be examined both as a recurring feature of an individual's speech and as part of spontaneous speech production. Fillers, meanwhile, refer to sounds, words, or expressions that occur during speech to manage hesitation, facilitate planning, or maintain conversational continuity. Clark and Fox Tree (2002) explain that filled pauses such as *uh* and *um* can signal an anticipated delay while speakers search for words or formulate their next utterances. Indonesian studies by Nugraha and Tarmini (2023) identifies non-lexical, word, and phrase fillers, with hesitation and emphasis among their functions. Etikasari et al. (2021) also examine hesitation phenomena in an exclusive interview with President Joko Widodo. Together, these studies provide a basis for identifying fillers and interpreting their functions in spontaneous public speech.

Self-Repair in Spoken Discourse

Self-repair refers to the process through which speakers monitor and modify their own utterances when they detect a problem in speech production. Levelt (1983) describes this process through monitoring, interruption or hesitation, and the production of a repair. Repairs may involve replacing words, correcting expressions, or reformulating parts of an utterance. Wouk (2005), specifically examining Indonesian conversation, demonstrates that self-repair may involve the repetition or modification of words and larger syntactic constituents. This is particularly relevant to the present study because repetition and self-repair may appear together but serve different functions. While repetition involves the recurrence of linguistic material, self-repair involves an observable modification or reformulation of an earlier expression.

Language Variation in Spoken Discourse

Language variation refers to differences in language use associated with social, situational, and communicative contexts (Wardhaugh, 2011). In spoken discourse, speakers may shift between formal and informal forms depending on the setting, audience, and communicative purpose. Colloquial expressions, shortened forms, and conversational particles are among the features that may characterize informal speech. Several Indonesian studies have examined such variation in public and institutional communication. Subiyatningsih (2018) identified particles, interjections, shortened forms, and other spoken-language characteristics in Tri Rismaharini's communication. Nabilah and Mujianto (2021) also documented colloquial forms in interactions within the Indonesian National Police, demonstrating that informal linguistic forms may occur even in semi-formal and formal settings. Furthermore, Noorsanti and Cholsy (2023) examined the interactional styles of Indonesian politicians in television talk shows, highlighting the linguistic features employed in public political communication. These studies provide a contextual basis for examining colloquial and conversational expressions in Agustiar Sabran's speech.

3. Theoretical Framework

Drawing on the concept of idiolect and previous research on spontaneous spoken discourse, this study develops a selective analytical framework consisting of four indicators: repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation. Shymko's (2025) framework provides the broader perspective for identifying individual linguistic characteristics, while studies by Maclay and Osgood (1959), Clark and Fox Tree (2002), Levelt (1983), Wouk (2005), and Wardhaugh (2011) provide theoretical support for the selected indicators. Indonesian studies further demonstrate the relevance of these features in public officials' speech, interviews, talk shows, and institutional interactions. Accordingly, the four indicators are operationalized to examine recurring linguistic patterns in Agustiar Sabran's utterances across two YouTube interviews concerning forest and land fires in Central Kalimantan. The framework does not assume that each feature is unique to the speaker; rather, it investigates how these features recur and are manifested in the selected speech samples.

4. Research Question

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What linguistic features of repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation are found in Agustiar Sabran's spoken discourse in the selected YouTube interviews concerning forest and land fires in Central Kalimantan?
2. How are these linguistic features manifested and function in his utterances?

5. Significance of The Study

This study is expected to provide both theoretical and practical contributions to the study of language and communication.

Theoretically, this research contributes to sociolinguistic and spoken discourse studies, particularly the examination of idiolect through observable features of spontaneous speech. By bringing together repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation, the study offers an operational perspective for examining recurring linguistic characteristics in an individual's spoken discourse. It may also serve as a reference for further research on individual language use in Indonesian public communication. Practically, this study may provide insights into the linguistic characteristics of public officials when communicating through media interviews. It can help readers and researchers understand how spontaneous speech features emerge when speakers explain policies and respond to public issues. Furthermore, the findings may serve as a reference for students and researchers interested in analyzing spoken language, particularly the language use of public figures in the Indonesian context.

