

Digital Tools for Enhancing Oral Presentation Skills in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review

Siti Fauziana Zakaria*

Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi Mara, Shah Alam Selangor, Malaysia.

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.102100186>

Received: 03 August 2026; Accepted: 08 August 2026; Published: 07 October 2026

ABSTRACT

With the rapid development of digital technology, oral presentation skills in higher education have changed dramatically. There have been many attempts to develop digital tools to support learners' presentation skills, but the literature is still scattered in terms of the technologies developed, pedagogical strategies, and learning environments. This systematic literature review (SLR) brings together the existing research pertaining to the use of digital tools for the development of oral presentation skills in higher education. A systematic search was conducted in the Scopus and WOS database following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. After the identification, screening, eligibility and inclusion processes, 41 empirical studies were selected and analysed from 2016 to 2026. Six criteria were established to assess the methodological rigour of the included studies, which were then subject to a quality assessment. Thematic analysis revealed four themes: (1) AI-supported, automated and mobile support of oral communication; (2) video-, audio- and multimodal-based oral presentation learning; (3) Web 2.0, social, hybrid and collaborative learning environments; and (4) new technologies and contextual factors affecting the development of oral presentation. The results show that the use of digital tools overall has a positive impact on the oral presentation performance, communication confidence, learner autonomy, engagement and opportunities for self and peer feedback of learners. In the area of personalised feedback, as well as repeated practice, AI-enabled apps and multimodal technologies stood out. Yet issues of digital literacy, ethics in AI applications, access, teacher workload and sustainability of technology integration are all underdeveloped. This review summarises recent research trends, pinpoints gaps in the literature, and brings practical implications for higher education educators, curriculum designers, and researchers who want to incorporate digital technologies into the teaching and learning of oral presentations.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Tools, Higher Education, Oral Presentation, Systematic Literature Review

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

With the quick development of digital technologies, the way to teaching and learning has been completely changed in higher education, presenting new opportunities to use technology to further develop oral presentation skills. Recent studies have demonstrated positive effects of AI feedback systems (Aeni et al., 2025), mobile applications (Barrett et al., 2022), multimodal learning (Yeh, 2018), and collaborative platforms (Lee & Azman, 2021). Oral presentations are viewed as an essential graduate competence (Jackson, 2014) necessary for academic success, professional communication and workplace readiness. Educators, however, have been increasingly adopting a diverse range of digital technologies and tools such as artificial intelligence (AI), mobile apps, video technologies, Web 2.0 platforms, and collaborative learning spaces in an attempt to enhance presentation performance, deliver effective feedback, foster student independence, and support reflective learning (Musliadi et al., 2024). Despite the prevalence of these technologies, there is little consensus

on the breadth of the current knowledge, since the research is spread over a number of technological approaches, pedagogical strategies, and educational settings.

Statement of Problem

While there are many empirical studies investigating the use of digital tools in learning oral presentation, there are still several challenges. The body of literature has been largely limited to assessing individual technologies or individual classroom interventions, leading to a weak synthesis of the impact of the various categories of digital tools on the development of oral presentation. Furthermore, though positive development reported in recent studies ranged from increased communication confidence to personalised feedback, engagement, collaborative learning, and digital competency (Agustina et al., 2026), there is a lack of studies that address issues related to digital literacy, ethical implications of using AI, learner accessibility, teacher workload, and sustainability of technology integration. Finally, the thematic analysis found in this review shows that studies have focused mainly on AI-supported technologies, multimedia learning, and collaborative digital learning environments, while comparatively fewer studies have focused on the emerging technologies and contextual factors (Moolman et al., 2024), such as immerse technologies, employability, and public speaking anxiety. The gaps indicate the need for a systematic synthesis to collate the currently available evidence, to pinpoint the prevailing research trends and to identify research areas that need further investigation. Against this background, the present systematic literature review (SLR) aims to synthesise and critically analyse existing empirical research on the use of digital tools for developing oral presentation skills in higher education. Guided by the PRISMA framework and structured using the PICO approach, the review addresses four research questions concerning (1) AI-enabled, automated and mobile technologies, (2) video-, audio- and multimodal technologies, (3) Web 2.0, social, hybrid and collaborative learning environments, and (4) emerging technologies and contextual factors influencing oral presentation development. By integrating findings from 41 empirical studies, this review seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of current research trends, identify gaps in the literature, and offer evidence-based implications for educators, curriculum designers, and researchers interested in the effective integration of digital technologies into oral presentation instruction in higher education.

Research Questions

Following the guidelines proposed by Kitchenham & Charters, 2007 (2007), the research questions were formulated at the planning stage to guide the review process, including the search strategy, study selection, data extraction, and synthesis. The PICO framework developed by Lockwood et al. (2015) was adopted to ensure that the research questions were clearly aligned with the scope of the review. In this study, the Population (P) comprised higher education students and educators involved in oral presentation learning, the Interest (I) focused on digital technologies and pedagogical approaches used to develop oral presentation skills, and the Context (Co) referred to oral presentation instruction and assessment in higher education. Guided by this framework, four research questions were formulated to synthesise the current state of research according to the four themes identified during the thematic analysis: (1) AI-enabled, automated and mobile support for oral communication, (2) video-, audio- and multimodal-based oral presentation learning, (3) Web 2.0, social, hybrid and collaborative learning environments, and (4) emerging technologies and contextual factors influencing oral presentation development.

RQ1. What types of AI-enabled, automated, and mobile technologies have been employed to support the development of oral presentation skills in higher education?

RQ2. How have video-, audio-, and multimodal technologies been utilised to enhance students' oral presentation learning and performance in higher education?

RQ3. How do Web 2.0, social, hybrid, and collaborative learning environments facilitate the development of oral presentation skills in higher education?

