A Comparative Study of Synchronous vs. Asynchronous Technology Tools in Developing Oral Communication Skills

Milimo Mundia
Namangan State University, Namangan Region, Uzbekistan
milimomundia89@gmail.com

Abstract
Purpose: This study explores how synchronous and asynchronous tools contribute to the development of oral communication skills by investigating their impact on fluency, interpersonal understanding, anxiety reduction, and repeated practice.

Research Methodology: A mixed-methods approach was used, combining quantitative data from surveys and performance assessments with qualitative insights from interviews, classroom observations and student reflections.

Results: Synchronous tools such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams enhanced students' fluency, spontaneity, and interaction skills. In contrast, asynchronous tools, such as Flipgrid and online discussion boards, offered a reflective space that reduced anxiety, allowing for thoughtful and precise contributions.

Conclusions: This study emphasizes the importance of hybrid learning methods that combine the strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous approaches to foster confident and accurate communication skills.

Limitations: This study was limited to undergraduate students and focused on specific tools, potentially limiting its generalizability to other contexts or educational levels.

Contributions: This research highlights the complementary role of synchronous and asynchronous tools in developing oral communication skills, advocating hybrid pedagogies in digital learning environments.

Keywords: *Asynchronous Learning, Educational Technology, Hybrid Pedagogy, Oral Communication, Synchronous Learning*

How to Cite: Mundia, Milimo. (2026). A Comparative Study of Synchronous vs. Asynchronous Technology Tools in Developing Oral Communication Skills. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language,* 2(1), 11-22.

1. Introduction

The ability to speak and listen effectively is a cornerstone of human connection. In education, oral communication allows students to share insights, challenge perspectives, and grow intellectually. In professional life, it drives collaboration, leadership, and innovation. In an era defined by global connectivity and multilingual exchange, oral communication is not merely an academic skill but a life one. Technology has become a central player in the teaching and practice of oral skills. Digital platforms now provide opportunities for learners to engage in real-time conversations or reflect at their own pace. These opportunities can be grouped into two broad categories: synchronous tool platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or Skype that allow live dialogue and simulate the immediacy of a classroom.

On the other hand, asynchronous tools platforms like Flipgrid, Kahoot, Elsa-speak, online discussion boards, or recorded video submissions allow learners to prepare and respond on their own schedule (Mahdi, 2022; Putri, Padmadewi, & Budiarta, 2022). Both types of tools have distinct strengths and challenges. Synchronous tools encourage immediacy and social connection but can heighten anxiety,

particularly among learners who fear speaking in front of peers. Asynchronous tools reduce this stress, allowing for more thoughtful contributions, but they may lack the spontaneity of live conversations. Most studies have focused on one type of tool in isolation, but fewer have directly compared the two. The key question is how they shape oral communication differently and how they might be best combined. This study tackles that question by examining both the outcomes and experiences of learners engaged in synchronous and asynchronous communication (Zeinali Nejad, Golshan, & Naeimi, 2021). As technology continues to advance, the understanding of oral communication skills is expanding beyond traditional classroom settings and professional environments, reaching everyday life, where interactions are becoming more dynamic. The advent of technology has made it possible to learn and practice oral communication in a more flexible and accessible manner, overcoming the previous limitations of time and space.

Digital tools provide individuals with opportunities to develop their speaking skills in a structured and planned manner, free from the social pressures that often accompany face-to-face interactions. With the use of online learning platforms and voice-based communication apps, students can refine their speaking abilities without feeling overwhelmed by the anxiety that in-person speaking may cause. This creates new opportunities to personalize the learning experience and allows learners to benefit from both synchronous and asynchronous communication tools in a broader context, paving the way for better integration of both methods to achieve improved learning outcomes (Lee and Hsieh, 2019).

2. Literature Review

Three key theories provide the foundation for understanding how synchronous and asynchronous tools influence the development of oral communication skills.

1. Sociocultural Theory (Mahdi, 2022):
   Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory posits that learning and skill development are socially mediated. According to this theory, individuals develop skills and knowledge through interactions with more knowledgeable others, such as peers, instructors, or mentors. This interaction plays a crucial role in cognitive development of children. In the context of oral communication, synchronous tools are particularly relevant because they facilitate real-time exchanges, offering students the opportunity to engage in immediate social interactions. These interactions, such as live discussions, debates, or feedback sessions, allow learners to practice and refine their communication skills in a dynamic, interactive environment, which aligns with Vygotsky's emphasis on the importance of social interaction in learning.

