Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
Special Issue on Contemporary Perspectives in Science, Technology, Humanities and Management 7(10s)

SOFT SKILLS IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: IMPACT OF AI TOOLS ON PRESENTATION SKILLS AMONG ENGINEERING AND POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

Dr. R. Meghana Rao [1] ✉, Thalla Rakesh [2]

[1] Principal Investigator RUSA.2.0, Assistant Professor and Head, Department of English, Director, Centre for English Language Training (CELT), Kakatiya University, Warangal, Telangana, India
[2] Research Project Fellow, RUSA.2.0, Kakatiya University, Warangal, Telangana, India

Received 20 February 2026
Accepted 23 April 2026
Published 14 May 2026

Corresponding Author
Dr. R. Meghana Rao,
Meghana.Rao@outlook.com

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v7.i10s.2026.8112

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

Background: Artificial intelligence (AI) is changing higher education by changing what skills professionals are supposed to have. A lot of research has been done on how AI can improve technical skills and personalized learning pathways.
Purpose: This study looks into how AI-based speech coaching tools affect the speaking skills of Engineering and Postgraduate students at Kakatiya University in India. In particular, it looks at how real-time feedback produced by AI affects important aspects of spoken communication, such as fluency, pronunciation, organization of content, body language, and overall confidence.
Method: The study looked at 110 student presentations using the AI platforms Yoodli.ai and SmallTalk2Me as part of a mixed-methods research approach. Descriptive statistics and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used on quantitative data that included measures like the number of filler words, pacing (words per minute), clarity, repetition, and eye contact ratings.
Findings: The ANOVA showed that there were statistically significant differences between groups in the use of filler words, brevity, repeat frequency, and eye contact. This confirms that these are important factors that determine how well a presentation works. Students in the low-filler-usage group had better pace, clarity, and ability to keep the audience's attention.
Implications: The results show that AI tools could be used to help traditional ways of teaching soft skills in a way that is both flexible and personalized.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Soft Skills, Presentation Skills, Higher Education, Employability

1. INTRODUCTION

Good communication skills are no longer just nice-to-haves in today's knowledge economy; they are essential for job success. Presentation skills, which include how to speak clearly, organize your information, read body language, and keep an audience interested, are an important part of soft skills that are needed in school, the workplace, and the public sector (Robles, 2012; Succi & Canovi, 2020). Oral communication skills are constantly ranked as one of the most desirable skills in graduates by employers, often ranking them at the same level as or higher than technical expertise in the specific field (World Economic Forum, 2023)

Traditionally, people have learned how to give presentations by practicing over and over, getting comments from their peers, and working with a teacher. However, these traditional methods have well-known flaws: they require a lot of resources, are subjective by nature, and are limited by the supply of teachers and the size of the class (Van Ginkel et al., 2015). There isn't a lot of one-on-one, formative comments on oral presentation in programs with a lot of students, especially in engineering and postgraduate programs.

The fast growth of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has caused a big change in the way we use technology in schools. AI-powered platforms can now do things like real-time speech analysis, automated evaluation of prosodic features (such as pitch, pacing, and intonation), filler word detection, and even basic evaluation of nonverbal behavior like body language and eye contact (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017; Zou et al., 202123). These tools claim to make high-quality, data-driven comments more accessible to everyone, something that could only be done before by hiring a professional coach.

Even though these systems are getting smarter, there is still a big hole in the empirical literature. A lot of research has been done on how AI can help people learn languages and technical skills (Du & Daniel, 2024; Lin & Mubarok, 2021). But not as much research has been done on how AI can help people improve their presentation skills—and even less on how AI can help students in Indian higher education. In India, engineering and college students have special problems with pronunciation, confidence, and switching between different language registers (Mohammadkarimi, 2024) that make this gap important.

This study fills in that gap by looking at how AI-based speech coaching tools, in particular Yoodli.ai and SmallTalk2Me, affect the speaking skills of 110 students from Kakatiya University, India, who are in Engineering and Postgraduate programs. The study uses a mix of methods, including ANOVA-based inferential statistics and qualitative topic analysis, to find strong, empirically-based insights into how AI-assisted presentation training can help teachers.