RQ4. What roles do emerging technologies and contextual factors play in influencing oral presentation development in higher education?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical framework for digital tools for enhancing oral presentation skills in higher education

Theory 1: Social Cognitive Theory

Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) (Bandura, 1986) states that learning is the reciprocal interaction of personal, behavioural and environmental factors. One of the core principles of SCT is that of self-efficacy: the confidence a person has in their ability to engage in a particular behaviour successfully. A high level of self-efficacy promotes the willingness to try challenging activities, to persevere when things go wrong and to keep working at an activity to improve their performance through practice and feedback. This theoretical approach is similar to research that falls under Theme 1, on AI-driven, automated and mobile technologies for oral communication. By leveraging digital tools like AI chatbots, automated speech assessment systems, generative AI apps, intelligent speaking assistants, and mobile learning platforms, learners can receive instant, personalised, and ongoing feedback, allowing them to track their progress, improve their presentation techniques, and gain confidence through practice (Lui et al., 2015). The technologies also establish supportive learning environments that foster autonomous learning and self-regulation, core principles of Social Cognitive Learning. In view of this, SCT offers a solid theoretical basis for understanding the role that AI technologies can play in supporting the development of oral presentation competence by boosting learners' self-efficacy, encouraging active participation and improving their communication skills, terms of strengthening self-efficacy, promoting their active involvement and developing their general communication competence.

Theory 2: Multiliteracies Theory

The theory of Multiliteracies was developed by the New London Group (1996), who stated that literacy in the digital age involves more than a single mode of communication, such as writing and reading, and now encompasses linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and spatial representations. This theory is focused on the integration of these modes of communication in order to communicate meaningfully in increasingly technology-rich surroundings. This view is very close to the research in Theme 2, which centres on video-, audio-, and multimodal-based technologies such as video journals, vlogging, digital storytelling, podcasts, lecture capture, GoReact, and multimodal video production (Harma Yadav, 2025). These technologies involve using spoken language alongside visual aids, audio recordings, digital resources and interaction with feedback to produce and present effective oral presentations. Using multimodal technologies also promotes reflection, creativity, critical thinking and self-assessment as learners repeatedly view and revise their recorded performances to improve their speaking skills. In this light, the theory of Multiliteracies serves as a robust conceptual framework to support Theme 2 and its emphasis on the development of oral presentation skills, as it incorporates several communication modes, active meaning-making, and the established practices of authentic digital literacy, all of which empower students to engage in communication in real-world academic and workplace settings.

Theory 3: Social Constructivist Theory

Social Constructivist theory, Vygotsky (1978), suggests that learning is a social process whereby knowledge is generated through interaction, collaboration and shared experiences. The theory is that higher-order thinking and communication skills is developed through interactions with others, teachers and more knowledgeable others in meaningful learning environments. The research into the use of Web 2.0 technologies, social media, hybrid learning, collaborative online international learning (COIL) and other digital collaborative platforms to facilitate the development of oral presentations can be looked at as similar or close to this aspect (Villamizar & Mejía, 2019). The learning spaces are designed to facilitate the sharing of ideas, offer peer input, co-construct knowledge and enable authentic communication outside of the classroom setting. Learners through the collaborative discussions and digital interaction, enhance their presentation strategies, communication skills,

and confidence in presenting to a variety of audiences. In addition, ongoing dialogue and the exchange of knowledge are possible in a hybrid and online collaborative setting, transcending the barriers of time and space. Therefore, the role of collaborative digital environments in supporting oral presentations and their role in fostering active participation, social interaction and co-construction of knowledge in higher education is well explained by Social Constructivist Theory.

Theory 4: Experiential Learning Theory

Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory (ELT), suggests that learning is an ongoing process, where knowledge emerges as a product of the transformation of experience. The theory explains learning as a process that has four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation, and active experimentation. In terms of the studies included within Theme 4 and exploring emerging technologies and contextual factors that impact development of oral presentation, the theoretical perspective is well supported by the studies on immersive technologies and digital mapping applications, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for oral presentation, mock job interviews, and interventions for dealing with oral presentation anxiety (Aceron, 2026). Such studies involve learners in real or simulated communication situations and involve the learners in the presentation task, encouraging reflection, feedback and development of strategies to enhance future performance. These experiential activities improve oral presentation competence as well as critical thinking, professional communication skills, and confidence in real-world situations. Moreover, innovative technologies are also integrated, creating realistic learning environments which help learners to connect classroom learning with professional practice. Hence, the adoption of Experiential Learning Theory provides a holistic theoretical basis in comprehending the means by which the authentic learning experiences and contextualised technological interventions promote the development of effective oral presentation skills in higher education.

METHODOLOGY

The PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) approach by Page et al. (2021) provides a well-established guideline to follow in order to ensure transparency, completeness, and consistency in the literature review procedure. In the context of this SLR, the writers involved in this article act as researchers and work together to analyse the articles deemed relevant for the title. This analysis was conducted using two crucial databases, Web of Science and Scopus, due to their broad coverage and strength. Scopus and Web of Science were chosen as the bibliographic databases because they are internationally known databases that cover high-quality, peer-reviewed publications from various fields and are recommended for conducting SLR due to their extensive coverage and high quality of indexing (Page et al., 2021; Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2020). Searching both databases provides a broader search, thus minimizing database-specific publication and citation bias because both databases index journals that do not have the same coverage and citation styles. Only articles in English were included, to ensure consistency and facilitate reliable synthesis, since English is the language of international scholarly communication and is the majority language of publications in both databases. Moreover, restricting the review to works published from 2016 to 2026 ensured that the review would reflect the latest advancements in digital technologies, such as the enhanced development of artificial intelligence, mobile learning applications, multimodal learning environments and Web 2.0, which have had a strong impact on oral presentation pedagogy in higher education. Papers published before this time were excluded as many of the current digital technologies that were summarized in this review were not yet available or developed enough for this earlier time.

PRISMA is structured into 5: identification, screening, eligibility and inclusion, data abstraction and analysis, and quality of appraisal. During the identification stage, databases are explored to find all of the relevant studies. The screening process next is to review these studies to remove irrelevant or low-quality studies according to some predetermined criteria. In the eligibility phase, the remaining studies are carefully reviewed to ensure that they comply with the eligibility criteria. Lastly, data abstraction involves identifying and synthesising data from the studies included, the reason being that this enables meaningful and reliable conclusions to be drawn. The systematic review is carried out using a structured approach, which guarantees the rigor and trustworthiness of the outcomes, which should be used in the planning of future research and

practice. The PRISMA framework lists three main stages for analysis: (i) identification, (ii) screening, (iii) eligibility and inclusion, (iv) data abstraction and analysis, as well as (v) quality of appraisal.