6. Research Methodology

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design to examine the idiolectal features in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech. The researcher served as the primary instrument, supported by a data classification sheet based on four selected indicators: repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation. The data were obtained from two YouTube videos featuring Agustiar Sabran responding to journalists' questions concerning forest and land fires (karhutla) in Central Kalimantan. The videos were selected purposively based on their relevance to the research objectives; *first*, MetroTV channel entitled [HEADLINE NEWS, 01/09] Gubernur Kalteng Ungkap OMC Sulit Dilakukan di Kalteng, and *second*, Tempovideochannel entitled Gubernur Kalimantan Tengah sebut Status Bencana Nasional Belum Diperlukan. Data collection involved watching and listening to the videos, transcribing the speaker's utterances, verifying the transcripts against the original audio, and identifying relevant linguistic features. Only Agustiar Sabran's utterances were included in the analysis. The data were analyzed qualitatively through identification, classification, description, and interpretation. First, the identified utterances were categorized according to the four indicators. Second, each occurrence was examined in its linguistic and communicative context to determine its form and possible function. Particular attention was given to distinguishing simple repetition from repetition associated with self-repair, as well as differentiating fillers from discourse particles. Finally, the findings from both videos were compared to identify recurring linguistic patterns and interpret their relevance to the concept of idiolect. The analysis was limited to the selected speech samples and did not aim to establish a comprehensive profile of the speaker's language use across all contexts.

7. Findings

The analysis of the two YouTube videos revealed four linguistic features in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech: repetition, fillers, self-repair, and language variation. The table 1 below presents the linguistic features identified in Agustiar Sabran's speech in the two selected YouTube videos. Four features were identified: repetition, fillers and hesitation, self-repair, and language variation. Repetition recorded the highest number of occurrences (16), followed by

language variation (14), fillers and hesitation (11), and self-repair (10). These findings indicate that repetition was the most frequently identified feature in the selected speech samples. However, the features are not necessarily mutually exclusive, since a particular expression may involve more than one linguistic process.

Table 1: Linguistic features in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech

No.	Linguistic feature	Utterances	Occurrence
1	Repetition	*[1]harapan kami harapan kami; [2]terus berupaya... terus berupaya; [3]berupaya berupaya; [4]untuk mencoba terus OMC; [5]Kalimantan Tengah ini Kalimantan; [6]OMC ini cuma 30% ya; [7]ada, ada pengertiannya; [8]ekonomi ekonomi; [9]Mengganggu .. mengganggu juga; [10]Belum ya. Belum; [11]di di permukaan api; [12]kurang lebih ya. Kurang lebih...; [13]Kalimantan Tengah (repeated several times); [14]selaku pemerintah daerah selaku pemerintah daerah; [15]apa namanya (repeated); [16]Tapi kami... tapi...*	*16*
2	Fillers and hesitation	*[1]Ya; [2]Ah; [3]Apa; [4]Apa Namanya; [5]Kan; [6]Cuma; [7]Gini; [8]Kan; [9]Eh; [10]Nah; [11]Oke*	*11*
3	Self-repair	*[1]Kalimantan Tengah ini Kalimantan mungkin dari khatulistiwa...; [2]water bombing apa OMC ini; [3]Cuma O- OMC ya bukan water bombing ya OMC ini...; [4]Di muka apa di di permukaan api di bawahnya?; [5]Kalimantan Tengah kami Kalsel eh Kalbar...; [6]Yang eh kurang lebih ya. 18.000 kebakaran; [7]Sumatera apa namanya di Papua Selatan...; [8]Pusat enggak? Oke. Pusat ya; [9]Membuat apa namanya surat sukarelawan; [10]Tersusun ke terkendala ISPA*	*10*
4	Language variation	*[1]Ya; [2]Kan; [3]Apa Namanya; [4]Cuma; [5]Di antara; [6]Berupaya; [7]Gini; [8]Enggak; [9]Kayak gitu; [10]Makan korban; [11]Belum ya; [12]Gitu; [13]Cuma; [14]Terus*	*14*

8. Discussion

In this section, this study elaborates the occurrence of linguistic features found in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech and explains the functions.

Repetition

Repetition was the most frequently identified linguistic feature, with 16 occurrences across the two videos. It appeared in the form of repeated words, phrases, and expressions. For example, Agustiar stated:

harapan kami harapan kami
terus berupaya... terus berupaya.