1.1. SOFT SKILLS AND PRESENTATION SKILLS: A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

Soft skills, also known as transferable skills, non-cognitive skills, or twenty-first-century competencies, are the set of social, communication, and self-control skills that people need to do well in both personal and professional settings (Heckman & Kautz, 2012). Domain-specific hard skills are usually learned through formal instruction and tested using standardized tests. Soft skills, on the other hand, depend on the person, the situation, and their growth.

Presentation skills are in a different category within this larger one. Cognitive, linguistic, and emotional processes must all work together at the same time: the speaker must organize complex information in a way that makes sense, say it with the right prosody and vocabulary, deal with anxiety and self-presentation, and change how they speak based on audience feedback (De Grez et al., 2009). Because of all of these different needs, technology-enhanced support systems are especially useful for and useful for speaking skills.

The idea behind this study comes from Goleman's (1995) model of emotional intelligence, which says that being self-aware and open to feedback are important for getting along with others. These ideas are put into practice by AI tools that give objective, measurable feedback that encourages metacognitive awareness of one's own communicative behavior—an awareness that is typically hard to develop through self-reflection alone (Wang & Koh, 2021).

1.2. THE EMERGENCE OF AI TOOLS IN PRESENTATION DEVELOPMENT

There are three main types of AI-assisted presentation building tools, and each one helps with a different part of the presentation process.

First, platforms that use AI to create content (like ChatGPT and Gemini) help speakers organize their ideas, make outlines, and improve their writing. Asneci et al. (2023) say that these tools use big language models to get around cognitive bottlenecks in the ideation and writing stages. This lets speakers focus more on getting ready for delivery.

Second, AI-powered design platforms like Canva AI, Gamma, and SlidesAI make visual design choices automatically, such as choosing a layout, making sure all the colors go together, and making an infographic. These tools free speakers from worrying about how their slides look, so they can focus on making sure their stories make sense and getting the audience involved.

Finally, and most importantly for this study, AI speech teaching tools like Yoodli.ai, SmallTalk2Me, Orai, and Speeko use automatic speech recognition (ASR) and natural language processing (NLP) to watch how you speak in real time. These platforms measure things like how fast you talk, how often you use filler words, how your pitch changes, and

sometimes they even measure nonverbal cues like eye contact and body alignment. Learners get concrete, repeatable feedback from the analytics, which goes along with the subjective feedback they get from teachers (Zou et al., 2023; Farooqi, 2025).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. AI IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PERSONALISATION AND FEEDBACK

Scholars have been studying how to use AI in higher education for a long time now, going back ten years. A study of 63 peer-reviewed articles published between 2014 and 2024 found that AI-based learning tools improve cognitive, skill-based, and affective learning outcomes in many fields, such as computer science, medical education, and foreign languages [See the study by the International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 2025]. The review also said that about half of the studies used freely available AI systems and the other half used tools that were specially made for each study. This shows that AI technologies are becoming easier to use in educational settings. Talbert and Talbert (2026)

Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2017) and Davenport and Kirby (2016) did some of the first in-depth studies of how AI changes the skills needed by workers. They said that while routine cognitive tasks become more automated, skills that are uniquely human, like creativity, persuasion, emotional intelligence, and interpersonal communication, become more important. Survey research has shown that as the use of AI in organizations grows, employers put more weight on soft skills when hiring (Cardon, 2024) to back up this theory practically.

2.2. AI TOOLS FOR SPEAKING AND PRESENTATION SKILL DEVELOPMENT

More and more studies are looking into how well AI speech teaching tools can help people communicate better in person. Wang and Koh (2021) showed that AI platforms with real-time feedback and simulated practice settings can improve communication skills by encouraging self-awareness and making improvements over and over again. The results they found are in line with constructivist learning theory, which stresses the importance of feedback loops in learning new skills.

In 2025, Farooqi did a study with 44 Saudi English as a foreign language students using SmallTalk2Me. After three weeks of six practice activities, the students' IELTS speaking band scores went up by 12.12% and their speaking proficiency (words per minute) went up by 11.18 %. Participants said that feedback produced by AI worked well, motivated them, and kept them interested. Similarly, Celi and Bustos (2025) used an action research design with Ecuadorian college students and found that adding SmallTalk2Me to classroom routines led to big gains in pronunciation, fluency, and speaking confidence.