Identification

According to PRISMA, the identification phase is a crucial initial step to the systematic literature review process, aimed at achieving an exhaustive coverage of relevant studies, without introducing a selection bias. The search strategy combined terms related to digital technologies, oral presentations, and higher education, and were used to conduct a structured and comprehensive search of the Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus as two major bibliographic databases. The search string is displayed in the following table (Table 1).

The databases were purposefully chosen due to their broad subject coverage, tight indexing requirements, and high percentage of quality, peer-reviewed journals. A total of 189 records were retrieved after eliminating duplicates from the search process, 117 from Scopus and 72 from Web of Science. This was partly due to the fact that the number of results was higher with Scopus because it provided wider coverage for the journals and also provided more coverage in the social sciences, while WoS contributed more targeted and methodologically rigorous studies. The number of identified records (189) demonstrates the field's academic growth and indicates the conceptual diversity of the research, which ranges from a linguistic to a pedagogical to a psychological point of view (see Table 1).

The use of several databases increases the methodological strength of the review, as it reduces the risk of bias arising from any single database and increases the chances of including a variety of research traditions and geographical contexts. Moreover, carefully constructed search terms also maximised the sensitivity with respect to terminological variation and met the aim of the review. In general, this transparent and systematic identification process paves a solid ground for the next step of screening and eligibility as per PRISMA and rigorous and replicable research standards and expectations.

The database searches were conducted in July 2026 using predefined combinations of keywords representing three core concepts: digital technologies, oral presentation, and higher education. Boolean operators (AND/OR), quotation marks, and truncation were used where applicable to increase search sensitivity while maintaining relevance. In Scopus, the search was conducted within the title, abstract, and keyword fields (TITLE-ABS-KEY), whereas the equivalent topic field (TS) was used in Web of Science. The syntax was adapted to the requirements of each database while retaining the same conceptual search structure. The complete database-specific search strings are presented in Table 1 to enhance transparency and replicability.

Table 1 The search string

Scopus	Web of Science
TITLE-ABS-KEY (("digital tools" OR "digital technology*" OR "digital resources" OR "e-tools" OR "online tools") AND ("oral presentation" OR "verbal presentation" OR "spoken presentation" OR "speech") AND (university OR "higher education" OR "tertiary education" OR college*))	TS=(digital tools) AND TS=(oral presentations) AND TS=(university) Extracted July 2026

Screening

In the screening phase of the systematic literature review, potentially relevant studies were assessed to confirm that they fit the four research questions set out. This phase was geared toward eliminating duplicates from the original pool of records and to using pre-established inclusion/exclusion criteria. After the initial review, 146 publications were omitted due to the lack of scope and relevance of the study, and 41 articles (Scopus=27; Wos14) were subjected to further evaluation, as shown in Figure 2.

The main inclusion criterion was the content of the literature, which was prioritised based on being scholarly in nature and providing substantive and empirical insights. Consequently, literature that was not directly related

to the main focus of the review, including book reviews, book series, meta-syntheses, meta-analyses, conference proceedings, and book chapters was omitted. Only peer-reviewed publications in the English language and published between 2016 and 2026 were included to make the content relevant and consistent with current academic dialogue. Also, 0 records were duplicated and removed in the databases in a duplication check. Such a systematic and criteria-driven screening process brought focus and quality into the evidence base, guaranteeing that only the most relevant and methodologically sound studies moved to the next steps of analysis.

Eligibility and inclusion

For the third step, known as eligibility, a total of 41 articles have been prepared. All articles' titles and key content were thoroughly reviewed at this stage (see Table 2) to ensure that the inclusion requirements were fulfilled and fit into the present study with the current research aims.

Table 2 The selection criterion

Criterion	Language	Time line	Literature type	Publication stage
Inclusion	English	2016-2026	Journal (Article)	Published
Exclusion	Non-English	<2016	Conference, Book, Review	In Press

Data abstraction and analysis

A structured data-abstraction procedure was employed to ensure consistency across the included studies. Information extracted from each study included the authors and year of publication, technological intervention or digital tool, educational context, methodological approach, and findings relevant to oral presentation development. A standardised extraction framework was applied consistently across all included studies. Following extraction, studies were compared to identify recurring technological approaches, pedagogical practices, learning outcomes, and contextual factors.

Initial categories were progressively refined through repeated comparison of the extracted evidence, resulting in the four final thematic categories. To minimise interpretive bias, predefined eligibility and quality-assessment criteria were applied consistently, decisions concerning study inclusion and thematic classification were documented, and the extracted information was repeatedly cross-checked against the original articles before the themes were finalised. An audit trail of screening, extraction, quality-assessment, and thematic decisions was maintained to improve the transparency and reproducibility of the review process.

Quality of appraisal

According to Kitchenham and Charters (2007), the researchers need to assess the quality of the research chosen. The next stage is applying quality assessment which consists of six questions complying to a scoring procedure for evaluating each criteria. The possible ratings are "Yes" (Y) with a score of 1 if the criterion is fully met, "Partly" (P) with a score of 0.5 if the criterion is somewhat met but contains some gaps or shortcomings, and "No" (N) with a score of 0 if the criterion is not met at all.

Table 3 Possible ratings for 6 question

Number	Question
QA1	Is the purpose of the study clearly stated?
QA2	Is the interest and the usefulness of the work clearly presented?
QA3	Is the study methodology clearly established?
QA4	Are the concepts of the approach clearly defined?
QA5	Is the work compared and measured with other similar work?
QA6	Are the limitations of the work clearly mentioned?

The writer independently assesses the study according to these criteria, and the scores are then totalled across all experts to determine the overall mark. For a study to be accepted for the next process, the total mark, derived from summing the scores from all three experts, must exceed 3.0. Following the quality assessment framework adapted from Abouzahra et al. (2020), studies scoring more than 3.0 out of a maximum score of 6 were considered to have achieved an acceptable level of methodological quality and were retained for further synthesis. This threshold has also been adopted in subsequent systematic literature reviews using the same quality assessment framework.

This threshold ensures that only studies meeting a certain quality standard proceed further. The results are shown in Table 4. Collectively, the use of predefined eligibility criteria, a standardised extraction framework, documented decision-making, and structured quality-appraisal criteria was intended to reduce subjectivity and enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the review process.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Quality of assessment

Table 4 outlines how the chosen primary studies performed in the quality assessment. The overall quality of the articles is as follows;

- **High Quality (80% or higher):** Most of the reviewed studies.
- **Moderate Quality (60% to 79%):** Descriptive or conceptual work.
- **Low Quality (under 60%):** Exploratory abstracts and survey-only papers.

