

Voices in Dialogue: Evaluating Communicative Performance in Panel Discussions

Maya R Atmawinata * Rachmi rachmi

¹Universitas Teknologi Digital, Bandung; e-mail : maya.r.atmawinata@digitechuniversity.ac.id, STIT Misbahul Ulum Gumawang, Indonesia rachmi@stitmugu.ac.id

*Corresponding Author : Maya R Atmawinata

Abstract: Panel discussions have long been a popular learning method in various fields, particularly in higher education. In public speaking classes, panel discussions serve as an exceptional platform for students to develop communication skills, critical thinking, and collaboration. However, the effectiveness of panel discussions often hinges on the quality of each panelist's presentation. Engaging and effective presentations not only enliven discussions and make them informative but also significantly contribute to students' understanding and learning. The significance of this research cannot be separated from the role of presentations in panel discussions. Presentations are not merely the delivery of information but an excavation and exploration of rich perspectives from panel participants. A good presentation ignites the discussion, sparks healthy argument exchanges, and encourages all participants to actively engage. Conversely, weak or uninteresting presentations can easily dampen the discussion atmosphere and hinder the learning process. Therefore, understanding the factors contributing to engaging and effective presentations in panel discussions is crucial. Through this research, we can identify the characteristics of presentations that need strengthening by students. Thus, public speaking classes can be optimally utilized to cultivate a generation of skilled and confident public speakers. This research will employ qualitative methods to analyze data collected through observation. The research results are expected to provide an in-depth perspective on the performance of panelists' presentations, along with concrete and applicable recommendations for improvement.

Keywords: Panel Discussion; Learning Method; Presentation

1. Introduction

In today's digital era and globalization, the ability to speak in public and communicate effectively in academic and professional forums is becoming an increasingly crucial skill. One form of formal communication that is now often used in higher education is panel discussions [1]. This phenomenon can be seen from the increasing number of seminars, conferences, discussion forums, and other academic activities that use panel formats to convey ideas and encourage an open exchange of perspectives. However, not all students have sufficient readiness or communicative skills to perform effectively in the role of moderator, speaker, or MC.

Many students still face obstacles in terms of self-confidence, articulation, structure of idea delivery, and interaction with the audience. This phenomenon is reinforced by observations that in various formal discussion activities, there is still inappropriate use of language, minimal eye contact, and lack of ability to facilitate the dynamic course of the discussion. This reflects the gap between the need for formal communication skills and the training provided in higher education [2], [3].

On the other hand, the development of the 21st century skills-based curriculum encourages educational institutions to not only assess students' cognitive abilities, but also

Received: date
Revised: date
Accepted: date
Published: date
Curr. Ver.: date



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

develop communication, collaboration and leadership skills. Therefore, evaluation of communicative performance in panel discussions becomes very relevant as part of efforts to improve the quality of graduates who are not only academically competent, but also able to appear confident and professional in various public forums [4], [5].

Panel discussions emerge as a potent pedagogical tool for enriching students' comprehension and skills. As posited by [6], panel discussions effectively stimulate participant interaction, cultivating critical thinking, and problem-solving skills. However, the success of such discussions hinges on various factors, notably the caliber of participants' presentations. [7], [8]underscores the significance of compelling presentations in ensuring clarity, conciseness, and active engagement in panel discussions.

A meticulous approach is imperative when dissecting the performance of panel discussions to comprehend how presentations influence audience understanding and participation. [9]accentuates the importance of related research in dissecting pivotal elements that compose effective presentations within a panel discussion context. This reference lays a robust groundwork for a comprehensive analysis of critical aspects when evaluating panel discussion performance.

Within the realm of panel discussions, captivating presentation techniques play a pivotal role in sustaining audience interest. [10], [11] delineate innovative strategies to heighten presentation allure in such discussions. This reference offers an encompassing perspective on the influential role played by word choice, visual emphasis, and presentation style in determining the success of a panel discussion.