The repetition of *harapan kami* appears to emphasize the speaker's expectations, while the repetition of *terus berupaya* reinforces the idea that efforts to conduct weather modification operations (OMC) are ongoing. In this context, repetition functions not only as a speech-planning strategy but also as a means of emphasizing continued efforts. Another example, Agustiar stated:

berupaya berupaya

Here, the immediate repetition of a word may indicate that the speaker is planning or organizing the next part of the utterance while speaking. Similar patterns can be observed in:

ada, ada pengertiann*ya*
mengganggu mengganggu juga

These repetitions may provide the speaker with additional time to formulate the following expression while maintaining the flow of speech. Maclay and Osgood (1959) identify repetition and other hesitation phenomena as characteristics of spontaneous speech, while Clark and Fox Tree (2002) explain that such speech phenomena can contribute to the organization of spontaneous utterances. Repetition also functions to maintain the topic and reinforce important information. For instance, the expression:

selaku pemerintah daerah selaku pemerintah daerah

The statement repeats a phrase referring to the speaker's institutional position. This repetition keeps the focus on the role of the regional government in determining the response to the forest and land fires. Similarly, the repeated mention of Kalimantan Tengah helps maintain the geographical focus of the discussion. In this case, repetition contributes to topic continuity and reinforces information considered relevant to the speaker's explanation. Some repetitions, however, occur alongside reformulation or hesitation. In the expression of:

Kalimantan Tengah ini Kalimantan mungkin dari khatulistiwa...

It appears to show the speaker beginning with one geographical expression before continuing with a revised or extended formulation. Likewise, in the example:

Tapi kami... tapi...

It suggests an interruption and continuation of the previous statement. These examples demonstrate that repetition may serve several functions, including emphasis, speech planning, topic maintenance, and reformulation. This is consistent with the view that individual speech patterns can form part of a speaker's idiolectal characteristics (Wright, 2018; Shymko, 2025).

Fillers and Hesitation

The second feature identified was fillers and hesitation, with 11 occurrences. The data include vocalized hesitation forms, lexical expressions, and discourse particles, such as *ah, eh, apa, apa namanya, ya,* and *kan*. These expressions should not be regarded as having identical functions because some indicate difficulty in formulating an utterance, whereas others help organize interaction and reinforce a statement. For example, the speaker says:

Kami baru berkoordinasi ah terus...

The hesitation marker *ah* appears between two parts of the utterance and may indicate that the speaker is planning how to continue. Also, in the example:

yang eh kurang lebih ya, 18.000 kebakaran

It shows a similar pattern. The use of *eh* suggests a moment of hesitation before the speaker completes the numerical information. These examples can be understood as speech-planning devices that allow the speaker to maintain the speaking turn while preparing the next expression. Maclay and Osgood (1959) discuss such hesitation phenomena in spontaneous speech, while Clark and Fox Tree (2002) explain that fillers such as *uh* and *um* can signal ongoing planning and help speakers manage the production of an utterance. The expressions of:

apa and *apa namanya*

Both are prominent in the data. For instance, the speaker uses *apa namanya* when attempting to formulate a reference or retrieve a particular expression. This occurs in:

Sumatera apa namanya di Papua Selatan...
mem*buat apa namanya surat sukarelawan*

In these examples, the expressions appear to function as word-searching strategies: the speaker temporarily delays the completion of an utterance while attempting to retrieve an appropriate word or geographical reference. This interpretation is in line with studies of hesitation and speech production, including Maclay and Osgood (1959) and Clark and Fox Tree (2002). In addition to hesitation expressions, the speaker frequently uses *ya* and *kan*. For example: *OMC ini cuma 30% ya* and the use of *kan* in explanatory statements show how these particles can reinforce an assertion, seek

shared understanding, or maintain interaction with the listener. They are therefore more appropriately interpreted as discourse particles than as conventional hesitation fillers. This distinction is important because not every short or frequently occurring expression in spontaneous speech indicates difficulty in speech production. The findings also relate to Indonesian studies of speech hesitation, such as Etikasari, et al. (2021) and Nurjakia, et al. (2021), which examine hesitation phenomena in spoken Indonesian.