Table 4 Quality Assessment for the selected 41 papers

Study	Author(s) and Year	Article Title	QA 1	QA 2	QA 3	QA 4	QA5	QA 6	Total	%
PS1	Lui et al. (2015)	A Novel Mobile Application for Training Oral Presentation Delivery Skills	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS2	Schamphoeleer et al. (2026)	Dictionaries, DeepL, and ChatGPT: Comparing Language Tool Effects on L2 English Speaking and Learner Perceptions	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS3	Lee et al. (2016)	Developing an Online System to Evaluate EFL College Students' Voice Performance in English Public Speaking	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS4	Aceron (2026)	Social Media Dependency and English-Speaking Performance in Mock Job Interviews	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS5	Aeni et al. (2025)	AI Chatbots in Oral Communication for Higher Education Students	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	4.5	75.0
PS6	Shumeiko & Osadcha (2024)	Application of AI in Higher Education Institutions	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS7	Sinclair (2016)	Assessment of Digitally Recorded Audio Presentations	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	4.5	75.0
PS8	Villamizar & Mejía (2019)	Digital Video-Journals	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS9	Matyakhan (2026)	Vlogging as Learning-Oriented Assessment	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5.0	83.3
PS10	Musliadi et al. (2024)	Hybrid Teaching Experiences	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5.0	83.3

PS11	Moolman et al. (2024)	Immersive Technology Solutions	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	4.5	75.0
PS12	Yeh (2018)	Multimodal Video Making	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS13	Dascalu et al. (2023)	Blended Learning Techniques	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS14	Pravitha et al. (2026)	Digital Storytelling	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5.0	83.3
PS15	Ionițiu (2024)	Practicing Speaking Skills	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS16	Niitsu et al. (2023)	COIL in Nursing	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS17	Ali & Nauman (2026)	Public Speaking Anxiety	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS18	Kirkgöz (2011)	Video Recorded Speaking Tasks	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS19	Sytniakivska et al. (2026)	Digital Language Resources	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS20	Al-khresheh et al. (2025)	Web 2.0 Tools	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	5.5	91.7
PS21	Hsu (2021)	Videotaped Peer Evaluation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	5.5	91.7
PS22	Mouhammad et al. (2025)	SPEAKS	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	P	4.5	75.0
PS23	Geathers et al. (2025)	ChitterChatter	Y	Y	P	Y	N	P	4.0	66.7
PS24	Smith & Sodano (2011)	Lecture Capture	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	N	4.5	75.0
PS25	Ipatov et al. (2024)	AI-Powered Language Assistant	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS26	Zaripova et al. (2025)	Applying CDIO and PBL	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	5.5	91.7
PS27	Wajda et al. (2022)	Giving Generation Z Students a Voice	P	Y	P	Y	N	P	3.5	58.3
PS28	Hasan (2026)	Yoodli AI	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS29	Sinkus & Ozola (2026)	Research Communication Skills	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS30	Morze et al. (2021)	Digital Formats of Learning Outcomes Assessment	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	N	4.5	75.0
PS31	Vu & Hà (2026)	Generative AI Tools for L2 Oral Presentations	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS32	Asensio-Martínez et al. (2025)	Educational Podcasts vs Live Oral Presentations	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6.0	100
PS33	Johnson (2023)	GoReact to Improve Student Oral Presentations	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	4.5	75.0
S34	Barrett, Liu, & Wang (2022)	Student Perceptions of a Mobile Learning Application for English Oral Presentations: The Case of EOPA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5.0	83.3
PS35	Gutiérrez- Porlán, Prendes- Espinosa, & Sánchez-Vera (2022)	Digital Technologies for the Assessment of Oral English Skills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3
PS36	Robillos (2022)	Impact of LoiLooNote Digital Mapping on University Students' Oral Presentation Skills and Critical Thinking Dispositions	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7

PS37	Sandoval Zapata & Diaz Larenas (2020)	Podcast-Based Lessons: A Useful Tool to Improve University Students' Descriptive Oral Skills	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS38	Lee & Azman (2021)	Integrating Facebook as a Web 2.0 Tool in a Responsive Pedagogy for Multimodal Oral Presentation Skills	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
PS39	Pusparaju, Yusak, & Maruthamuthu (2021)	Enhancing Students' Oral Presentation Skills by Using Facebook	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4.0	66.7
S40	Wallenius, Votkin, & Sevón (2019)	Digital Portals in Language Learning Encouraging Student Autonomy	Y	Y	P	Y	N	N	3.5	58.3
PS41	Ochoa Alpala & Ortiz Garcia (2018)	Creating Machinima (3D) and Real Life Videos in an ESP Classroom	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5.0	83.3

Themes

Table 5 Analysis of themes

Theme	Thematic category	Number of studies	Percentage of total studies
Theme 1	AI-Enabled, Automated and Mobile Support for Oral Communication	13	31.7
Theme 2	Video-, Audio- and Multimodal-Based Oral Presentation Learning	11	29.3
Theme 3	Web 2.0, Social, Hybrid and Collaborative Learning Environments	12	26.8
Theme 4	Emerging Technologies and Contextual Factors Influencing Oral Presentation Development	5	12.2

Based on the thematic analysis of the 41 included studies, four main themes emerged that indicate the main research areas on the use of digital technologies for the development of oral presentations in higher education. The most common theme represented was AI-Enabled, Automated and Mobile Support for Oral Communication with 13 studies (31.7%), highlighting the increasing focus on enhancing oral presentation performance through the use of AI tools, automated feedback systems and mobile applications.

Theme 2, Video-, Audio- and Multimodal-Based Oral Presentation Learning, represented 11 studies (26.8%), indicating that a wide variety of digital resources, such as videos, audio recordings, vlogs, digital stories, and other multimodal resources, are used to support oral presentation practice, reflection, and feedback.

Most (12 studies, 29.3%) were classified under Theme 3, Web 2.0, Social, Hybrid and Collaborative Learning Environments, reflecting the use and growth of social networking platforms, blended learning, hybrid instruction and collaborative digital learning tools in supporting the teaching and learning of oral communication. Finally, 5 studies (12.2%) were related to Theme 4: Emerging Technologies and Contextual Factors Influencing Oral Presentation Development, and addressed newer technologies such as virtual reality and augmented reality, as well as the learner-related or contextual factors such as public speaking anxiety, employability, and professional communication.