Ultimately, audience interaction and engagement stand as linchpins for the triumph of any panel discussion. [12], [13]into psychological and communication concepts supporting effective interaction and audience engagement furnishes valuable insights into constructing productive dialogues between panelists and the audience, thereby fostering a more dynamic and interactive presentation.

2. Preliminaries or Related Work or Literature Review

Achieving success in a panel discussion demands thorough preparation and attention to detail, contrary to its outwardly spontaneous appearance, as it is just as scripted and rehearsed as a formal speech [14]. The key to triumph lies in the careful selection of a captivating topic that resonates within the industry, conducting exhaustive research on panelists to ensure their expertise, and allocating ample time for meticulous preparation [15].

Effective engagement in public speaking is significantly bolstered by the deliberate use of appropriate body gestures. Research consistently underscores that the precise application of body language enhances audience understanding and facilitates better absorption of messages [13]

In the realm of public speaking, the meticulous choice of words and adept facial expressions emerges as pivotal factors influencing communication success. [16]research underscores that accurate facial expressions and the careful selection of words play a crucial role in enhancing communication effectiveness during public speaking engagements.

The integration of visual aids emerges as a powerful tool to enhance message readability and comprehension during public presentations. Studies conducted by [17]demonstrate that the strategic use of visual aids, such as graphics or diagrams, significantly contributes to increased information retention and audience understanding.

Emphasizing captivating communication techniques is integral to effective presentations. The analysis places a strong emphasis on storytelling and clear language as fundamental elements in crafting presentations that can sustain interest and maintain attention throughout a discussion forum. [18]posit that employing captivating presentation techniques, including storytelling and engaging visuals, positively influences audience appeal and comprehension in panel discussions.

To ensure the success of a panel discussion, it is crucial to collaboratively discuss the format with panelists, addressing whether each participant answers every question or specializes in particular types of questions or topics (The Professional Development Group,[18].

Elements such as voice intonation, body gestures, and eye contact are considered indispensable components in crafting an effective presentation. Both the physical and verbal

presence of panelists is highlighted as a significant factor in shaping a positive impression and enhancing presentation effectiveness during a panel discussion. According to Brown's analysis (2020) in the context of panel discussion performance, effective interaction and audience engagement can be heightened through the strategic use of communication techniques that foster two-way dialogue, ensuring that the audience remains actively involved throughout the presentation.

3. Proposed Method

This study used the naturalistic observation method to analyze the past performance of three students from Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang in the 3rd semester, in Public Speaking class. The particular reference of past performance being used is a panel discussion performance, performed by three students. The data analysis process will be conducted through an inductive approach, allowing the researcher to identify patterns and themes that emerge naturally from the data. Qualitative analysis techniques, such as coding and thematic analysis, will be used to explore the meaning and concepts that emerge from the observation of the panel discussion [19]

Data analysis uses the qualitative approach to explain the performance of the subject. Data were collected through direct observation of the ongoing panel discussion. The researcher recorded the behavior, interactions, and presentation techniques used by the panelists without direct intervention. These observations will provide insight into critical aspects that influence the success of the presentation. Subject which includes three people, where Subject 1 (S1) performed as Master of Ceremony and subject 2 (S2) preformed Moderator, while Subject 3 (S3) performed as the Speaker of the event. The subject of the research being the 8th Group of the panel discussion performance . The importance of choosing an approach that is appropriate to the research objectives and context, provides a strong foundation for choosing and applying appropriate qualitative analysis methods in the research context [20]

4. Results and Discussion

The discussion will be segmented into three key parts, focusing on the analysis of each role in panel discussion performance, such as; the master of ceremony, moderator, and speaker. The examination encompasses distinct criteria for each segment, with the master of ceremony predominantly evaluated on speaking techniques, the moderator on facilitation skills and engagement, and the speaker on delivery skills, presence, interaction, and audience engagement. This discussion not only scrutinizes performance but also extends to providing recommendations for enhancing these abilities and techniques through self-efficacy.