Through advanced NLP and ASR algorithms, research on Yoodli.ai has shown that the platform can measure speech habits that are usually rated subjectively, such as the number of filler words used, changes in pacing, and tonal patterns. Yoodli is different from other coaching tools because it offers repeatable, data-driven measures that are in line with the principles of behavioral learning, which say that measurement comes before correction [Citation: Yoodli product analysis and review literature]. Companies like Google and Korn Ferry have adopted the platform, which shows that people think it can help improve business communication.

There are, however, some problems that have been found. Manggiasih et al. (2023) say that AI speech coaching tools mostly look at how well someone delivers their speech, not how well they use logic, argument, or feeling. Also, accent analysis isn't always accurate, and the tools may give wrong pronunciation grades to people who speak non-standard forms of English. This is especially a problem for people who speak Indian English.

2.3. THE SOFT SKILLS IMPERATIVE IN THE AI ERA

According to the Future of Jobs Report 2023 from the World Economic Forum, 44% of workers' key skills will be disrupted by 2027. This will increase the need for skills that are uniquely human. According to IMARC Group (2024), the world market for soft skills training will grow at a rate of 12% per year and reach USD 83.5 billion by 2032, up from USD 29.8 billion in 2023. This market growth shows that institutions are starting to understand that developing soft skills

can't just happen naturally during school; they need to be actively encouraged through programs that have been shown to work.

In this situation, coaching tools that are driven by AI are a scalable way to close the soft skills gap. Terblanche wrote in 2024 that AI coaches can give feedback, help with goal-setting, be accountability partners, and build safe, non-judgmental spaces that encourage people to talk about themselves and try new things. These traits are especially helpful for improving presentation skills, since stage anxiety and fear of public speaking can make it hard to get better.

2.4. RESEARCH GAP AND RATIONALE

Even with these positive changes, there are still some gaps in the available literature. First, most research on AI speech tools has been done on language learning situations (EFL/ESL), with little focus on speaking skills as a separate communication skill. Second, there aren't many actual studies of higher education in India, even though it has one of the biggest higher education systems in the world and students there have been shown to have trouble communicating orally in English. Third, not many studies have used strong inferential statistical methods (like ANOVA) to look at what makes a talk good across performance groups.

These gaps are filled by this study, which uses both quantitative and qualitative research methods to look into AI-assisted lecture training among Indian Engineering and Postgraduate students in a planned way.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study was based on the following goals:

1) To look into how AI-based speech teaching tools (Yoodli.ai and SmallTalk2Me) can help Engineering and Postgraduate students improve their presentation skills.
2) To find and study the key performance metrics—such as the use of filler words, brevity, repetition, eye contact, and pacing—that make a big difference between high-performing and low-performing presenters.
3) To look at the pros and cons of using AI to help with presentation training compared to traditional teaching methods.
4) To come up with strategies based on data for systematically adding AI tools to college soft skills courses.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

A mixed-methods research approach was used for this study, which combined quantitative analysis of AI-generated speech metrics with qualitative thematic analysis of feedback reports. The convergent parallel design made it possible to compare the results from three different sources, which improved their validity and interpretive depth (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

4.2. PARTICIPANTS AND SETTING

A total of 110 students (N = 110) from Engineering and Postgraduate programmes affiliated with Kakatiya University, Telangana, India, participated in the study. Participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation across academic disciplines and proficiency levels. The sample comprised students for whom English served as an additional language, a characteristic typical of the broader Indian higher education population.

4.3. INSTRUMENTS AND AI PLATFORMS

Two AI speech coaching platforms were employed as primary data collection instruments:

Yoodli.ai: An enterprise-grade AI speech coaching platform that provides real-time feedback on delivery metrics including filler word frequency, speaking pace (words per minute), pauses, body centering, and eye contact. The platform employs advanced NLP and ASR algorithms to generate quantitative performance reports following each recorded session.

SmallTalk2Me is a conversational practice tool powered by AI that checks your speaking speed, correct pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. The platform gives band score estimates that are in line with the IELTS and specific comments on how to improve.