Self-repair

Self-repair was identified in 10 instances. This feature occurs when the speaker interrupts, replaces, revises, or restarts an expression during speech. The examples indicate that Agustiar sometimes changes a word or phrase while speaking, particularly when explaining technical terms, geographical references, and numerical information. A clear example appears in:

water bombing apa OMC ini. Cuma O- OMC ya bukan water bombing ya OMC ini...

In this utterance, the speaker initially mentions water bombing but then replaces the term with OMC. The incomplete form "O-" further indicates that the speaker begins an expression, interrupts it, and clarifies the intended terminology. This can be classified as replacement or reformulation, in which the speaker revises the wording to make the intended reference more precise. The example is particularly relevant because it demonstrates how self-repair may occur when a speaker selects or clarifies terminology during an explanation. Another example occurs in:

Kalimantan Tengah kami Kalsel eh Kalbar...

The speaker appears to begin with one geographical reference and then changes it while continuing the utterance. The hesitation marker *eh* accompanies this revision, suggesting that the speaker is searching for the intended geographical reference. A similar process can be observed in:

Sumatera apa namanya di Papua Selatan...

The speaker pauses to retrieve or formulate a geographical expression. These examples show that self-repair may be associated with lexical retrieval and the adjustment of information during spontaneous speech. Self-repair also appears in the formulation of numerical information. The expression:

yang eh kurang lebih ya, 18.000 kebakaran

It indicates that the speaker interrupts the flow of the utterance before completing the numerical statement. The use of *eh* and *kurang lebih* suggests an attempt to qualify or reformulate the information. Such examples demonstrate that self-repair is not limited to correcting an inaccurate word; it may also involve restarting an utterance or adjusting the formulation of information while speaking. These findings are consistent with Levelt's (1983) explanation of monitoring and self-repair in speech production. According to this perspective, speakers monitor their utterances and may interrupt or revise them when they detect a problem or wish to produce a more appropriate expression. Wouk's (2005) study of repair in Indonesian also provides a relevant linguistic perspective for examining how speakers organize and revise their utterances. In Agustiar's speech, self-repair appears to support clarification, terminology selection, lexical retrieval, and the reformulation of information.

Language variation

Language variation was identified in 14 occurrences, mainly through colloquial vocabulary, informal expressions, and discourse-oriented forms. Examples include *gini, enggak, kayak gitu, gitu, makan korban,* and *cuma.* These expressions reflect the speaker's use of conversational Indonesian rather than consistently formal or standardized language. Their occurrence suggests that the speaker adopts an informal spoken style when responding to journalists and explaining the situation concerning forest and land fires. For example, the expression:

Gini, bencana nasional itu ada, ada pengertiannya...

At the beginning, he uses *gini* as a colloquial discourse marker equivalent to the more formal begini. It introduces an explanation and helps establish the direction of the speaker's response. Similarly, *enggak* is an informal alternative to *tidak*, while *kayak gitu* and *gitu* are colloquial alternatives to *seperti itu* and *begitu.* These forms contribute to a conversational tone and make the utterances less formal. Wardhaugh (2011) explains that language variation is influenced

by social context, participants, and communicative situations. In this case, the interview setting provides a context in which conversational forms may naturally occur. The expression *makan korban* is another example of colloquial lexical choice. Rather than using a more formal expression such as *menimbulkan korban jiwa*, the speaker employs a shorter and more conversational phrase. Similarly, *cuma* is an informal lexical alternative to *hanya*, as in:

OMC ini cuma 30% ya.

In this context, *cuma* introduces a limitation or qualification concerning the effectiveness of OMC. These examples demonstrate that language variation involves not only differences in vocabulary but also the selection of expressions that suit the speaker's immediate communicative purpose. The findings are broadly related to Indonesian sociolinguistic studies that examine colloquial expressions and language use in public communication. Nabilah and Mujianto (2021), for example, discuss colloquial language forms in institutional communication, while Subiyatningsih (2018) examines the language used by a public official. These studies provide a relevant basis for understanding how informal linguistic forms may appear in the speech of public figures. In Agustiar's speech, colloquial vocabulary and discourse-oriented expressions contribute to an accessible and conversational speaking style. Taken together, these features provide evidence of recurring linguistic patterns in the selected samples of Agustiar's spontaneous speech. They can be examined as aspects of his idiolect because idiolect concerns individual patterns of language use, including vocabulary and habitual speech practices (Wright, 2018; Shymko, 2025). Nevertheless, the findings is interpreted within the scope of the two videos analyzed. They identify patterns in the selected speech samples rather than establishing a complete or permanent profile of the speaker's language use across all communicative situations.