Master Of Ceremony

The performance of the Masters of Ceremony (MCs) in the panel discussions demonstrated a high level of professionalism and impact, particularly in sustaining audience engagement and managing the overall flow of the event. Their dynamic presence was a key factor in setting the tone of the discussions. With charismatic delivery and effective use of humor, the MCs successfully captivated the audience and fostered a welcoming and lively atmosphere. This emotional connection created anticipation and attentiveness among participants, significantly enhancing the level of audience receptivity throughout the sessions [21]. Their ability to maintain energy and interaction played a pivotal role in reinforcing the overall communicative success of the panel.

Furthermore, One of the most notable strengths of the MCs was their mastery in time management and adherence to the planned agenda. They ensured that every segment of the event followed the designated schedule, which prevented unnecessary delays and contributed to the smooth and professional execution of the panel [22]. The precision with which they managed transitions between speakers and activities allowed for an uninterrupted flow, maintaining the audience's focus and ensuring that all elements of the program were delivered

efficiently and effectively. This careful orchestration reflects a deep understanding of event coordination and the importance of temporal discipline in formal speaking contexts.

In addition to time control, the MCs demonstrated exceptional skill in facilitating transitions between panelists and integrating diverse contributions into a cohesive dialogue. They provided smooth linkages between segments and speakers through strategic interjections, summaries, and comments. These thoughtful interventions helped maintain the continuity of ideas and highlighted thematic connections, which elevated the coherence and quality of the overall discussion. Their role as bridges between different speakers was essential in maintaining a structured yet engaging narrative throughout the event [23], [24].

Altogether, the MCs' dynamic engagement strategies, disciplined time management, and facilitation of collaborative dialogue affirm their indispensable role in the success of the panel discussions. Their performance exemplified the qualities of effective public communicators who not only guide an event but also enhance its intellectual and emotional impact. The synergy they created among the participants and audience significantly contributed to the professional tone and communicative richness of the discussions [25].

Moderator

The assessment of moderator performance within the context of panel discussions revealed a consistent pattern of competence and professionalism. Across the observed sessions, moderators demonstrated a high level of effectiveness in managing the discussion process, ensuring the panel maintained structure while allowing space for organic interaction. Their ability to navigate the flow of dialogue, control timing, and support the overall objectives of the panel contributed meaningfully to the success of the events. These findings reflect not only their technical skill but also a strong awareness of the interpersonal and intellectual demands of the moderator role [26].

One of the most evident strengths shown by moderators was their ability to facilitate discussion efficiently while managing time with precision. They ensured that each speaker had adequate time to express their views without any one voice dominating the conversation. This balance between allowing depth and maintaining pace helped keep the discussion dynamic and focused. Their awareness of time constraints and skill in transitioning between topics enabled the event to proceed smoothly and professionally, enhancing the experience for both panelists and audience members alike [27], [28]

In addition to effective time management, moderators played a central role in encouraging a variety of perspectives. Through thoughtful questioning and attentive listening, they created opportunities for panelists to explore their viewpoints in depth. This inclusive approach led to rich, multidimensional discussions that covered different angles of the topic being addressed. Their capacity to guide the conversation through divergent opinions while maintaining cohesion is a testament to their facilitation skills and understanding of intellectual dialogue [5], [29]

Equally important was the positive and collaborative atmosphere that moderators cultivated throughout the sessions. Their warm demeanor, open communication style, and genuine appreciation for each panelist's contributions fostered an environment where all participants felt respected and encouraged to speak. This sense of mutual respect and camaraderie contributed not only to the flow of discussion but also to the overall quality of engagement. As noted by [18], [30], [31], the emotional tone set by a moderator can significantly influence participant willingness to share and collaborate, and in this case, it was clearly a factor in the panels' effectiveness.