In general, the results suggest that research today focuses more on the pedagogical practices and the role of technology in supporting interactive learning, personalised feedback, collaboration, and learner engagement in oral presentations, but the literature is more limited in examining some emerging technologies and in investigating the contextual factors that impact oral presentations.

Theme 1 : AI-Enabled, Automated and Mobile Support for Oral Communication

Table 6 Theme 1

PS ID	Authors	Article title
PS1	Lui, Ng, and Wong (2015)	A Novel Mobile Application for Training Oral Presentation Delivery Skills
PS2	Schampheleer, Macken, and De Wilde (2026)	Dictionaries, DeepL, and ChatGPT: Comparing Language Tool Effects on L2 English Speaking and Learner Perceptions
PS3	Lee, Chen, and Lee (2016)	Developing an Online System to Evaluate EFL College Students' Voice Performance in English Public Speaking
PS5	Aeni et al. (2025)	AI Chatbots in Oral Communication for Higher Education Students: Threats or Opportunities
PS6	Shumeiko and Osadcha (2024)	Application of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education Institutions for Developing Soft Skills of Future Specialists in the Sphere of Information Technology
PS22	Mouhammad et al. (2025)	From Nervous to Noteworthy: Evaluating SPEAKS, an Educational Software for Speech Content
PS23	Geathers, Alvero, and Kizilcec (2025)	ChitterChatter: Curriculum-Aligned AI Speaking Partners for Language Learning Classrooms
PS25	Ipatov et al. (2024)	Implementation of an AI-Powered Language Assistant for Enhancing Engineering Students' Communicative Proficiency Through Mobile Technologies
PS26	Zaripova et al. (2025)	Applying CDIO and PBL Models in AI-Based Educational Projects
PS28	Hasan (2026)	Transforming Language Learning: Examining the Role of Yoodli AI in Developing Oral Skills Among First-Year Undergraduates
PS31	Vu and Hà (2026)	The Use of Generative AI Tools by EFL University Students for L2 Oral Presentations: A Mixed Methods Study
PS34	Barrett, Liu, and Wang (2022)	Student Perceptions of a Mobile Learning Application for English Oral Presentations: The Case of EOPA
PS35	Gutiérrez-Portlán et a. (2022)	Digital Technologies for the Assessment of Oral English Skills

Theme 1 consists of 12 studies examining how the use of artificial intelligence (AI), automated systems and mobile technology can support the enhancement of oral communication and oral presentation skills in Higher Education. Table 1 highlights the broad variety of AI-assisted and AI-powered tools that have been explored in the studies, such as mobile learning applications (e.g., PresentMate and EOPA), automated speech evaluation systems, AI chatbots, generative AI platforms (e.g., ChatGPT), AI speaking partners, intelligent language assistants, and AI speech coaching applications (e.g., Yoodli). These studies collectively support a growing trend of moving away from the traditional context of presentation-based teaching in the classroom to a learning environment that leverages technology to deliver immediate, personalised and data-driven feedback. Several studies examine the application of AI in the wider pedagogical context, as seen in for example, in project-based learning (PBL) and the Conceive–Design–Implement–Operate (CDIO) framework, showing how intelligent technologies can be leveraged to support communication and other transferable skills. Overall, studies in this theme demonstrate the growing visibility of AI and mobile applications in oral presentation teaching, especially in enhancing learners' performance in oral presentations, confidence, language skills, and opportunities for autonomous learning through continuous and accessible feedback.

Collectively, the evidence indicates that AI-enabled and automated technologies contribute to oral presentation development primarily through timely, personalised, and data-driven feedback. Rather than replacing instructors, these technologies function as supplementary learning tools that promote self-regulated learning,

repeated practice, and learner autonomy. Across the reviewed studies, improvements in pronunciation, fluency, confidence, and communication competence were consistently associated with opportunities for continuous feedback and iterative practice rather than with the technology itself. These findings suggest that the pedagogical value of AI lies not merely in automation but in its ability to support sustained skill development through immediate and individualised guidance. Consequently, successful implementation depends on integrating AI tools within structured instructional activities rather than using them as standalone learning resources.

Theme 2 : Video-, Audio- and Multimodal-Based Oral Presentation Learning

Table 7 Theme 2

PS ID	Authors	Article title
PS7	Sinclair (2016)	The Introduction and Refinement of the Assessment of Digitally Recorded Audio Presentations
PS8	Villamizar and Mejía (2019)	Fostering Learner Autonomy and Critical Reflection Through Digital Video-Journals in a University Foreign Language Course
PS9	Matyakhan (2026)	Vlogging as Learning-Oriented Assessment: Impacts on Thai EFL University Students' Oral Communication Ability and Mindset
PS12	Yeh (2018)	Exploring the Perceived Benefits of the Process of Multimodal Video Making in Developing Multiliteracies
PS14	Pravitha, Retnaningdyah, and Widyastuti (2026)	Digital Storytelling, Communication Anxiety, and English Learning Motivation Among Indonesian EFL Students: A Pre-Post Intervention Study
PS18	Kirkgöz (2011)	A Blended Learning Study on Implementing Video Recorded Speaking Tasks in Task-Based Classroom Instruction
PS21	Hsu (2021)	Academic Use of Social Networking Technology for English Learning: Implementing Videotaped Peer Evaluation into English Speech Class
PS24	Smith and Sodano (2011)	Integrating Lecture Capture as a Teaching Strategy to Improve Student Presentation Skills Through Self-Assessment
PS32	Asensio-Martínez et al. (2025)	Creating Educational Podcasts as an Expository Methodology for Active Learning and Its Relationship with Satisfaction: A Comparative Study with Live Oral Presentations
PS33	Johnson (2023)	New Technologies and Changing Pedagogy: Incorporating GoReact to Improve Student Oral Presentations
PS37	Sandoval Zapata and Diaz Larenas (2020)	Podcast-Based Lessons: A Useful Tool to Improve University Students' Descriptive Oral Skills
PS41	Ochoa Alpala and Ortiz Garcia (2018)	Creating Machinima (3D) and Real Life Videos in an ESP Classroom