2. Cognitive Load Theory (Skulmowski & Xu, 2022)
   Cognitive Load Theory suggests that learners process information more effectively when the cognitive demands of a task are manageable. This theory identifies three types of cognitive load: intrinsic, extraneous, and germinal. The goal is to minimize extraneous load (unnecessary cognitive effort) and ensure that the intrinsic load (difficulty of the content) is manageable for the learner. Asynchronous tools support this by allowing learners to engage with the material at their own pace, thereby reducing the pressure to respond immediately. This pacing gives students time to reflect on the content, organize their thoughts, and make more thoughtful contributions. Asynchronous activities, such as recorded videos or forum discussions, provide the flexibility needed for learners to control the cognitive demands of a task, leading to more effective learning and improved communication skills over time.

3. Communicative Competence (Avgousti, 2018):
   Hymes' theory of communicative competence expands the definition of oral skills beyond grammatical accuracy. It includes not only the ability to construct grammatically correct sentences but also sociocultural awareness and strategic competence required to use language effectively in various contexts. This theory emphasizes the importance of understanding how language functions in social contexts, including the ability to choose appropriate language based on the social setting, audience, and communication purpose. Both synchronous and asynchronous tools contribute to communicative competence in different ways: synchronous tools offer immediate feedback, which helps learners develop strategies for real-time communication, such as turn-taking, adjusting their speech based on the audience, and responding quickly in conversations. In contrast, asynchronous tools allow learners to focus more on accuracy, organization, and clarity of expression, supporting

the development of both sociocultural awareness and strategic communication through reflective practice.

These three theories provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how synchronous and asynchronous learning methods uniquely support the development of oral communication skills, emphasizing the importance of social interaction, manageable cognitive demands, and communicative competence.

2.1 Synchronous Tools in Oral Communication Development

Synchronous technology tools refer to digital platforms that enable learners and instructors to interact in real time, closely mirroring the immediacy of face-to-face communication. Common examples include Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, and Skype, all of which became indispensable during the COVID-19 pandemic. These tools allow participants to see, hear, and respond to one another instantly, thus creating opportunities for turn taking, negotiation of meaning, and spontaneous conversation (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022). From a pedagogical perspective, synchronous interaction accelerates fluency development.

Sun and Chen (2016) argue that when learners engage in live discussions, they are forced to retrieve language quickly, respond to peers, and manage interactional cues such as pauses, overlaps, and clarification requests. This immediacy encourages learners to practice conversational strategies that are essential in real-world situations. Research has also emphasized the role of synchronous platforms in fostering social presence and interpersonal awareness. According to Thomas, Sandhu, Oliveira, and Oliveira (2023), video conferencing tools simulate many nonverbal cues—eye contact, gestures, and tone—that support richer communication and stronger interpersonal connections.

In Uzbekistan, where oral communication is increasingly prioritized in higher education curricula, synchronous sessions have been reported to enhance students' confidence in interactive speaking tasks (Diana, Kholida, & Nargiza, 2023). However, synchronous learning is not without its challenges. Performance anxiety is one of the most commonly cited drawbacks of VR. Learners often report heightened stress during live speaking sessions, especially when tasks involve assessments or large audiences (Pakpahan and Gultom, 2020).

In the Uzbekistan context, additional barriers include unstable Internet connectivity and limited teacher training in digital pedagogy, which can reduce the effectiveness of synchronous sessions (Abdullaev & Visola, 2021). Despite these limitations, the consensus in both global and local research suggests that synchronous tools are indispensable for practicing fluency, immediacy, and interactional competence in FLL. They reproduce the urgency of natural conversation and prepare learners to operate effectively in real-world communicative situations. Synchronous tools create spaces that resemble the live classrooms. Research shows they:
1. Push learners to negotiate meaning in real time, which strengthens their fluency (Sun & Chen, 2016).
2. Enhance interpersonal connections through tone, gesture, and immediacy (Park & Bonk, 2007).
3. It can trigger stress and frustration due to performance pressure and technical glitches (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022).

While synchronous tools foster valuable real-time communication skills, they may also introduce challenges to the learning process. Learners, especially those with anxiety, may struggle with the immediacy of communication and fear of making mistakes in front of others. Additionally, technical issues, such as connectivity problems, can disrupt the flow of communication, causing frustration. Despite these potential drawbacks, the benefits of synchronous learning, such as improved fluency and the development of interpersonal skills, make it a vital component of oral communication training. The challenge lies in balancing these tools with more flexible and supportive approaches to mitigate stress and enhance overall learning effectiveness.

