

PROJECT-BASED LEARNING (PJBL) BASED ON EVENT SIMULATION TO OVERCOME SPEECH ERRORS IN STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS LEARNING

“PJBL BERBASIS SIMULASI ACARA UNTUK MENGATASI SPEECH ERROR DALAM PEMBELAJARAN KETERAMPILAN BERBICARA MAHASISWA”

Ika Martanti Mulyawati¹, Endang Fauzia², Markhamah³, Atiqa Sabardila⁴

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta¹

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta^{1,2,3,4}

e-mail: ikakhasby@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Keterampilan berbicara merupakan kompetensi inti dalam pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia di perguruan tinggi. Namun, banyak mahasiswa masih mengalami *speech error*—kesalahan ujaran yang mengganggu kelancaran komunikasi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk: (1) mendeskripsikan jenis *speech error* mahasiswa dalam kegiatan simulasi acara; (2) menjelaskan penerapan model *Project-Based Learning* (PjBL) dalam simulasi acara; dan (3) menganalisis persepsi mahasiswa terhadap penerapan PjBL untuk mengatasi *speech error*. Pendekatan yang digunakan adalah kualitatif deskriptif dengan karakteristik studi kasus. Data bersumber dari transkripsi video kegiatan simulasi acara, dilengkapi dengan wawancara dan kuesioner. Keabsahan data dijamin melalui triangulasi metode. Analisis kesalahan ujaran mengacu pada teori Clark dan Clark yang mencakup *filled pause*, *repetition*, *false start*, dan *correction*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa *filled pause* (27 kasus) dan *repetition* (25 kasus) merupakan jenis *speech error* paling dominan dari total 81 kasus yang ditemukan. Penerapan PjBL melalui enam tahapan terbukti memberikan pengalaman komunikasi yang autentik dan meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa secara bertahap. Persepsi mahasiswa pun positif: mereka merasa lebih percaya diri dan mampu memperbaiki kesalahan berbicara melalui proses latihan dan refleksi yang berkelanjutan.

Kata kunci: *speech error, keterampilan berbicara, Project-Based Learning, simulasi acara*

ABSTRACT

Speaking skills constitute a core competence in Indonesian language learning within higher education. However, many students still encounter speech errors—disruptions in speech that hinder communicative fluency. This study aims to: (1) describe the types of speech errors made by students during event simulation activities; (2) explain the implementation of the Project-Based Learning (PjBL) model within these simulations; and (3) analyze students' perceptions regarding the use of PjBL to overcome speech errors. A descriptive qualitative approach with case study characteristics was employed. Data were derived from video transcriptions of event simulations, supplemented by interviews and questionnaires. Data validity was ensured through method triangulation. The speech error analysis was based on Clark and Clark's theory, encompassing filled pauses, repetitions, false starts, and corrections. The results indicated that filled pauses (27 cases) and repetitions (25 cases) were the most dominant types of speech errors out of the 81

total cases identified. The implementation of PjBL through six stages proved to provide authentic communicative experiences and progressively enhance students' speaking skills. Furthermore, student perceptions were positive; they reported feeling more confident and capable of correcting speaking errors through continuous practice and reflection.

Keywords: *speech error, speaking skills, Project-Based Learning, event simulation*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking skills are an essential competency in Indonesian language learning in higher education. This ability not only serves as a means of conveying information but also serves as an indicator of students' academic communication skills. In an academic context, students are required to convey ideas clearly, systematically, and persuasively in various formal situations, such as scientific presentations, class discussions, and ceremonial activities. According to (Nurgiyantoro et al., n.d., 2016), speaking skills reflect a person's level of mastery of the material and their critical thinking skills.

The reality on the ground shows that many students still face serious challenges in their speaking skills. When performing in public, many students experience nervousness, lack confidence, and difficulty organizing their ideas coherently (Syahfutra, 2019). This attitude is often caused by a lack of experience and adequate training in public speaking, *public speaking*, which is very important for academic and professional success (Wahyuni, 2024).

Limited speaking experience and a lack of mastery of the material exacerbate the situation, resulting in disorganized and poorly structured communication. This directly impacts the low quality of students' academic communication.