Theme 2 consists of 12 studies that examine the use of video-, audio-, and multimodal-based technologies to support the development of oral presentation skills in higher education. As presented in Table 2, the studies encompass a diverse range of digital approaches, including digitally recorded audio presentations, video journals, vlogging, multimodal video production, digital storytelling, video-recorded speaking tasks, videotaped peer evaluation, lecture capture, educational podcasts, GoReact, podcast-based lessons, and machinima (3D) videos. Unlike the AI-focused studies in Theme 1, these studies primarily emphasise the use of multimedia technologies to facilitate repeated practice, self-reflection, peer and instructor feedback, and

learner autonomy. Many of the technologies allow students to review their own presentation performances, identify strengths and weaknesses, and refine their delivery through iterative practice. Several studies also demonstrate how multimodal production encourages learners to integrate verbal, visual, and digital communication skills, thereby promoting creativity, critical thinking, and multiliteracies alongside oral presentation competence. Collectively, the studies indicate that video-, audio-, and multimodal-based learning environments provide authentic and flexible opportunities for developing presentation performance, communication confidence, and active learner engagement, making them one of the most widely adopted categories of digital tools in oral presentation instruction. The overall findings indicate the most effective use of multimodal technologies is to enable reflection, self-evaluation and iterative improvement as the presentation progresses. Videos, podcasts, and digital stories offer real-world opportunities for students to engage in oral communication, but with the addition of feedback, either from the instructor or peers, the educational value is greatly increased. In all the studies reviewed, the learners' confidence, presentation and communication skills were higher when the multimedia tools were applied in reflective learning activities than when they were only applied in delivery or assessment. The results showed that technology acts as an enabler of reflective learning, and the pedagogical design has a more significant impact on learning outcomes than the use of a digital learning platform.

Theme 3: Web 2.0, Social, Hybrid and Collaborative Learning Environments

Table 8 Theme 3

PS ID	Authors	Article title
PS10	Musliadi, Triyono, and Jamilah (2024)	Enhancing Speaking Agility: Unveiling Indonesian Lecturers' Hybrid Teaching Experiences in Oral Communication Skills
PS13	Dascalu et al. (2023)	Efficacy of Blended Learning Techniques in Medical and Dental Education: Students' Opinions in Relation to Their Habits as Internet Consumers
PS16	Niitsu et al. (2023)	A Case Report of Collaborative Online International Learning in Nursing and Health Studies Between the United States and Japan
PS19	Syntniakivska et al. (2026)	Integration of Digital Language Resources into Foreign Language Teaching for Students of Non-Linguistic Degree Programmes
PS20	Al-khresheh, Demirkol Orak, and Alruwaili (2025)	The Development of Language Proficiency Through Global Skills Enhancement Using Web 2.0 Tools in University EFL Contexts
PS27	Wajda, Gias, and Chatterjee (2022)	Giving Generation "Z" Marketing Students a "Voice"
PS29	Sinkus and Ozola (2026)	Enhancing Postgraduate Engineering Students' Research Communication Skills in EAP Through Collaborative Practices
PS30	Morze et al. (2021)	Digital Formats of Learning Outcomes Assessment in the COVID-19 Paradigm: Survey Study
PS38	Lee and Azman (2021)	Integrating Facebook as a Web 2.0 Tool in a Responsive Pedagogy for Multimodal Oral Presentation Skills
PS39	Pusparaju, Yusak, and Maruthamuthu (2021)	Enhancing Students' Oral Presentation Skills by Using Facebook
PS40	Wallenius, Votkin, and Sevón (2019)	Digital Portals in Language Learning Encouraging Student Autonomy

Theme 3 comprises 11 studies that investigate the use of Web 2.0 technologies, social media platforms, hybrid teaching approaches, and collaborative digital learning environments to support oral presentation development. As shown in Table 3, the studies encompass a wide variety of technology-enhanced pedagogical practices, including hybrid learning, blended learning, Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), digital language resources, Web 2.0 applications, Facebook, digital learning portals, and collaborative assessment platforms. Rather than focusing on individual digital tools, these studies emphasise how technology facilitates interaction, collaboration, communication, and learner engagement within authentic learning environments. Many of the studies highlight the value of peer learning, online discussions, collaborative projects, and technology-mediated feedback in enhancing oral presentation skills while simultaneously promoting learner autonomy, intercultural communication, and digital literacy. Others examine the role of hybrid and blended instructional models in creating flexible learning experiences that combine face-to-face and online interactions to improve speaking proficiency and presentation performance. Collectively, the studies demonstrate that collaborative digital learning environments extend oral presentation practice beyond the traditional classroom by fostering active participation, social interaction, and continuous communication, thereby creating richer and more authentic opportunities for developing students' oral presentation competence.

Overall, these studies provide evidence that the collaborative digital learning environment is effective in enhancing oral presentation skills through interaction, peer learning, and co-construction of knowledge. While the technologies were very different, they were all consistently associated with meaningful learning engagement, not the technology used. Social interaction, joint problem solving and peer feedback were the most prominent ways in which the digital environment contributed to presentation competence. These results thus support the need to create cooperative learning activities that foster active learning, sharing of thoughts and ideas, and critical thinking, rather than just emphasizing technological innovations.

Theme 4 : Emerging Technologies and Contextual Factors Influencing Oral Presentation Development

Table 9 Theme 4

PS ID	Authors	Article title
PS4	Aceron (2026)	Social Media Dependency and English-Speaking Performance in Mock Job Interviews among Filipino Pre-Service Teachers in an Inclusive University Context
PS11	Moolman, Edgar, Boyle, & Walsh (2024)	Integrating Immersive Technology Solutions in Engineering Education at University Level
PS15	Ionițiu (2024)	Practicing Speaking Skills in the ESP Context to Prepare Students for Their Careers
PS17	Ali & Nauman (2026)	Addressing Public Speaking Anxiety: A Pedagogical Action Research Approach
PS36	Robillos (2022)	Impact of LoiLooNote Digital Mapping on University Students' Oral Presentation Skills and Critical Thinking Dispositions

Theme 4 comprises five studies that explore emerging technologies and contextual factors influencing the development of oral presentation skills in higher education. As presented in Table 4, the studies examine a range of topics, including immersive technologies, digital mapping applications, professional communication, public speaking anxiety, and the influence of social media on speaking performance. Unlike the previous themes, which primarily focus on specific categories of digital tools or technology-enhanced learning environments, the studies in this theme investigate broader technological innovations and learner-related factors that shape oral presentation development. For instance, immersive technologies and digital mapping tools are explored as innovative approaches to improving presentation performance, critical thinking, and communication skills, while other studies examine oral presentation within authentic professional contexts such as English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and mock job interviews. Additionally, one study specifically addresses public speaking anxiety through a pedagogical intervention, highlighting the importance of affective

factors in presentation performance. Collectively, these studies suggest that effective oral presentation development extends beyond the adoption of digital tools alone and is also influenced by learners' psychological readiness, professional communication needs, and the integration of emerging technologies that support higher-order thinking and authentic communication experiences.