2.2 Asynchronous Tools

2.2.1 Asynchronous Tools in Oral Communication Development

Asynchronous technology tools allow learners to engage in communication activities at their own pace without the pressure of immediate responses. Popular platforms include discussion forums, Flipgrid, Moodle voice recordings, YouTube, and podcasting tools, where students can record, upload, and reflect on their speeches. Unlike synchronous tools, which simulate real-time conversations, asynchronous tools emphasize preparation, reflection, and self-regulation (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022). One of the most significant advantages of asynchronous learning is the reduction in performance anxiety. Learners often feel less intimidated when they have time to prepare their spoken responses, which leads to a greater willingness to participate and experiment with language (Reinhardt, 2019).

For second-language learners, asynchronous tasks allow multiple attempts at recording speech, enabling self-monitoring and peer/teacher feedback (Hung, 2016). Asynchronous platforms also encourage deeper cognitive engagement of the learners. Takase (2024) notes that when students are not under the pressure of live interaction, they can plan, structure, and articulate their ideas carefully. This can result in more complex language use and higher lexical variety in the speech output. In Uzbekistan, recent studies have highlighted that students using Flipgrid and Moodle forums demonstrated stronger pronunciation control and structured responses, as they had the opportunity to practice before sharing their recordings (Kuliahana, 2022).

However, the delayed nature of asynchronous interactions may limit spontaneity and real-time fluency development. Learners often miss out on the natural rhythm of conversational turn-taking and the chance to react instantly to peers' contributions (Takase, 2024). Moreover, in Uzbekistan, limited access to high-quality audio/video recording devices and inconsistent digital literacy among students can sometimes reduce the pedagogical effectiveness of asynchronous tools (Nasibaliev & Abdullayeva, 2025).

Despite these challenges, asynchronous tools remain powerful in supporting reflection, self-expression and confidence-building. They serve as a low-pressure bridge to live communication, equipping learners with the confidence and preparation required for synchronous, real-world conversations. Asynchronous tools shift the pace, giving learners greater control. Studies find they:

1. It improves accuracy and vocabulary richness because learners can rehearse and reflect (Jaramillo, 2022).
2. Reduce anxiety, making them especially supportive for quieter or introverted students (Maghdalena, Faridi, & Hartono, 2022).
3. Risk losing the spontaneity and conversational adaptability of live exchanges (Amiti 2020).
4. Comparative Perspectives (Rahmani, Riyanti, Misieng, & Sayok, 2024)
5. Evidence comparing the two methods is sparse but growing. Emerging research suggests that they complement rather than compete: synchronous tools nurture immediacy and fluency, whereas asynchronous tools deepen reflection and inclusivity (Song & Lee, 2025).

2.2.2 Comparative Perspectives

Although evidence comparing synchronous and asynchronous tools remains limited, emerging research indicates that these tools do not necessarily compete with each other but rather complement one another in various ways. Synchronous tools, such as real-time video sessions and live discussions, foster immediacy, allowing students to interact on the spot, thus enhancing their fluency and ability to think and respond quickly in dynamic conversations. These tools are particularly effective in encouraging real-time engagement, peer interactions, and collaborative communication.

Conversely, asynchronous tools, including video submissions, forum discussions, and recorded feedback, provide students with the opportunity to reflect on their responses, plan their contributions, and engage in thoughtful expression without the pressure of immediate interaction. This flexibility, which allows learners to work at their own pace, is particularly valuable for fostering *inclusivity*, as it ensures that all students have an equal opportunity to contribute and engage in the learning process, regardless of their personal communication styles or anxiety. As research progresses, it is becoming

increasingly evident that combining the strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous methods can create a more holistic, flexible, and effective learning environment for developing oral communication skills (Gashi, Zhushi, & Krasniqi, 2024).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data to offer a comprehensive understanding of students' oral communication development. Quantitative data were used to measure the students' oral proficiency gains, including fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary usage. Using structured tests and standardized rubrics, this study objectively assessed improvements in students' speaking abilities. Qualitative data provided insights into students lived experiences, shedding light on their personal challenges, growth, and engagement with the learning process. Qualitative data were gathered through surveys, interviews, and reflective journaling, capturing the emotional and cognitive aspects of their learning journey. By integrating both forms of data, this study aimed to offer a well-rounded perspective on how synchronous and asynchronous tools influence oral communication skills, helping to bridge the gap between objective measurements and personal experiences (Öztürk & Öztürk, 2021).