Speaker

The evaluation of speaker performance in panel discussions revealed a consistent level of commendable competence among all participants. Each speaker demonstrated strong command of the foundational language skills essential for English learners—speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Their spoken communication was marked by clarity, precise articulation, and an engaging delivery that successfully captured audience attention. Furthermore, their listening skills were evident through responsive and thoughtful interactions with fellow panelists, reflecting genuine engagement in the flow of discussion [18]. A notable strength was their ability to deliver messages with clarity and coherence; presentations were logically structured, enabling audiences to follow complex ideas with ease.

Otherwise, this clarity significantly enhanced comprehension and sustained audience interest. Moreover, the speakers fostered an inclusive and interactive environment by encouraging audience participation through questions, comments, and reflections. This participatory approach not only enriched the learning experience but also demonstrated the speakers' attentiveness to the needs and interests of their listeners. One of the most effective tools supporting their delivery was the PowerPoint presentation, which stood out for its simplicity and strategic design. Visuals were clean, concise, and logically ordered, supporting the spoken content without overwhelming the audience [18], [32].

This thoughtful integration of visual aids played a key role in maintaining focus and reinforcing key messages. Collectively, the speakers' language proficiency, clarity in message delivery, audience engagement, and effective use of visual aids contributed meaningfully to the overall success of the panel discussions, highlighting the essential elements of impactful public communication in educational settings.

5. Comparison

The findings from the study showed solid communicative skills among the participants, particularly in three main roles: Master of Ceremony (MC), moderator, and speaker. These findings are consistent with the theories of public communication and collaborative pedagogy underpinning the study in the literature review. For example, the MC's excellent performance in establishing dynamic engagement and appropriate time management supports Lucas' (2020) notion that the success of public communication is strongly influenced by the ability to engage the audience, maintain the flow of the event, and facilitate smooth transitions. The MC's role in bringing the panelists' contributions together as a whole is also in line with Tannen's (2021) theory that emphasizes the importance of emotional connection and narrative cohesion in creating meaningful communication experiences.

Furthermore, the moderator's performance in facilitating the discussion, managing time, and encouraging diverse perspectives is consistent with the literature that highlights the role of facilitators in creating constructive dialogue. [7], [33] state that successful moderators are able to direct discussions without dominating, encourage in-depth exploration of multiple viewpoints, and maintain forum harmony. This finding also reinforces [19] theory of social learning, in which moderators serve as scaffolding that helps participants develop ideas through purposeful, reflective interactions. The moderators' positive interpersonal qualities also confirmed their role in shaping a supportive and collaborative discussion climate, as discussed by [34], [35].

The speakers on the panel demonstrated high competence in message delivery, effective use of visual media, and active audience engagement. This supports [16] concept of the importance of visual simplicity in presentations, as well as [32] notion of storytelling and visual engagement as key tools for delivering meaningful messages. The clarity of structure and logic in the presentations demonstrated by [33], [36] theory that emphasizes the importance of mastering language skills in academic contexts. The active participation of the audience triggered by the speakers' communication style reflects a paradigm shift in communication from a one-way model to a more inclusive dialogic interaction.

Overall, the comparison between the discussion results and the literature review shows a strong connection between public communication theory and actual practice in the panel discussion. This research enriches the literature with empirical evidence that the roles of MC, moderator and speaker are not only structural, but also pedagogically and psychosocially deep. All three have unique contributions to the success of panel discussions, and when executed effectively, create collaborative, reflective and meaningful learning spaces in line with 21st century learning principles (P21 Framework, [37]). This research confirms that effective communication in panel discussions depends not only on content, but also on the quality of relationships and the dynamics of interactions between roles.