One of the linguistic phenomena that often appears in such conditions is *speech error* or speech errors. These errors include various forms, including repetition, use of filled pauses, false starts, and incorrect corrections. *Speech error* according to Zhu & Liu, (2018) errors not only disrupt fluent communication but also affect the listener's perception of the quality of delivery and reduce the speaker's self-confidence. This phenomenon, therefore, is a crucial aspect in the study of speaking skills learning. Therefore, it is important to identify and analyze speech production errors and develop strategies to anticipate them in the context of speaking skills learning.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, *speech error* This is a natural occurrence because language production involves very complex mental mechanisms. Clark and Clark, (1977) explain that when someone speaks, they must simultaneously plan the message, encode the language, and articulate the utterance. This complexity of the process makes speakers susceptible to disruptions in the flow of speech. Similarly, (Hilario, 2023) within the framework of speech production theory states that failure at any stage of language processing—whether conceptual, formulation, or articulation—can trigger the emergence of various forms of *speech error*, including *slips of the tongue*, which often occurs in the context of public speaking.

Several previous studies reinforce the importance of this study. Maharani et al., (2025) found that phonological errors are still common in students' academic assignments, indicating weak control over oral language production (Sanni et al., 2024) also showed that language errors in formal contexts impact overall communication effectiveness. (He, 2024) emphasized the need for systematic speaking error correction strategies in language learning. These findings suggest that students still need a more contextual and meaningful learning approach to improve their speaking skills.

One learning model deemed capable of addressing these challenges is Project-Based Learning (PjBL). Theoretically, PjBL is rooted in the thinking of Dewey (1986) who emphasized that the most effective learning occurs through direct experience and reflection. Kilpatrick (Holm, 2011) then operationalized this idea into a project-based method centered on active student involvement. Hamidah (2020) defines PjBL as a learning model that provides authentic experiences to students through the completion of meaningful projects, thereby developing both knowledge and practical skills in an integrated manner.

Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of Project-Based Learning (PjBL) in improving speaking skills. Beckett and Slater (2005) stated that project-based learning encourages students to use language in real and meaningful contexts. Hilario (2023) demonstrated that Project-Based Learning (PjBL) improves speaking skills by developing students' intrinsic motivation. Firdaus (2023) also confirmed that this model effectively increases students' confidence and fluency. Thus, Project-Based Learning (PjBL) has great potential for implementation in speaking skills learning, particularly in addressing speech errors.

In this study, PjBL was implemented through simulations of various formal activities, such as Islamic boarding school ceremonial events and school farewells. Students were given various roles—host, reporter, storyteller, or speaker—and were required to speak authentically without relying entirely on text. In addition to analyzing the types of speech errors that emerged, this study also examined students' perceptions of the implementation of PjBL. Referring to Schiffman and Kanuk (2007), experiences that are perceived positively will encourage individuals to be more involved in learning activities, thus optimizing the effectiveness of PjBL in improving speaking skills.

This research is novel in integrating linguistic analysis of speech errors with the implementation of simulation-based PjBL in the context of higher education in Indonesia. Unlike previous research that generally focuses on only one aspect—either error analysis or learning model—this study combines both to produce a comprehensive picture of the dynamics of students' speaking skills. The results of this study are expected to make a real contribution to the development of more effective, contextual learning strategies that are oriented towards students' communication needs in the global era.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with case study characteristics. A qualitative approach was chosen because it can produce a deep and comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of speech errors in a learning context (Creswell, 2012). Specifically, this research adopts a case study design as proposed by Yin (2014), namely examining phenomena contextually and in-depth in a specific setting where the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly visible. This design allows researchers to capture the dynamics of speech errors naturally in real communication situations.

Data and Data Sources

The research data came from two sources. First, primary data consisted of transcriptions of student speech in two video simulations of events: "Semarak Hari Santri" (Santri Day Celebration) at Raden Mas Said Islamic Boarding School and "Peluaran Siswa Kelas IX MTs Raden Mas Said" (Grade IX Farewell Speech). Both videos documented authentic student speaking practices within the context of formal events. Second, secondary data were obtained through in-depth interviews and questionnaires to explore students' experiences and perceptions of the implementation of PjBL.

Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was conducted using three techniques. First, documentation in the form of video recordings of simulation activities, which were then transcribed verbatim. Second, semi-structured interviews to explore students' experiences in dealing with and overcoming speaking errors. Third, a questionnaire was used to more systematically obtain data on students' perceptions regarding the implementation of PjBL. The use of these three techniques aligns with the principle of method triangulation proposed by Denzin (2009).