3.2 Participants

The study participants consisted of 120 undergraduate students from three universities, representing diverse fields of study: Management, English Language Teaching, and International Relations. The students were selected to provide a broad spectrum of academic perspectives, allowing the researchers to examine whether the mode of learning had different impacts based on the students' disciplinary focus. The students were evenly divided into two groups: Group A, which participated in synchronous sessions, and Group B, which engaged with asynchronous methods. This division allowed for a direct comparison of the two modes of learning and their effects on the oral communication skills. Additionally, both groups were exposed to the same content and instructional materials, ensuring that any differences in outcomes were primarily due to the learning modality rather than content variation.

3.3 Instruments

The instruments used in the study included Oral Proficiency Tests to measure fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary; surveys to capture anxiety, confidence, and self-perception; interviews with 20 students to gain deeper insights into their personal experiences; and observations to document participation and engagement throughout the course. The Oral Proficiency Tests were designed to assess not only linguistic competence but also the ability to respond appropriately in real-world scenarios. Surveys provided a snapshot of students' emotional and cognitive states, such as their anxiety levels and self-assessment of their abilities, offering a psychological perspective on their learning. Interviews were conducted with a select group of 20 students to explore their experiences, struggles, and motivations in-depth, while observational data allowed for an assessment of the overall participation and engagement in both synchronous and asynchronous activities. These tools ensured a thorough and multi-faceted approach to data collection, allowing both broad patterns and individual nuances to be captured in the analysis (Pinandhita, 2025).

3.4 Procedure

The procedure followed in this study involved distinct activities for each group, designed to target specific skills in oral communication. Group A, which participated in synchronous learning, engaged in weekly live sessions on Zoom, which included presentations, debates, and interactive discussions. These activities were structured to foster real-time interactions, encouraging students to think quickly and respond dynamically to prompts. Synchronous sessions created an environment similar to a live classroom, where learners could practice their speaking skills in real time, simulate professional interactions, and build interpersonal communication skills. Group B, on the other hand, participated in asynchronous learning, which involved submitting weekly videos and engaging in forum-based discussions (Riwayatiningsih & Sulistyani, 2020).

This method allowed students to reflect on their responses, edit their contributions, and provide thoughtful and polished answers. Asynchronous learning, while providing flexibility, also allows students to work at their own pace, making it particularly beneficial for those who may need additional time to process information or who experience anxiety in live settings. The study spanned eight weeks, with data collected through pre- and post-tests, surveys, and student reflections to assess the impact of both learning methods on oral proficiency. Throughout the study, students' progress was continuously monitored, with feedback provided after each session to guide their improvement and address any challenges they faced (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022).

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Research Design

A mixed-methods approach was employed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data, providing a comprehensive view of students' oral communication development. The use of quantitative data allowed for the measurement of specific oral proficiency improvements, including fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary. This approach enabled the researchers to capture numerical evidence of progress, which provided a clear indication of the effectiveness of the learning methods (Sutrisno, Siswanto, Rahmawati, Rusdiyana, & Utama, 2025).

In addition to quantitative analysis, qualitative data were collected to explore students lived experiences. Interviews, surveys, and reflections helped illuminate the challenges, successes, and personal growth that students encountered during the learning process. These insights offer a deeper understanding of students' perceptions and experiences, which are often overlooked in purely numerical studies. By combining these two types of data, this study provides a more holistic view of how different learning methods influence oral proficiency.

4.2 Participants

The study involved 120 undergraduate students from three universities, ensuring a diverse sample across various fields of study. The participants were drawn from the Management, English Language Teaching, and International Relations programs. This diversity allowed for a broader understanding of how different academic disciplines influence oral communication skills. The participants were evenly divided into two groups: one engaged in synchronous learning and the other in asynchronous learning. This division enabled a direct comparison between the two learning methods and their respective effects on students' oral proficiency (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022).

4.3 Instruments

4.3.1 Oral Proficiency Tests

These tests were specifically designed to evaluate students' fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary use in oral communication. The fluency component measured how smoothly students could speak, whereas accuracy assessed their grammatical and syntactical precision. Vocabulary evaluates the breadth and depth of word choices. By focusing on these key areas, the tests provided a quantitative measure of students' improvements in oral communication, allowing the researchers to track progress over time and compare the effectiveness of the synchronous and asynchronous learning methods (Marcum & Kim, 2020).

1. Surveys

   Surveys were administered to capture students' perceptions of their anxiety levels, confidence, and self-assessment of their oral communication skills. Anxiety levels were particularly important, as they can significantly impact a student's performance during speaking activities. Confidence was measured to assess whether the learning methods helped students feel more comfortable in speaking situations. Self-perception provides insight into how students view their progress and abilities. These surveys helped the researchers understand the psychological factors that might influence their participation and performance, allowing for a deeper analysis of how the tools affected both their emotional state and communication outcomes.