The evidence as a whole indicates that emerging technologies should be considered as context-specific instructional supports and not as solutions to enhance oral presentation skills. Their effectiveness depends on the characteristics of learners, the contexts of their disciplines, their learning goals, and the characteristics of the presentation tasks. Immersive technologies and authentic simulations have a lot of potential for helping learners attain communication competence and minimize presentation anxiety, however, they must be aligned with the pedagogical objectives and the learner's needs for their implementation. The results show that the contextual and instructional aspects are important in the use of innovative technologies in the learning of oral presentation.

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of findings

In this systematic literature review, 41 empirical studies from the period 2016 to 2026 were synthesized and analyzed to learn how digital tools have been used in higher education to improve oral presentation skills. The review resulted in four broad themes, which reflect the current state of research in this area: (1) AI-assisted, automated and mobile support for oral communication; (2) video-, audio- and multimodal-based oral presentation learning; (3) Web 2.0, social, hybrid and collaborative learning environments; and (4) emerging technologies and contextual factors that impact oral presentation development. The results indicate that digital technologies have greatly revolutionized oral presentation pedagogy by offering personalised feedback, repeated practice, collaborative learning experiences, and authentic communication contexts, which will all enhance learners' performance in oral presentations, communication confidence, learning autonomy, engagement, and ability for self- and peer feedback. AI-based applications were especially effective in providing immediate and personalized feedback, and multimodal applications in providing a reflection learning and communication across multiple modalities. Likewise, the collaborative digital environments encouraged interaction, co-construction of knowledge and engagement of learners, while the emerging technologies emphasized the role of contextual and affective factors in developing oral presentations, such as the need for professional interaction and public speaking anxiety. The results of the study showed that the study in the current era is not just about the use of digital tools, but about whether technology can help in the teaching of meaningful and learner-centred oral presentation in Higher Education.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

The results have a number of research and practical implications. The review highlights the value of using AI tools for feedback, multimodal learning materials, and collaborative digital learning spaces in oral presentation teaching, making it a more engaging, authentic, and learner-centred learning experience for teachers and curriculum designers. From a practical perspective, at the institutional level, the implementation will need to take place with adequate technological infrastructure, educator professional development, and clear ethical guidelines on how to use applications that include AI. Although there has been an increasing volume of literature published, there are still some gaps. Of particular interest, however, is the fact that there are relatively few studies that have investigated immersive technologies like virtual reality, augmented reality, the potential long-term impact of AI-supported learning, or the effect of contextual factors including digital literacy, accessibility, teacher preparedness, and ethical concerns on the outcomes of oral presentation. Longitudinal and mixed methods studies should thus be further undertaken to examine the long-term impact of new digital technologies in various higher education environments. Future research should also investigate the creation of complete pedagogical frameworks which integrate technological, pedagogical and contextual aspects to systematically develop the use of digital tools in the instruction of oral presentations, thereby providing more evidence to support educational policy and classroom practice. Future systematic reviews could extend the present qualitative synthesis through meta-analysis where a sufficient number of studies report comparable

quantitative outcomes and effect-size data. Such analyses would enable the magnitude of the effects of digital interventions on outcomes such as oral presentation performance, speaking confidence, self-efficacy, and communication anxiety to be estimated more precisely. However, greater methodological consistency in outcome measures and intervention designs would be necessary to facilitate meaningful quantitative synthesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express sincere appreciation to the Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Shah Alam via and the APB Leaps 2026 Project for the support and encouragement provided throughout the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

1. Acheron, R. M. (2026). Social media dependency and English-speaking performance in mock job interviews among Filipino pre-service teachers in an inclusive university context. *International Journal of Special Education*, 41(4S), 638–647.
2. Aeni, N., Alsabbagh, Y. A. M. R., Taufik, M., Patandung, Y., Kurnia, R., Muthmainnah, & Wijayanti, T. (2025). AI chatbots in oral communication for higher education students: Threats or opportunities. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 1299, 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-3358-6_12
3. Agustina, L., Maulidiyah, F., & Dja'far, V. H. (2026). Comprehensive English learning model: Integrating digital storytelling for vocabulary and communication enhancement. *English Learning Innovation*, 7(2), 470-492. <https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v7i2.44430>
4. Ali, L. F., & Nauman, S. (2026). Addressing public speaking anxiety: A pedagogical action research approach. *Educational Action Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2026.2664802>
5. Al-khresheh, M. H., Demirkol Orak, S., & Alruwaili, S. F. (2025). The development of language proficiency through global skills enhancement using Web 2.0 tools in university EFL contexts: A mixed methods quasi-experimental study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), Article 931. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05210-2>
6. Asensio-Martínez, A., Aguilar-Latorre, A., Oliván-Blázquez, B., Fernández-Del-Río, E., Samper-Pardo, M., & Bartolomé, C. (2025). Creating educational podcasts as an expository methodology for active learning and its relationship with satisfaction: A comparative study with live oral presentations. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 62(3), 896–908. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2386031>
7. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1986(23-28), 2.
8. Barrett, N. E., Liu, G. Z., & Wang, H. C. (2022). Student perceptions of a mobile learning application for English oral presentations: The case of EOPA. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2476–2501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1881975>
9. Dascalu, C. G., Antohe, M. E., Topoliceanu, C., David, C., & Purcarea, V. L. (2023). Efficacy of blended learning techniques in medical and dental education: Students' opinions in relation to their habits as internet consumers. *Applied Sciences*, 13(13), Article 7795. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13137795>
10. Geathers, J., Alvero, A. J., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2025). ChitterChatter: Curriculum-aligned AI speaking partners for language learning classrooms. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale* (pp. 346–350). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3698205.3733953>
11. Gusenbauer, M., & Haddaway, N. R. (2020). Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 11(2), 181–217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378>
12. Gutiérrez-Portlán, I., Prendes-Espinosa, P., & Sánchez-Vera, M. D. (2022). Digital technologies for the assessment of oral English skills. *Applied Sciences*, 12(22), Article 11635. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app122211635>