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was conducted in stages. The first stage involved verbatim transcription of student speech from video recordings. The second stage involved identifying and classifying speech errors based on the categories developed by Clark and Clark (1977), including filled pauses, repetitions, false starts, and corrections. The third stage involved describing and interpreting the findings in the context of the PjBL application. The fourth stage involved drawing conclusions that integrated all data from the three sources to produce a holistic understanding.

Data Validity

Data validity was ensured through method triangulation techniques, which involved comparing and integrating data from video transcriptions, interviews, and questionnaires. Denzin (2009) emphasized that triangulation is a crucial strategy in qualitative research to reduce bias and increase trust in the findings. Furthermore, member checking was also conducted by confirming findings with participants to ensure accurate data interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Types of Student Speech Errors in Event Simulations

a. General Description of Findings

Based on an analysis of the transcriptions of two video simulations of formal events, a total of 81 speech errors were found, distributed into four categories according to Clark and Clark's (1977) classification: filled pauses (27 cases), repetitions (25 cases), false starts (17 cases), and corrections (12 cases). These findings indicate that almost all types of speech errors categorized by Clark and Clark were evident in students' speaking practice in the context of formal event simulations. The frequency distribution is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Frequency Recapitulation Speech Error Student

No.	Types of Speech Errors	The Excitement of Santri Day	Student Release	Total
1	Filled Pause	12	15	27
2	Repetition	10	15	25
3	False Start	8	9	17
4	Correction	5	7	12
	Total	35	46	81

Source: Analysis of video transcription of event simulation activities

b. Filled Pause

Filled pauses were the most frequent type of speech error in the data, with 27 cases. Filled pauses are pauses containing specific sounds or words—such as 'eh', 'um', 'anu'—that speakers use to temporarily fill gaps when the speech planning process is not yet complete. Lickley (2015) explains that filled pauses signal that the speaker is in the process of lexical search or planning

sentence structure. In this research data, filled pauses were most often found in the opening section of the event, when students are just beginning their performance and situational pressure is still high.

In the transcription of the video 'Semarak Hari Santri', the following utterance is found: "The next event is a performance, eh, which will be presented by female students..." (Segment 6). The pause filler 'eh' in the utterance indicates that the speaker needs additional time to plan the continuation of the utterance after the repetition of the word. A similar phenomenon is found in the video 'Pelepasan Siswa': "Okay viewers, I am currently reporting live... um... from MTs Raden Mas Said." The presence of 'um' indicates a barrier to spontaneous word production. According to Lickley (2015), *filled pause* It often occurs when the speaker is under situational pressure and has to speak without adequate preparation.

c. Repetition

Repetition or repetition of speech was found in 25 cases and is a type of *speech error* second most. Repetition occurs when the speaker repeats one or more words that have been spoken before moving on to the next part. Clark and Clark (1977) state that *repetition* serves as an 'extra time' strategy for speakers to maintain their speaking turn while completing the unfinished utterance planning process.

Concrete data is found in the utterance: "The next event is a performance, which will be performed by female students..." (Santri Day Celebration, Segment 6). The repetition of the word 'performance' in this utterance is not a deliberate repetition for emphasis, but rather reflects a break in the flow of the utterance's planning. This finding aligns with the results of Abed's (2019) research which states that *repetition* most often occurs when the speaker does not have enough time to plan his or her speech thoroughly before speaking

d. False Start

False start was found in 17 cases. Types *speech error* This occurs when a speaker begins a sentence with a certain structure, then stops it and starts again with a different structure without completing the first sentence. Gormley (2014) explains that false starts are the result of a mismatch between the planned utterance at the conceptual level and the actual output produced.

In the data, a false start is seen in the utterance: "Let me introduce myself, I will be guiding the event tonight, namely the commemoration of National Santri Day..." (Semarak Hari Santri, Segment 2). The speaker begins the sentence with the phrase 'Let me introduce myself, I will be guiding...' which is then continued with additional information that should have been planned earlier. In addition, the utterance "the sixth sermon followed by a prayer and the final event is closing" shows the speaker constructing information gradually without a clear structure.

e. Correction

Correction is a type *speech error* with the lowest frequency, namely 12 cases. Correction occurs when the speaker realizes an error they have made—whether in pronunciation, word choice, or sentence structure—and then corrects it directly. According to Lickley (2015), *correction* is evidence of the existence of a mechanism *self-monitoring* which is active in the language production process, where the speaker monitors the speech produced and immediately intervenes when deviations occur.