6. Conclusions

These communicative performances show that panel discussions are not only a platform for conveying information, but also for building interpersonal communication, critical thinking and collaborative skills. Nevertheless, some aspects still need to be improved. For example, MCs need to strengthen vocal techniques and microphone mastery to improve voice clarity. Moderators are advised to increase the depth in the introduction of panelists to provide the audience with better context. Speakers are also encouraged to rely less on presentation texts to create a more natural and persuasive delivery. The conclusion of this study emphasizes that the success of a panel discussion depends heavily on the synergy between the three main roles. The ability to communicate effectively in formal situations such as panel discussions is an essential skill that needs to be developed in the context of higher education. This research contributes not only as a theoretical study, but also as a practical guide for the development of 21st century skills-based curriculum, especially in terms of communication, collaboration, and reflective thinking.

Thus this study is not only an evaluative study, but also reflective of the importance of education that emphasizes public communication as a foundation for the formation of students' academic and professional competencies in the future.

Author Contributions: The authors worked together by dividing the tasks; the 1st author as the author of the concept of the research and the part of compiling the instrument, the 2nd author of data collection and data analysis. the result and discussion part of the 1st and 2nd authors worked together.

Funding: no finding from any institution

Data Availability Statement: We thank you to all the subject of the reseach

Acknowledgments: We thank you to all the respondents and contributor during thie research is running

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest in the preparation and publication of this manuscript.

References

- [1] N. Safira Timur, S. Asari, and N. Ma'ruf, "Investigating the Impact of CALL on EFL Students' Speaking Skills at Islamic Boarding School: A Mix-Method Approach," *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 21–50, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.30762/jeels.v12i1.3800.
- [2] Arjulayana arjulayana, Zainal Rafli, and Siti Ansoriyah, "Neuro-Linguistics Programming Concept For Teaching Productive Skill," *ELS-JISH*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2018.
- [3] Arjulayana, Z. Rafli, and R. Dewanti, "Representation Of Multiliteracies Approach in Student 's Academic Speaking Practice During Pandemic h," vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 504–511, 2021, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5542033.

- [4] A. Arjulayana and R. Rachmi, "The Issues of Academic Literacy in Conversation Practice During Online Learning," *VELES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 440–452, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.29408/veles.v6i2.5137.
- [5] Arjulayana and T. Pujiati, "Optimize Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach for Non English Learners Speaking Skill," *JALIE: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Islamic Education*, vol. 08, no. September 2024, pp. 215–237, 2024.
- [6] H. T. D. Huang, "Exploring strategy use in L2 speaking assessment," *System*, vol. 63, pp. 13–27, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2016.08.009.
- [7] Arjulayana, Z. Rafli, and R. Dewanti, *A Multiliteracy - Based Public Speaking Module*. 2021.
- [8] T. R. Shankar, "Speaking on the record: A theory of composition," *Comput Compos*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 374–393, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1016/J.COMPCOM.2006.05.002.
- [9] J. Lumy, "Enhancing Students' Speaking Skill Using Communicative Language Teaching Method," *Journal of English Language and Literature Teaching*, vol. 3, no. 01, 2018, doi: 10.36412/jellt.v3i01.738.
- [10] Arjulayana, Z. Rafli, and R. Dewanti, "Speaking Class Based Coaborative Virtual Learning As Multiliteracies Concept," in *4rd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, Indonesia, 2021, pp. 108–113.
- [11] Zulhermindra, "Improving Students' Public Speaking Skills through the Use of Videotaped Feedback," 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://ecampus.iainbatusangkar.ac.id/ojs/index.php/takdib/index>
- [12] M. H. Long, J. C. Richards, J. Schachter, A. U. Chamot, and M. Swain, *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. 1995. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511551185.
- [13] J. C. Richards *et al.*, *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice*, vol. 35, no. April. 2008. doi: 10.1017/S0261444802211829.
- [14] G. Beattie *et al.*, "An experimental investigation of some properties of individual iconic ...," *Cognition*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 1086–1109, 2006, doi: 10.1002/tea.
- [15] G. King, R. Nielsen, C. Coberley, and J. E. Pope, "Comparative Effectiveness of Matching Methods for Causal Inference," *Unpublished manuscript*, vol. 15, 2011.
- [16] A. Hennessey, *Your Guide to Public Speaking*, First. NY, America: Adam media, 2019.
- [17] S. Petrucione and S. M. Ryan, *Teaching Listening and Speaking Simultaneously*, First. NY, America: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [18] S. E. Lucas and P. Stob, *The art of Public Speaking*, vol. 53, no. 9. New York, USA, 2020.
- [19] Arjulayana, D. S. Lastari, and A. Al-Manar, "English Department Students' Metacognition Awareness in Completing Mini-thesis," *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 15–32, 2024, doi: 10.33369/jcet.8.1.15-32.
- [20] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*, Fourth. United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014. doi: 978-1-4522-2610-1.
- [21] A. Arjulayana and R. Rachmi, "The Issues of Academic Literacy in Conversation Practice During Online Learning," *VELES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 440–452, 2022, doi: 10.29408/veles.v6i2.5137.
- [22] L. G. Gago-Galvagno, L. A. Passarini, and Á. M. Elgier, "Social vulnerability and verbal and non-verbal communication in early childhood. Systematic review," *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.11600/RLCSNJ.20.1.4711.
- [23] F. Fahmi and A. Arjulayana, "Digital Translation Literacy of Undergraduate EFL Students," *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 240–252, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.31002/metathesis.v7i2.561.