2. Interviews

   In-depth interviews were conducted with a select group of 20 students to gather qualitative insights into their learning experiences. These interviews offered students the opportunity to express their

challenges, triumphs, and overall growth in oral communication skills. Through open-ended questions, the interviews allowed students to reflect on their experiences with both synchronous and asynchronous methods in detail. This qualitative data provided a richer understanding of how each learning method impacted students on a personal level, highlighting aspects such as motivation, engagement, and perceived effectiveness that might not have been captured through quantitative measures.

3. Observations

Observations were carried out during both synchronous and asynchronous learning activities to assess the level of student participation and engagement in the course. In synchronous sessions, the focus was on how actively students engaged in real-time discussions, debates and presentations. In asynchronous activities, researchers documented how students participated in online forums, video submissions, and other non-live tasks. These observations provided valuable data on student involvement, helping to identify patterns in participation, such as the tendency of some students to dominate discussions in live sessions or the overall inclusiveness of asynchronous tasks. This instrument provides a real-time perspective on the dynamics of student engagement, complementing the data from surveys and interviews to provide a comprehensive view of student behavior and learning outcomes.

4. Procedure

a. Group A (Synchronous):

Group A participated in weekly live sessions on Zoom, which included presentations and discussions. These activities were designed to foster real-time interaction, encouraging students to speak spontaneously and engage in discussions, simulating a classroom environment. This approach was intended to improve students' fluency and confidence in speaking, as well as their ability to respond to immediate prompts.

b. Group B (Asynchronous):

Group B engaged in weekly video submissions and forum-based discussions, allowing students to contribute at their own pace. They were asked to submit recorded videos of their responses to the prompts and to participate in discussions on an online forum. This format encouraged thoughtful reflection and provided students with the freedom to carefully plan and edit their responses, thereby reducing the pressure of live interaction.

c. Duration:

The study spanned eight weeks, providing an adequate timeframe to observe progress in students' oral communication skills. This period allowed both groups to engage consistently with their respective tools while ensuring that the effects of the learning methods were measurable.

d. Data:

Data were collected using a combination of pre- and post-tests, surveys, and student reflections. The pre- and post-tests assessed oral proficiency in terms of fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary size. The surveys captured students' perceptions of their anxiety levels, confidence, and self-assessment of their communication skills. Additionally, student reflections provided qualitative insights into their learning experiences, challenges, and growth during the study.

4.4 Results
4.4.1 Quantitative Findings

Table 1. Oral Proficiency Score Improvements

Group	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Improvement (%)
Synchronous (A)	62.4	78.1	+25.2
Asynchronous (B)	61.8	74.6	+20.7

Table 1 show in both groups showed strong progress in oral proficiency. The synchronous group (A) exhibited a higher improvement of +25.2%, with notable advancements in fluency and interaction skills. Meanwhile, the asynchronous group (B) demonstrated a +20.7% improvement, particularly excelling in vocabulary and articulation. Although both groups improved significantly, the areas of strength

varied between them, with synchronous learners focusing on fluency and interaction, while asynchronous learners enhanced their vocabulary and articulation skills.

4.4.2 Qualitative Findings

Table 2. Student perceptions

Dimension	Synchronous	Asynchronous
Confidence building	High (but stressful)	Moderate (comfortable)
Fluency practice	Very effective	Limited
Anxiety management	Challenging	Supportive
Depth of expression	Moderate	High
Peer interaction	Strong	Weak

Table 2 show in synchronous learners reported feeling more confident in speaking spontaneously, especially during real-time sessions, which allowed them to practice quick thinking and fluency. However, many also admitted to experiencing high levels of stress, particularly during live debates and presentations. This anxiety was especially challenging for learners who were less comfortable speaking in front of peers, where the pressure to perform in real time could inhibit full participation. In contrast, asynchronous learners generally experienced lower anxiety levels and were able to produce more polished contributions.

The flexibility to prepare their responses in advance allowed these learners to reflect on and refine their language and delivery skills. While this approach allowed for greater control over communication, some asynchronous learners expressed a sense of disconnection from their peers. The absence of live interaction and the delayed nature of feedback led to feelings that the social engagement and immediacy offered by synchronous sessions were lacking, which may have impacted students' overall experience (Jin, Sun, Wang, & Zhang, 2017).