Research data shows examples *correction* in the utterance: "the first day is the opening" (Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 2). The word 'iniar' is a pronunciation error that the speaker immediately realized and corrected. Interestingly, the frequency of *correction* which is lower than other types shows that students are not yet fully active in monitoring their speech effectively. *real-time*, especially when under situational pressure.

Table 2. Analysis of Student Speech Error Data in Event Simulation

No.	Types of Speech Errors	Quotes	Data source	Analysis
1	Filled Pause	"The next event is a performance, which will be performed by female students..."	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 6	The filler pause 'eh' shows the process of planning the utterance that occurs spontaneously.
2	Filled Pause	"Today is the first day, namely the opening"	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 2	The speaker inserts a pause in the pronunciation of 'iniar' before correcting it.
3	Repetition	"The next event is a performance, the performance will be shown..."	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 6	Repetition of the word 'staging' as a strategy to maintain one's turn in speaking.
4	False Start	"Let me introduce myself. I will be guiding tonight's event, the commemoration of National Santri Day..."	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 2	The speaker begins a sentence with a less planned structure and then continues with a more complete structure.
5	False Start	"The sixth sermon was followed by a prayer and the final event was a closing ceremony."	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 2	The speaker constructs information in stages without any clear planning; the sentence structure is unsystematic.
6	Correction	"Today is the first day, namely the opening"	Santri Day Celebrations, Segment 2	The speaker realized the mispronunciation of 'iniar' and immediately corrected it.
7	Filled Pause	"Okay viewers, I'm currently reporting live... um... from MTs Raden Mas Said."	Student Send-Off, Segment 1	The filler pause 'em' indicates a delay in spontaneous word retrieval.
8	Repetition	"The fifth event was the farewell ceremony for class IX students... the handover of the samir."	Student Farewell, Segment 6	The repetition of the word 'surrender' is due to the unfinished transition of thoughts planned.

Source: Analysis of video transcription of event simulation activities

2. Application of Project-Based Learning Model in Event Simulation

a. General Description of Implementation

The PjBL model was implemented through a formal event simulation project that included two main activities: the Celebration of Santri Day and the Farewell of Grade IX Students. The implementation was carried out in six stages referring to the PjBL framework from the Buck Institute for Education (2015), namely: (1) determining basic questions, (2) project planning, (3) scheduling, (4) project monitoring, (5) testing results, and (6) evaluating experiences. These six stages were designed to provide authentic and meaningful learning experiences for students, in accordance with the principles of experiential learning.

Table 3. PjBL Stages in Event Simulation and Data Findings

No.	PjBL Stages	Activity Description	Findings in Data
1	Determining Fundamental Questions	Students are given the project of designing a simulation of an event themed on Islamic boarding school/school activities and understanding the context of formal communication.	Students choose a role (MC, reporter, storyteller, speaker) and begin to prepare their speaking skills.
2	Project Planning	Preparation of event concepts, division of roles, and creation of event scripts.	Even though a script is available, filled pauses and repetition still occur during spontaneous speaking.
3	Scheduling	Students determine the practice time and recording of activities.	The practice process helps identify speech errors before the final performance.
4	Project Monitoring	The lecturer observes the practice process, provides feedback on intonation and fluency of speech.	False starts were still found, indicating the need for cognitive readiness in direct speech production.
5	Testing Results	The event simulation is shown in front of the class and documented as a video.	Correction occurs naturally; students demonstrate active self-monitoring.
6	Experience Evaluation	Students reflect on the speaking errors they experience.	Students are becoming more aware of speech error patterns and are working to correct them.

Source: g-form research data

b. Basic Question Determination and Planning Stage

In the initial stage, students are given a project to design a simulated event with a pesantren or school theme. Students choose their respective roles—host, reporter, storyteller, speaker, or principal—and understand the communication context they will build. This process aligns with the PjBL principle that learning begins with authentic questions relevant to students' real lives (Thomas, 2000). Next, in the planning stage, students develop the event concept, assign roles, and create a script for the event.