9. Conclusion

This study examined the idiolectal features in Agustiar Sabran's spontaneous speech in two YouTube videos concerning forest and land fires (karhutla) in Central Kalimantan. The analysis identified four linguistic features: repetition, fillers and hesitation, self-repair, and language variation. Among the 51 recorded occurrences, repetition was the most prominent feature, with 16 occurrences, followed by language variation with 14, fillers and hesitation with 11, and self-repair with 10. The findings demonstrate that these linguistic features serve different communicative functions in spontaneous speech. Repetition was primarily used to emphasize information, maintain topics, support speech planning, and reinforce statements about ongoing efforts to address forest and land fires. Fillers and hesitation helped the speaker maintain the flow of interaction, delay utterance completion while planning speech, and search for appropriate words or expressions. Self-repair reflected the speaker's process of monitoring and reformulating utterances, particularly when clarifying terminology, revising geographical references, and adjusting numerical information. Meanwhile, language variation was characterized by colloquial vocabulary and informal expressions that contributed to a conversational speaking style. Overall, the findings indicate that repetition, hesitation, self-repair, and colloquial language use constitute recurring linguistic patterns in the selected samples of Agustiar Sabran's speech. These patterns provide an understanding of how individual linguistic characteristics are manifested in spontaneous public communication. However, since the study is limited to two YouTube videos, the findings represent patterns within the selected speech samples and should not be considered an exhaustive description of the speaker's idiolect across different communicative contexts.

References

Chaer, A. & Agustina, L. (1995). Sosiolinguistik, perkenalan awal. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. Cognition, 84(1), 73–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(02)00017-3

Etikasari, D., Nurjanah, E., & Mulyaningtyas, R. (2021). Senyapan tuturan Presiden Joko Widodo dalam wawancara eksklusif di Kompas TV. Jurnal Ilmiah Semantika, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.46772/semantika.v2i02.384

Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. Cognition, 14(1), 41–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90026-4

Maclay, H., & Osgood, C. E. (1959). Hesitation phenomena in spontaneous English speech. WORD, 15(1), 19–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1959.11659682

Nabilah, F., & Mujianto, G. (2021). Ragam kolokial pada Kepolisian RI. Alinea: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajaran, 10(2), 126–144. https://doi.org/10.35194/alinea.v10i2.1257

Noorsanti, P. H., & Cholsy, H. (2023). Gaya interaksi politikus Indonesia dalam acara talkshow di televisi (Kajian bahasa dan gender). Jurnal Wanita dan Keluarga, 4(1), 15–41. https://doi.org/10.22146/jwk.6379

Nugraha, E., & Tarmini, W. (2023). Produksi fillers dalam ujian berbicara Bahasa Indonesia kelas 10 kurikulum IGCSE: Tinjauan psikolinguistik. Deskripsi Bahasa, 6(2), 60–74. https://doi.org/10.22146/db.v6i2.9760

Nurjakia, L. P., Harras, K. A., & Nurhadi, J. (2021). Senyapan dalam ujaran Isyana dan Cindercella pada video talkshow "Metal" di YouTube. Anterior Jurnal, 20(3), 65–69. https://doi.org/10.33084/anterior.v20i3.2309

Shymko, V. (2025). Identifying key idiolect markers in sociolinguistic profiling: A scoping review and analytical framework for real-world applications. SAGE Open, 15(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251334276

Subiyatningsih, F. (2018). Bahasa pejabat: Studi kasus pemakaian bahasa Wali Kota Surabaya Tri Rismaharini. Kandai, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.26499/jk.v14i2.480

Wardhaugh, R. (2011). An introduction to sociolinguistics (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Wouk, F. (2005). The syntax of repair in Indonesian. Discourse Studies, 7(2), 237–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050368