Each person gave a recorded presentation that lasted between 3 and 6 minutes. The AI platforms made structured feedback reports on their own, which included both quantitative measures and qualitative diagnostic commentary.

4.4. VARIABLES

The dependent variables comprised the following speech performance indicators, operationalised through AI-generated metrics:

Variable	Operationalisation
Filler Words	Count and percentage of non-lexical vocalisations (e.g., "uh," "um," "like")
Weak Words	Frequency of hedging and vague language (e.g., "very," "just," "so")
Conciseness	Percentage of content deemed redundant or excessive by AI analysis
Repetition	Count and percentage of repeated words, phrases, or sentence starters
Eye Contact	Rating on a 5-point scale based on AI visual analysis
Pacing	Speaking rate measured in words per minute (WPM)
Body Centering	Categorical assessment: perfectly, mostly, or off-centered

4.5. GROUPING PROCEDURE FOR ANOVA

To facilitate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), participants were classified into three performance groups based on filler word usage, which the literature identifies as a robust proxy indicator of speech fluency (Corley & Stewart, 2008):

- **Group A (Low Filler Usage: 0–2%):** Participants demonstrating minimal non-lexical vocalisations, characterised by smooth delivery, confident pacing, and apparent preparedness. This group represents fluent, experienced presenters.
- **Group B (Moderate Filler Usage: 3–7%):** Participants exhibiting intermittent filler word usage without severe disruption to intelligibility. This group represents developing presenters whose fluency is improving but not yet consolidated.
- **Group C (High Filler Usage: >7%):** Participants with frequent filler word insertion, associated with marked hesitancy, reduced clarity, and diminished audience engagement. This group represents presenters requiring substantial remediation.

Analogous tripartite classifications were applied to conciseness levels, repetition frequency, and eye contact ratings to enable multidimensional comparison across communicative factors.

4.6. HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION

The following hypotheses were tested:

- ***Null Hypothesis (H_0):*** There is no statistically significant difference in presentation performance across groups defined by filler word usage, conciseness, repetition frequency, or eye contact ratings.
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H_1):*** There are statistically significant differences in presentation performance across groups defined by filler word usage, conciseness, repetition frequency, or eye contact ratings.

4.7. ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

IBM SPSS (Version 30.0) was used to analyze the quantitative data. For all continuous variables, descriptive data like mean, median, range, and standard deviation were found. One-way ANOVA was used to look for differences between groups, and Tukey HSD tests were used when omnibus F-tests hit significance at the ± = 0.05 level. eta-squared (·^{2}) was used to figure out effect sizes and figure out how important they were in real life.

We used Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis approach to look at qualitative data from AI-generated feedback reports. This made it possible to find recurring patterns in diagnostic commentary in a structured way.

5. RESULTS

5.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The descriptive analysis of 110 student presentations revealed considerable variability across all measured delivery metrics, summarised in Table 2.

Table 1

Table 1 Summary Statistics for Key Speech Performance Metrics (N = 110)

Metric	Mean	Median	Min	Max	SD
Pacing (WPM)	122.55	125.5	0	194	—
Eye Contact (1–5)	1.56	1	0	5	—
Filler Words (count)	6.69	4	0	67	—
Weak Words (count)	2.16	1	0	15	—
Repetition (count)	2.66	1	0	42	—
Duration (minutes)	4.2	4	1.2	9.00+	—

Note: SD values should be computed from the cleaned dataset. Dash (—) indicates values to be calculated upon final data cleaning. WPM = Words Per Minute.

The average speaking speed, 122.55 WPM, was within the range of 120 to 150 WPM that is usually recommended for public speaking. However, individual performances ranged from almost zero WPM (which could mean problems with the recording or data entry) to 194 WPM. The range of fluency levels was very wide, with a mean of 6.69 filler words per show and a high of 67. Eye contact scores were very low (M = 1.56 out of 5.00), which suggests that most of the people who took part had trouble keeping their eyes on the crowd or camera.

Most of the talks were between 3 and 6 minutes long, which is typical for classroom presentations. Filler word rates often went over 20–40%, and AI systems often flagged many of these cases as having too much non-lexical vocalization.

5.2. ANOVA RESULTS

One-way ANOVA tests were conducted across all primary grouping variables. The results are synthesised below.