Interestingly, even though students have prepared a written script, in practice many errors are still found. *speech error*, especially *filled pause* And *repetition*. These findings indicate that written scripts do not automatically guarantee fluency in spoken language. According to Brown (2001), spontaneous speaking skills require intensive practice that cannot be completely replaced by written preparation, because the process of producing spoken language involves different cognitive and psychological dimensions than writing.

c. Monitoring and Results Testing Stage

During the monitoring phase, the lecturer actively provides feedback on speaking technique, intonation, and fluency. The lecturer's role in this phase is crucial as scaffolding—support that enables students to overcome difficulties they are not yet able to resolve independently (Vygotsky, 1978). However, data shows that false starts still occur even after practice sessions, confirming that cognitive readiness in speech production cannot be developed quickly.

In the results testing stage, the event simulation is shown live in front of the class and documented in video form. It is at this stage that various *speech error* appear naturally, including *correction* as evidence of the mechanism *self-monitoring* Fragoulis and Tsiplakides (2009) stated that public presentations in PjBL provide positive pressure (desirable difficulty) which encourages students to try harder to deliver their speech well.

d. Evaluation and Reflection Stage

The final stage, evaluating the experience, is the most critical phase in the PjBL cycle. In this stage, students reflect on the speaking errors they experienced and identify frequently occurring speech error patterns. Reflection is an essential component of *experiential learning* proposed by Kolb in Moris (2020) and is the primary mechanism enabling the transformation of concrete experiences into meaningful learning. Through structured reflection, students develop metalinguistic awareness—an understanding of how language works—which helps them plan more targeted improvement strategies.

3. Student Perceptions of the Implementation of PjBL in Overcoming *Speech Error*

a. Triggering Factors *Speech Error*

Based on the results of interviews and questionnaires, students identified three main factors that triggered the emergence of *speech error* in event simulation activities. The first factor is situational pressure, especially nervousness when performing for the first time in front of an audience. Most students admitted that their speech was more disfluent at the beginning of the performance, which was reflected in the high frequency of *filled pause* And *repetition* in the opening segment of the program. This condition is in line with the findings of Horwitz et al. (1986) that language anxiety is a significant obstacle in the production of spoken language.

The second factor is a lack of practice in certain areas. Students acting as storytellers, for example, tend to struggle with remembering the storyline while maintaining fluency. This dependency results in filled pauses and repetitions when the memory flow is disrupted. The third factor is the difficulty of speaking without a script. When students have to speak spontaneously without a script, false starts and corrections become more frequent because the speaker must construct sentence structures in real time without the aid of written references.

b. Positive Perception of PjBL

Despite experiencing various forms of speech errors, students generally responded positively to the implementation of PjBL. They reported significant increases in confidence as the practice progressed, as they became accustomed to communication situations that resembled real-life situations. This finding supports Beckett and Slater's (2005) argument that PjBL creates a safe

yet challenging learning environment, where students feel free to experiment with language without fear of failure.

Students also reported that active involvement in planning and executing events helped them gain a deeper understanding of the structure of formal communication. This understanding contributed to their ability to organize their speech more systematically. Furthermore, repeated practice has been shown to gradually reduce the frequency of speech errors, as students become more familiar with the demands of formal communication and become more skilled at anticipating potential obstacles.

Table 4. Student Perceptions of PjBL in Overcoming Speech Errors

No.	Perception Aspect	Data Findings	Interpretation
1	Feeling nervous when performing for the first time	Almost all students experience nervousness at the beginning of the performance (MC and storyteller); speech is not fluent, many <i>filled pause</i> .	Situational pressure at the beginning of speaking triggers <i>speech error</i> which is higher.
2	Lack of training in certain areas	The storyteller experiences pauses while trying to remember the storyline.	Material readiness has a direct impact on the fluency of spontaneous speech.
3	Difficulty speaking without text	<i>False start</i> And <i>correction</i> arises when students have to speak without a script.	Reliance on texts hinders the development of spontaneous speaking skills.
4	Self-confidence increases after training	Students reported increased self-confidence with increased practice.	PjBL provides repetitive experiences that build confidence gradually.
5	Better understanding of event structure	Students are able to organize speech more systematically after repeated simulations.	Active involvement in event planning strengthens formal communication schemes.