13. Hasan, A. (2026). Transforming language learning: Examining the role of Yoodli AI in developing oral skills among first-year undergraduates. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 1806, 459–468. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-16389-9_41
14. Hsu, P. Y. (2021). Academic use of social networking technology for English learning: Implementing videotaped peer evaluation into English speech class. In *ACM International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 248–253). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450148.3450159>
15. Ionițiu, I. (2024). Practicing speaking skills in the ESP context to prepare students for their careers. *Analele Universitatii Ovidius Constanta, Seria Filologie*, 35(1), 291–304.
16. Ipatov, O., Barinova, D., Andreeva, A., Odinokaya, M., & Krylova, E. (2024). Implementation of an AI-powered language assistant for enhancing engineering students' communicative proficiency through mobile technologies. *Annals of DAAAM and Proceedings of the International DAAAM Symposium*, 35(1), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.2507/35th.daaam.proceedings.015>
17. Jackson, D. (2014). Business graduate performance in oral communication skills and strategies for improvement. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(1), 22–34.
18. Johnson, M. (2023). New technologies and changing pedagogy: Incorporating GoReact to improve student oral presentations. In *IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm)* (pp. 222–226). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ProComm57838.2023.00027>
19. Kirkgöz, Y. (2011). A blended learning study on implementing video recorded speaking tasks in task-based classroom instruction. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(4), 1–13.
20. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
21. Lee, S. S., & Azman, H. (2021). Integrating Facebook as a Web 2.0 tool in a responsive pedagogy for multimodal oral presentation skills. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 21(3), 103–124. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2021-2103-06>
22. Lee, Y. J. J., Chen, L. Y., & Lee, M. H. (2016). Developing an online system to evaluate EFL college students' voice performance in English public speaking. *International Journal of Technologies in Learning*, 23(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0144/CGP/v23i02/1-13>
23. Lockwood, C., Munn, Z., & Porritt, K. (2015). Qualitative research synthesis: Methodological guidance for systematic reviewers utilizing meta-aggregation. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 13(3), 179–187. <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000062>
24. Lui, A. K. F., Ng, S. C., & Wong, W. W. (2015). A novel mobile application for training oral presentation delivery skills. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 559, 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48978-9_8
25. Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). *Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering* (EBSE Technical Report No. EBSE-2007-01, Version 2.3). Keele University and University of Durham.
26. Matyakhon, T. (2026). Vlogging as learning-oriented assessment: Impacts on Thai EFL university students' oral communication ability and mindset. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 15(2), 164–180. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v15n2p164>
27. Moolman, J. H., Edgar, M., Boyle, F., & Walsh, J. (2024). Integrating immersive technology solutions in engineering education at university level. In *SEFI 2024 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1910–1919). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14256939>
28. Mouhammad, N., Schneider, J., Klemke, R., & Di Mitri, D. (2025). From nervous to noteworthy: Evaluating SPEAKS, an educational software for speech content. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on e-Learning* (pp. 271–280). <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecel.24.1.4104>
29. Musliadi, M., Triyono, S., & Jamilah, J. (2024). Enhancing speaking agility: Unveiling Indonesian lecturers' hybrid teaching experiences in oral communication skills. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 14(2), 401–433. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2024-0018>
30. New London Group. (1996). *The pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures*. Harvard Educational Review, 66(1), 60–93. doi:10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u
31. Niitsu, K., Kondo, A., Hua, J., & Dyba, N. A. (2023). A case report of collaborative online international learning in nursing and health studies between the United States and Japan. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 44(3), 196–197. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000000974>

32. Ochoa Alpala, C. A., & Ortíz García, W. R. (2018). Creating machinima (3D) and real-life videos in an ESP classroom. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.59412>
33. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Medicina Fluminensis*, 57(4), 444–465. https://doi.org/10.21860/medflum2021_264903
34. Pravitha, C. W., Retnaningdyah, P., & Widyastuti. (2026). Digital storytelling, communication anxiety, and English learning motivation among Indonesian EFL students: A pre–post intervention study. *International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture*, 13(5), e2026-1314. <https://doi.org/10.61838/ijbmc.v13i5.1314>
35. Robillos, R. J. (2022). Impact of LoiLooNote digital mapping on university students' oral presentation skills and critical thinking dispositions. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(2), 501–518. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15228a>
36. Sandoval Zapata, M. M., & Díaz Larenas, C. (2020). Podcast-based lessons: A useful tool to improve university students' descriptive oral skills. *Revista Comunicación*, 29(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.18845/rc.v29i1-2020.5260>
37. Schampheler, I., Macken, L., & De Wilde, V. (2026). Dictionaries, DeepL, and ChatGPT: Comparing language tool effects on L2 English speaking and learner perceptions. *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Journal*, 15, 105–120.
38. Sharma Yadav, M. (2025). English Speaking Practice: Tools & Technology. Available at SSRN 6432818.
39. Shumeiko, N. V., & Osadcha, K. P. (2024). Application of artificial intelligence in higher education institutions for developing soft skills of future specialists in the sphere of information technology. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2871(1), 012027. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2871/1/012027>
40. Sinclair, S. (2016). The introduction and refinement of the assessment of digitally recorded audio presentations. *Open Learning*, 31(2), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2016.1190640>
41. Smith, C. M., & Sodano, T. M. (2011). Integrating lecture capture as a teaching strategy to improve student presentation skills through self-assessment. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(3), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787411415082>
42. Villamizar, A. G., & Mejía, G. (2019). Fostering learner autonomy and critical reflection through digital video-journals in a university foreign language course. *Reflective Practice*, 20(2), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2019.1575195>
43. Vu, V. B., & Hà, T. A. (2026). The use of generative AI tools by EFL university students for L2 oral presentations: A mixed methods study. *London Review of Education*, 24(1), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.24.1.10>
44. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
45. Yeh, H. C. (2018). Exploring the perceived benefits of the process of multimodal video making in developing multiliteracies. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(2), 28–37.