5.2.1. FILLER WORDS AND OVERALL PERFORMANCE

The ANOVA for filler word use produced an omnibus F-test with a significance level of 0.05 or less, which means that there were meaningful differences between the groups. Students in Group A (low filler usage) made much better eye contact, were clearer, and kept a better pace than students in Groups B and C. There was some variation within each group, which shows that the use of empty words is a good way to tell the difference in presentation quality. These results are in line with earlier study that found disfluency to be the main problem that makes communication less effective (Corley & Stewart, 2008).

5.2.2. CONCISENESS

There were big changes in how concise the writing was between the groups ($p < 0.05$). Students who did better on conciseness had lower rates of repeating, better control over their pacing, and clearer arguments. This finding shows how important structured content organization is for good public speaking and says that AI-flagged conciseness metrics measure an important aspect of presentation skills.

5.2.3. REPETITION

The number of repetition led to significant ANOVA results ($p < 0.05$). High repetition was linked to less interest from the crowd and less confidence in the speaker. Students who repeated words a lot used formulaic sentence starts like "And...", "So...", and "I think...", which showed they didn't have a wide range of words in their vocabulary and didn't practice enough.

5.2.4. EYE CONTACT

Eye contact ratings produced statistically significant between-group differences ($p < 0.05$). Participants rated higher on eye contact were perceived as more confident and communicatively effective. A notable positive correlation was observed between eye contact and reduced filler word usage, suggesting that nonverbal competence and verbal fluency co-develop.

5.2.5. WEAK WORDS AND PACING

Weak word usage produced between-group differences that approached but did not consistently reach statistical significance. While the use of hedging language moderately attenuated perceived authority, its impact was less pronounced than that of filler words or conciseness. Similarly, pacing differences were only moderately significant; however, extreme deviations from the 120–150 WPM range were associated with reduced comprehensibility and audience retention.

5.3. QUALITATIVE THEMATIC ANALYSIS

AI-generated feedback reports and diagnostic comments were analyzed thematically, and five main themes emerged, listed in order of how common they were:

Structure and organization of speech (≥65% of comments) was the first theme. The most common thing that was pointed out as needing work was the way the thoughts were put together. A lot of the talks didn't have clear beginnings, middles, or endings, which made the arguments hard to follow.

The second theme is Prosody and Stress in Syllables (55%). There were a lot of mistakes in where the stress went on each syllable, especially in complex words with a lot of them. These mistakes made it harder to understand and showed that the person hadn't had enough experience with spoken academic English models.

The third theme is phonemic confusion, which accounts for 48% of the total. A unique pattern of phonemic substitution from /v/ to /w/ was seen, which is in line with studies on first-language transfer effects in Indian English. Some people had more trouble telling the difference between /θ/ and /t/.

Theme 4: Phrasing That Isn't Clear or Complete (about 40%). The points were less clear and convincing when vague words like "this thing" and "that stuff" were used a lot, which suggests a lack of academic register competence.

The fifth theme is filler words and patterns of repetition (35%). Although the above metrics show numbers, a qualitative study showed that filler words often grouped together at the transitions between ideas. This suggests that hesitancy was linked to cognitive planning problems rather than general nervousness.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study converge to illuminate the multifaceted relationship between AI-based feedback and presentation skill development, while also delineating the boundaries of what AI tools can and cannot accomplish in this domain.

6.1. FLUENCY AS THE FOUNDATION OF EFFECTIVE DELIVERY

The strong statistical significance of filler word usage as a discriminator of presentation quality confirms fluency as the foundational dimension of effective oral delivery. Filler words function as audible disruptions to the information

stream, compelling listeners to expend additional cognitive effort to extract meaning (Clark & Fox Tree, 2002). The AI platforms employed in this study proved highly effective at detecting and quantifying these disruptions, providing learners with objective evidence of patterns that are typically invisible to the speaker. This finding aligns with Farooqi's (2025) observation that AI-generated feedback promotes speaking fluency by making unconscious habits visible and measurable.