4.2.3 Observations
In the synchronous sessions, approximately 70% of the students actively participated, although a few students dominated the conversations. This suggests that while synchronous learning encourages real-time interaction, it may have led to some imbalance in participation. Students who felt more confident or experienced in speaking were more likely to engage in discussions, potentially leaving less vocal students with fewer opportunities to contribute. However, in asynchronous tasks, participation was more evenly distributed. With 90% of students contributing on a weekly basis, the flexibility of asynchronous learning allowed everyone to participate at their own convenience, without the pressure of immediate peer judgment or speaking in front of others.

This format also allowed students to reflect carefully on their contributions before submitting them, leading to more thoughtful responses. While this might have fostered a more inclusive environment, it also meant that peer interaction was weaker compared to synchronous sessions, where immediate feedback and dynamic conversation were possible. This difference highlights the trade-off between the benefits of flexibility and the need for spontaneous engagement in real-time conversations (Wu, He, Li, Han, & Huang, 2022).

4.5 Discussion
The results of this study align with previous research highlighting the unique strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous learning tools. Synchronous tools, such as live sessions on platforms like Zoom, are particularly effective for building real-time fluency and interaction skills. These platforms simulate real-world communication by offering opportunities for immediate feedback and dynamic conversations, which are essential for developing quick thinking and spontaneous speaking

abilities. However, this immediacy can also increase stress, particularly for students who experience anxiety in public speaking or fear being judged by peers. This psychological pressure can sometimes limit the full potential of these tools, as students may be too focused on overcoming anxiety to fully engage in the learning process (Ledford et al., 2023).

Conversely, asynchronous tools, such as recorded video submissions or forum-based discussions, provide students with a safer, more controlled environment where they can take their time to reflect, plan, and improve their responses. These tools foster greater inclusivity as they give everyone the opportunity to contribute without the pressure of real-time interactions. While this format promotes accuracy and allows students to express themselves more thoughtfully, it may lack the immediacy and peer connections that synchronous learning offers. The slower-paced nature of asynchronous tasks can sometimes make them feel less engaging, and the absence of real-time interaction may reduce the sense of social connection and collaboration among peers (Meng & Saad, 2025).

From a pedagogical perspective, synchronous learning enhances the feeling of immediacy and strengthens peer relationships by encouraging more active engagement in live discussions. It helps students learn how to interact in a social context, improving their ability to think on their feet and respond quickly to real-life situations. In contrast, asynchronous learning offers more equal participation, ensuring that all students have equal opportunities to contribute and reflect. This can be particularly beneficial for students who may struggle with the social pressure or anxiety that comes with live interactions (Ling and Luan, 2024).

From a technological perspective, synchronous platforms depend on strong Internet connectivity and reliable technical infrastructure, which can sometimes be a limitation, especially in areas with less stable Internet access. Any disruption in connectivity can break the flow of learning, potentially affecting students' performance. Asynchronous tools, while more flexible and adaptable to various schedules, require patience, as feedback is delayed, and students must wait for their instructors or peers to respond to their queries. This delay can lead to frustration for some learners, especially those who prefer quicker feedback to improve their skills (Abdujalilova 2025).

The key takeaway from this study is that these two approaches synchronous and asynchronous learning should not be seen as opposing methods. Rather, they complement each other and can be integrated into a more holistic communication-training program. By combining the strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous tools, educators can create a balanced learning environment that accommodates the diverse needs of students, providing opportunities for both immediate interactive communication practice and thoughtful reflective skill development (Nazki, 2025). This integrated approach offers a more comprehensive way to develop oral communication skills, fostering both spontaneity and accuracy while addressing the psychological and technical challenges associated with each format.

4.6 Recommendations
1. Hybrid Pedagogy:
   A hybrid approach combining recorded submissions with live peer feedback sessions would provide the best of both worlds. Recorded submissions allow students to reflect, plan, and refine their contributions, whereas live sessions foster real-time interaction and the development of fluency. By integrating these two methods, educators can offer a comprehensive learning experience that encourages careful preparation and spontaneous communication.
2. Anxiety Sensitivity:
   For students who experience anxiety, asynchronous practice should be used as a stepping stone toward live discussion. This approach allows learners to build confidence in a low-pressure environment before transitioning to real-time communications. Gradually increasing their exposure to synchronous activities can help alleviate anxiety and improve performance in live interactions.
3. Balanced Assessment:
   A balanced assessment approach should evaluate both spontaneous fluency and accuracy. While synchronous tools help measure real-time fluency and interaction skills, asynchronous tools can

assess the depth and accuracy of students' contributions. By evaluating both aspects, educators can gain a more comprehensive view of a student's oral communication abilities, acknowledging the different strengths each modality offers.