Source: Interview and questionnaire results

DISCUSSION

1. Discussion of the Findings of Speech Error Types

The findings of this study confirm Clark and Clark's (1977) theory that speech errors are a natural consequence of the complexity of the language production process. The predominance of filled pauses and repetitions in the data indicates that students still experience difficulties in simultaneously planning and producing utterances—a challenge referred to as 'competing demands on working memory.' In the context of a formal event simulation, high situational pressure further exacerbates this condition as students must manage performative anxiety while simultaneously producing coherent utterances.

The advantage of using the event simulation context in this study is its ability to present data. *speech error* that are authentic and ecologically valid. In contrast to highly controlled speaking tasks in the laboratory, simulated event situations provide real communicative pressure so that patterns of *speech error* The results that emerge better reflect students' speaking abilities in real

academic and professional life. However, a weakness is the significant variation in difficulty levels between participants, depending on the role played and previous public speaking experience.

The difference in speech error frequency between the two analyzed videos—35 cases in 'Semarak Hari Santri' and 46 cases in 'Pelepasan Siswa'—can be explained by the students' level of familiarity with the context and content of the events. In the context of Islamic boarding schools, some students may be more accustomed to religious ceremonial settings, resulting in a relatively lower error frequency. This finding supports Skehan's (1998) argument that familiarity with the topic and context of communication significantly influences speaking fluency

2. Discussion on the Implementation of PjBL in Event Simulation

The implementation of PjBL through event simulations in this study was proven to have a positive impact on the development of students' speaking skills, although speech errors could not be completely eliminated. This is in line with the basic premise of PjBL that errors are an integral part of the learning process (Thomas, 2000). Through structured project stages, students have repeated opportunities to practice, receive feedback, and reflect on their speaking development—a cycle that gradually reduces the frequency of speech errors.

The advantage of PjBL in this context lies in its authentic and contextual nature. Event simulations create communication situations that mimic the demands of the real professional world, thereby increasing students' intrinsic motivation to learn (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Active involvement in all stages of the project—from planning to evaluation—also fosters a sense of ownership of the learning process, a prerequisite for meaningful learning (Bryce, 2023). However, implementing PjBL also faces challenges, particularly in terms of time management and the availability of adequate recording facilities.

The finding that false starts persisted even after the practice phase indicates that spontaneous speaking readiness requires a longer development period than just one project cycle. This demonstrates the limitations of PjBL within a single semester to completely address speech errors, and implies the need for a continuous and well-programmed speaking practice program for more optimal results (Brown, 2001).

3. Discussion on Student Perceptions

Students' positive perceptions of simulation-based project-based learning (PjBL) are consistent with the findings of various previous studies. Wahyuni et al. (2024) reported a significant increase in student motivation and self-confidence after participating in project-based learning. Nurgiyantoro (2016) emphasized that self-confidence is an essential prerequisite for effective speaking skills. When students feel safe making mistakes and learning from them, psychological barriers to oral communication gradually diminish.

However, this study also found that positive perceptions did not necessarily translate to a drastic reduction in speech error frequency within a single project cycle. More structured learning interventions, such as scheduled speaking practice programs and more specific lecturer feedback, are needed to optimize the impact of PjBL on speech error reduction. Overall, these findings confirm that event simulation-based PjBL is a promising learning model and deserves further development in the speaking skills curriculum at universities.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results and discussion, three main points can be concluded. First, the types of speech errors found in the student event simulations included filled pauses (27 cases), repetitions (25 cases), false starts (17 cases), and corrections (12 cases), with a total of 81 cases from two videos. Filled pauses and repetitions were the most dominant types, indicating that

students still experience difficulties in planning and organizing spontaneous speech in stressful formal communication situations.

Second, the implementation of the six-stage Project-Based Learning (PjBL) model—determining fundamental questions, planning, scheduling, monitoring, testing results, and evaluation—has been proven to provide an authentic and meaningful learning experience. Through active involvement in all stages of the project, students gradually develop speaking skills in contexts that resemble real-life communication situations. Although speech errors cannot be completely eliminated in a single project cycle, the implementation of PjBL encourages the development of self-monitoring and linguistic awareness, which are the foundation for long-term speaking skill improvement.