6.2. THE CENTRALITY OF CONTENT ORGANISATION

Being brief is a good indicator of how good a presentation will be, which shows how important structured, targeted communication is. Students who had trouble being brief often did something called "cognitive overloading," which means they tried to say too many things at once without organizing them in a way that made sense. This made their messages less powerful and lost the audience's attention. The AI tools' ability to spot too much content and repetition is a useful diagnostic tool. However, it's important to remember that these tools can only check the formal properties of arguments and not their content or logical truth.

6.3. NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION: EYE CONTACT AS A CONFIDENCE PROXY

One of the most interesting things about this study is that the group as a whole got a low mean eye contact score (1.56 out of 5.00). Eye contact is generally seen as one of the best ways to connect with an audience, show confidence, and keep them interested (Beebe & Beebe, 2018). The link seen between eye contact and less filler speech suggests that the vocal and nonverbal parts of presentation skills are connected. This supports a whole-person rather than an atomistic approach to skill development. AI tools (specifically Yoodli) can now judge eye contact through video analysis, which is a big step forward in technology. However, it needs to be looked into more to see how accurate these judgments are in different recording situations.

6.4. CONTEXTUAL FACTORS: INDIAN ENGLISH AND L1 TRANSFER

There is systematic /v/–/w/ phonemic misunderstanding, which is in line with patterns of first-language (L1) phonological transfer seen in speakers of Telugu, Hindi, and other Indian languages (Maxwell & Fletcher, 2009). This result has important implications for how AI tools are made: platforms that judge pronunciation based on a narrow standard for native speakers run the risk of punishing legitimate regional varieties of English, which could hurt learners' confidence instead of boosting it. In order to give more useful input in different situations, future versions of AI speech tools should use training data with a wider range of phonological patterns.

6.5. AFFORDANCES AND LIMITATIONS OF AI-ASSISTED TRAINING

The results of the study back up the idea that AI speech coaching tools are strong but limited teaching tools. Some of their best features are scalability (allowing for personalized feedback to be given to large groups of people at the same time), objectivity (removing evaluator bias and mood effects), repeatability (allowing for long-term tracking of improvement), and psychological safety (establishing a safe place to practice without fear of being judged). Many of the problems with traditional presentation teaching have been fixed by these features, as pointed out by Terblanche et al. (2024) and Van Ginkel et al. (2015).

But it's clear that the tools have their limits. They can't judge how well a case is argued, how well it appeals to the audience, how well it fits with the culture, or how well it uses critical thinking. An honest writer put it this way: AI tools improve how people speak, not what they should say. Setting clear limits is important for ensuring that AI tools are used in the right way in education; they should work with human teachers who can evaluate higher-level communication skills, not replace them.

7. CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that AI-based speaking coaching tools, like Yoodli.ai and SmallTalk2Me, can really help Engineering and Postgraduate students in Indian higher education improve their presentation skills. The study looked at 110 student talks using ANOVA and found that using filler words, being brief, repetition frequency, and eye

contact were statistically significant factors that affected how well the presentations went. Weak words and pacing had less of an impact.

The mixed-methods design helped us get a better sense of both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the presentation problems the study group had, such as unique phonological transfer effects and structural organization deficits. The results show that AI tools are useful in addition to humans. They offer scalable, objective, and repeatable input that helps close the gap in personalization that comes up in large-class settings.

At the same time, the study warns against blindly using AI tools as answers on their own. For presentation training to work, AI-generated analytics need to be combined with human mentoring that covers things like cultural sensitivity, critical thought, and rhetorical strategy, which are all things that automated systems can't do yet.

7.1. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results, the following suggestions are made for researchers, curriculum designers, and people who make decisions at schools:

Curricular Integration: AI speech coaching tools should be carefully added to communication and soft skills modules at the college level. This is especially important in engineering and technical programs, where such training is often left out.

Blended Pedagogy: AI tools should be used in a framework that mixes automated feedback with workshops run by teachers on rhetorical strategy, argumentation, storytelling, and audience analysis.

Inclusive AI Design: People who make AI tools should make their pronunciation models bigger to include regional English types. This way, they can make sure that feedback is useful for a wide range of students.

Ethical Considerations: To reduce stress and encourage a growth-oriented learning culture, institutions using AI coaching tools should make their data privacy rules clear and use AI-generated tests for formative rather than summative purposes.