4. Inclusivity:
   Offering modality choices respects different learning styles and preferences. Not all students are comfortable with real-time communication, and providing options for both synchronous and asynchronous participation allows learners to choose the method that best suits their needs. This ensures a more inclusive learning environment in which all students can thrive according to their preferences.

5. Technical Support:
   Investing in reliable platforms and providing adequate training for both students and instructors are crucial steps for minimizing barriers to learning. Ensuring that all participants have access to stable and user-friendly platforms can prevent technical issues from disrupting the learning process. Additionally, offering training on how to effectively use these tools will help students and instructors maximize their potential and reduce the frustration caused by unfamiliarity with the technology.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusion

This study demonstrates that both synchronous and asynchronous tools are vital for developing oral communication skills, each contributing uniquely. Synchronous tools enhance fluency, spontaneity, and interpersonal engagement by simulating real-time communications. In contrast, asynchronous tools foster reflection, accuracy, and equitable participation by allowing students to craft thoughtful responses without the pressure of immediate interactions. These tools complement each other in fostering comprehensive communication.

5.2 Research Limitations

Despite the valuable insights provided, this study has some limitations that should be considered. It was conducted within a specific sample of undergraduate students from three universities, which may not represent all academic disciplines or educational contexts of the population. Additionally, the study focused on a relatively short 8-week period, which may not fully capture the long-term impact of synchronous and asynchronous tools on the development of communication. Finally, the study primarily relied on self-reported data, which could be influenced by students' subjective perceptions.

5.3 Suggestions and Directions for Future Research

Future research should explore hybrid learning models over a longer period to better understand the sustained effects of combining synchronous and asynchronous tools. It would be beneficial to examine how different academic disciplines adapt these tools and whether their impact varies according to the specific requirements of each field. Additionally, cross-cultural studies could offer valuable insights into how students from diverse cultural backgrounds experience and benefit from these learning methods. Ultimately, the goal should be to refine oral communication pedagogy in digital spaces by blending the strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous approaches to create a more adaptable and human-centered learning environment for students.

References

Abdujalilova, M. (2025). Linguistic study of household vocabulary in Englishand Uzbeklanguages. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language (JICTL), 1*(2), 75-86. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i2.3428

Abdullaev, Z. K., & Visola, I. (2021). Developing Uzbek Student-Teachers' Proficiency in Speaking English at the University Level. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(7), 13911-13925.

Amiti, F. (2020). Synchronous and asynchronous E-learning. *European Journal of Open Education and E-Learning Studies, 5*(2), 60-70. doi:https://doi.org/10.46827/ejoe.v5i2.3313

Avgousti, M. I. (2018). Intercultural communicative competence and online exchanges: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 31*(8), 819-853. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1455713

Diana, A., Kholida, B., & Nargiza, A. (2023). Integration of information and communication technologies in online teaching of academic English in higher education in Uzbekistan. *Перспективы развития высшего образования*(13), 66-76. doi:https://doi.org/10.36078/1687761685

Gashi, A., Zhushi, G., & Krasniqi, B. (2024). Exploring determinants of student satisfaction with synchronous e-learning: evidence during COVID-19. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 41*(1), 1-20. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-05-2022-0118

Hung, S.-T. A. (2016). Enhancing feedback provision through multimodal video technology. *Computers & Education, 98*, 90-101. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.03.009

Jaramillo, N. (2022). Leveraging asynchronous speaking tasks to promote willingness and confidence to speak in Spanish: A qualitative study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 38*(2), 1-14. doi:https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6657

Jin, W., Sun, Y., Wang, N., & Zhang, X. (2017). Why users purchase virtual products in MMORPG? An integrative perspective of social presence and user engagement. *Internet research, 27*(2), 408-427. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-04-2016-0091

Kohnke, L., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2022). Facilitating synchronous online language learning through Zoom. *RELC Journal, 53*(1), 296-301. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220937235

Kuliahana, A. (2022). Teaching of speaking using asynchronous e-learning applications. *Datokarama English Education Journal, 3*(1), 34-47. doi:https://doi.org/10.24239/dee.v1i1.48

Ledford, V., Wang, X., Anderson, L. B., Leach, J., Lucas, M., & Mazzone, R. (2023). Communication apprehension in the online presentational speaking course: Considerations for synchronous course meetings and asynchronous presentations. *Communication Teacher, 37*(1), 64-82. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2022.2046284

Lee, J. S., & Hsieh, J. C. (2019). Affective variables and willingness to communicate of EFL learners in in-class, out-of-class, and digital contexts. *System, 82*, 63-73. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.03.002