Third, students' perceptions of the implementation of PjBL were generally positive. Students reported increased self-confidence, a better understanding of formal communication structures, and an improved ability to organize utterances systematically. The pedagogical implication of this study is the need to continuously integrate the PjBL model based on event simulations into the speaking skills curriculum, accompanied by programmed practice programs, specific feedback, and structured reflection, to optimize the reduction of speech errors and the holistic development of students' communication skills.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abed, T. B. B. (2019). The implementation of jigsaw as a cooperative learning strategy to improve Birzeit University EFL students' reading comprehension. *Ricerche Di Pedagogia E Didattica. Journal of Theories and Research in Education*, 14(3), 269–304. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1970-2221/9430>
- Beckett, G. H., & Slater, T. (2005). The project framework: A tool for language, content, and skills integration. *ELT Journal*, 59(2), 108–116. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eltj/cci016>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Bryce, T. G. K., & Blown, E. J. (2023). Ausubel's meaningful learning re-visited. *Current Psychology*, 43(5), 4579-4598.
- Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, Conducting, And Evaluating Quantitative And Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human Needs And The Self-Determination Of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. AldineTransaction. New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. Macmillan.
- Fromkin, V. A. (Ed.). (1980). *Errors In Linguistic Performance: Slips Of The Tongue, Ear, Pen, And Hand*. Academic Press.
- Gormley, A. (2014). Acoustic Evidence for Phonologically Mismatched Speech Errors. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 44(2), 105–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10936-013-9282-2>
- Hamidah, Hasanatul, et al. (2020). *HOTS-Oriented Module:Project-Based Learning*. SEAMEO QITEP in Language :Jakarta Selatan
- He, T. (2024). Strategies for Spoken Error Correction In English Classroom. *Frontiers in Sustainable Development*, 4(6), 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.54691/txe5as98>

- Hilario, E. Cabanillas. (2023). The Impact Of Interdisciplinary Project Based Learning On Young Learners' Speaking Results. *Porta Linguarum. An International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, (39), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi39.22864>
- Horwitz, Elaine, Tallon, Michael & Luo, Han (2010). *Foreign Language Anxiety*. In Cassidy, Jerrell, C. (ed.), *Anxiety in schools: the causes, consequences, and solutions for academic anxiety* (pp. 96-118). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Holm, M. (2011). Project-Based Instruction: A Review Of The Literature On Effectiveness In Prekindergarten Through 12th Grade Classrooms. *InSight: Rivier Academic Journal*, 7(2), 1–13. <https://www2.rivier.edu/journal/roaj-fall-2011/j575-project-based-instruction-holm.pdf>
- Lickley, R. J. (2015). *Fluency and Disfluency*. 445–474. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584156.CH20>
- Maharani, I., Asnawi, A., Safitri, F., & Fauziah, A. (2025). Kesalahan Berbahasa Pada Tataran Fonologi dalam makalah 'Manajemen Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (Pelatihan dan Karier).' *Jurnal Vokatif*, 2(2), 98–107. <https://doi.org/10.51574/vokatif.v2i2.3399>
- Morris, T. (2020). Experiential learning – A Systematic Review And Revision Of Kolb's Model. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 28(8), 1064–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1570279>
- Nurdiyantoro, B. (2016). *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi* (2nd ed.). BPFÉ.
- Sanni, B. T., Rini, N. M. B. D., Irawan, A. D., & Arum, D. P. (2024). Analisis kesalahan berbahasa pada website Siamik UPN 'Veteran' Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Pendidikan West Science*, 2(02), 62–72. <https://doi.org/10.58812/jpdws.v2i02.1048>
- Syahfutra, W., Wibowo, A. P., Ardiya, & Febtiningsih, P. (2019). *Students' Perceptions and Challenges in Improving Speaking Ability in Public and Private University*. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ICCELST-SS-19.2019.14>
- Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2007). *Consumer behavior* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2008). *Berbicara sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa*. Angkasa.
- Thomas, J. W. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. Autodesk Foundation.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wahyuni, W., Sudika, I. N., Susanti, P. A., Pratama, J. R., Nazir, Y. N., & Rizkia, S. (2024). Speech Act Strategies of Prospective Indonesian Language Teacher Students in Academic Presentations: a Pragmatic Perspective. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan)*. DOI: <http://10.36312/jisip.v10i1.10297>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zhu, Q., & Liu, B. (2018). A Study of Categorization and Causes of Speech Errors. *ACM Transactions in Embedded Computing Systems*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/J.TECS.20180301.11>