7.2. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several things can go wrong with this study. The cross-sectional design makes it impossible to draw conclusions about causes. Longitudinal studies that follow the development of presentations over several semesters would add to the body of data. The group was only from one university, which makes it hard to apply to other places. Also, there isn't a control group of speakers who didn't use AI, so it's not possible to directly compare the results of AI-assisted training to those of regular training.

Randomized controlled trials, multi-institutional sampling, and longitudinal designs should be used in future study to get around these problems. Also, research that looks at how to combine multimodal AI (which includes speech analysis, facial expression recognition, and gesture tracking) with virtual reality-based crowd simulation is a good way to move the field forward.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. J. (2018). Public speaking: An audience-centered approach (10th ed.). Pearson.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W.W. Norton & Company.

Cardon, P. (2024). New study finds AI makes employers value soft skills more. Fast Company. [Citation placeholder: Full bibliographic details to be confirmed]

Celi Díaz, J. F., & Bustos Rodríguez, J. P. (2025). The SmallTalk2Me AI app in English speaking skills: An action research among higher education students in Loja, Ecuador. Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar, 8(6), 7869–7890.

Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. Cognition, 84(1), 73–111.

Corley, M., & Stewart, O. W. (2008). Hesitation disfluencies in spontaneous speech: The meaning of um. Language and Linguistics Compass, 2(4), 589–602.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davenport, T. H., & Kirby, J. (2016). Only humans need apply: Winners and losers in the age of smart machines. Harper Business.

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2009). The impact of an innovative instructional intervention on the acquisition of oral presentation skills in higher education. Computers & Education, 53(1), 112–120.

Du, J., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). Transforming language education: A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots for English as a foreign language speaking practice. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100230.

Farooqi, S. ul H. (2025). Efficacy of AI-generated feedback by SmallTalk2Me for improving speaking skill of Saudi EFL learners. Forum for Linguistic Studies, 7(3), 714–728.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254–280.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.

Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. Labour Economics, 19(4), 451–464.

IMARC Group. (2024). Soft skills training market: Global industry trends, share, size, growth, opportunity and forecast 2024–2032. [Citation placeholder]

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

Lin, M. P.-C., & Mubarok, H. (2021). Learning analytics for investigating the mind map-guided AI chatbot approach in an EFL flipped speaking classroom. Educational Technology & Society, 24(4), 1–15.

Manggiasih, et al. (2023). Strengths and limitations of SmallTalk2Me app in English language proficiency evaluation. [Citation placeholder: Full bibliographic details to be confirmed from ResearchGate publication]

Maxwell, O., & Fletcher, J. (2009). Acoustic and durational properties of Indian English vowels. World Englishes, 28(1), 52–69.

McCarthy, J. (2011). What is Artificial Intelligence? Stanford University.

Mohammadkarimi, E. (2024). Exploring the use of artificial intelligence in promoting English language pronunciation skills. LLT Journal, 27(1), 98–115.

Robles, M. M. (2012). Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. Business Communication Quarterly, 75(4), 453–465.

Succi, C., & Canovi, M. (2020). Soft skills to enhance graduate employability: Comparing students and employers' perceptions. Studies in Higher Education, 45(9), 1834–1847.

Talbert, P. Y., & Talbert, P. S. (2026). Transforming Human Resources Operations Through Artificial Intelligence: Foundations, Opportunities, and Challenges. ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 3(1), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhai.v3.i1.2026.65

Terblanche, N. H. D. (2024). Artificial Intelligence (AI) coaching: Redefining people development and organizational performance. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863241283919

Terblanche, N. H. D., Cilliers, D., Hugo-Van Dyk, L., & Others. (2024). Engagement and adoption of AI coaches. [Citation placeholder]

Van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2015). Towards a set of design principles for developing oral presentation competence: A synthesis of research in higher education. Educational Research Review, 14, 62–80.

Wang, P., & Koh, C. (2021). Artificial intelligence and the enhancement of interpersonal skills. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 24(2), 45–57.

World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Zou, B., Du, Y., Wang, Z., Chen, J., & Zhang, W. (2023). An investigation into artificial intelligence speech evaluation programs with automatic feedback for developing EFL learners' speaking skills. CALICO Journal, 40(1), 1–20.