Ling, C. W., & Luan, N. L. (2024). The roles of teaching presence in asynchronous and synchronous online teaching contexts. *The English Teacher, 53*(1), 33-43. doi:https://doi.org/10.52696/wynd5473

Maghdalena, A. H., Faridi, A., & Hartono, R. (2022). The effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous e-learning environments in teaching writing to different personalities. *English Education Journal, 12*(3), 333-346. doi:https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i3.57801

Mahdi, D. A. (2022). Improving speaking and presentation skills through interactive multimedia environment for non-native speakers of English. *SAGE Open, 12*(1), 1-12. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079811

Marcum, J., & Kim, Y. (2020). Oral language proficiency in distance English-language learning. *Calico Journal, 37*(2), 148-168. doi:https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.37788

Meng, B. C., & Saad, N. H. M. (2025). Factors influencing the Oral Output of Foreign Language Learners: A case study in Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 9*(26), 8602-8610. doi:https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0649

Nasibaliev, A., & Abdullayeva, M. (2025). The development of IT education in Uzbekistan. *European Journal of Applied Science, Engineering and Technology, 3*(6), 24-29. doi:https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2025.3(6).03

Nazki, S. H. (2025). Despair, desire, and dissent: Theatrical contributions of Sarah Kane and Mark Ravenhill. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language (JICTL), 1*(1), 45-60. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.2829

Öztürk, E. Ö., & Öztürk, G. (2021). Reducing speaking anxiety in EFL classrooms: An explanatory mixed-methods study. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de Las Lenguas Extranjeras*(36), 249-261. doi:https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi36.18018

Pakpahan, E. M., & Gultom, I. (2020). Foreign language speaking anxiety in online learning. *J-ELLiT (Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching), 4*(2), 47-51. doi:https://doi.org/10.17977/um046v4i22020p47-51

Pinandhita, F. (2025). Integrating Digital Tools and Learning Strategies to Enhance Speaking Proficiency: Evidence from a Mixed-Methods Study in Indonesian EFL Universities. *EDUKASIA Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 6*(2), 1003-1014. doi:https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v6i2.1674

Putri, N. R., Padmadewi, N. N., & Budiarta, L. G. R. (2022). Flipgrid: Video-based applications to improve English ability for junior high school students. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan, 9*(2), 170-182. doi:https://doi.org/10.21831/jitp.v9i2.47095

Rahmani, E. F., Riyanti, D., Misieng, J., & Sayok, A. K. (2024). A review on Synchronous, Asynchronous, and Blended Learning on ELT in Indonesian Context. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies), 11*(1), 223-260. doi:https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i1.2326

Reinhardt, J. (2019). Social media in second and foreign language teaching and learning: Blogs, wikis, and social networking. *Language Teaching, 52*(1), 1-39. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000356

Riwayatiningsih, R., & Sulistyani, S. (2020). The implementation of synchronous and asynchronous e-language learning in EFL setting: A case study. *Jurnal Basis, 7*(2), 309-318. doi:https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v7i2.2484

Skulmowski, A., & Xu, K. M. (2022). Understanding cognitive load in digital and online learning: A new perspective on extraneous cognitive load. *Educational psychology review, 34*(1), 171-196. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09624-7

Song, J., & Lee, J. (2025). Presence and motivation: Comparing synchronous and asynchronous learning environments for foreign language learners using path analysis. *Education and Information Technologies, 30*(5), 6061-6090. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/S10639-024-13047-6

Sun, A., & Chen, X. (2016). Online education and its effective practice: A research review. *Journal of information technology education: Research, 15*, 157-190. doi:https://doi.org/10.28945/3502

Sutrisno, E., Siswanto, D., Rahmawati, A., Rusdiyana, E., & Utama, J. Y. (2025). Study on the utilization of village funds to support food security in Glagah Lamongan District, East Java. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language(JiCTL), 1*(1), 15-24. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1734

Takase, N. (2024). Synchronous and asynchronous online communication for developing foreign language speaking skills. *AsiaCALL Online Journal, 15*(2), 60-76. doi:https://doi.org/10.54855/acoj.241525

Thomas, M. A., Sandhu, R. K., Oliveira, A., & Oliveira, T. (2023). Investigating the effect of media synchronicity in professional use of video conferencing applications. *Internet research, 33*(6), 2131-2171. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-12-2021-0887

Wu, X., He, Z., Li, M., Han, Z., & Huang, C. (2022). Identifying learners' interaction patterns in an online learning community. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(4), 2245. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042245

Zeinali Nejad, M., Golshan, M., & Naeimi, A. (2021). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) on learners' pronunciation achievement. *Cogent Psychology, 8*(1), 1872908. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2021.1872908