- [24] A. arjulayana and D. Supraba Lastari, "Reconceptualizing Sight Words to Promote Students Public Speaking Skill," Jakarta, Dec. 2022.
- [25] K. Hasibuan, "Teaching Speaking as a Productive Skill," *Combustion Science and Technology*, vol. 21, no. 5–6, pp. 1–49, 2007, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00102208008946937>
- [26] P. Gusmuliana, E. Apriani, and Syafryadin, "Improving Students Speaking Motivation by Using Role Play Technique at Institute Islamic in Indonesia," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Sciences and Teacher Profession (ICETeP 2020)*, vol. 532, no. 532, pp. 356–361, 2021, doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.210227.060.
- [27] H. Helaluddin, M. H. Al Aqad, H. Wijaya, J. Anwar, N. L. Nadya, and S. Syafryadin, "Development and Validation of Academic Writing Textbook Based on Process Genre Approach for University Students," *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1068–1079, 2021, doi: 10.35445/alishlah.v13i2.766.
- [28] A. Permana and Arjulayana, "Analysis Student's Speaking Fluency in Speaking Class Performance," *An English-Indonesian journal for English, Education and Culture*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.31000/globish.v7i2.
- [29] A. Miller, "On paper, in person, and online: A multi-literacies framework for university teaching," *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. A19–A31–A31, 2015.
- [30] J. S. Wrench, A. Goding, D. I. Johnson, and B. A. Attias, *Public speaking*, vol. 39, no. 5. 1975.
- [31] M. De Paola, R. Lombardo, V. Pupo, and V. Scoppa, "Do Women Shy Away from Public Speaking? A Field Experiment," *Labour Econ*, vol. 70, p. 102001, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.LABECO.2021.102001.
- [32] N. Linardopoulos, "Teaching and learning public speaking online," *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 198–209, 2010, [Online]. Available: http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no1/linardopoulos_0310.pdf
- [33] D. H. R. dan R. S. O'Hair, "A Pocket Guide to Public Speaking," pp. 1–337, 2010.
- [34] T. Wörtwein, L. P. Morency, M. Chollet, R. Stiefelhagen, B. Schauerte, and S. Scherer, "Multimodal public speaking performance assessment," *ICMI 2015 - Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, no. November, pp. 43–50, 2015, doi: 10.1145/2818346.2820762.
- [35] S. E. Lucas and P. Stob, *The art of Public Speaking*, Thirteenth., no. 13. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Education, 2015.
- [36] A. B. Hancock, M. D. Stone, S. B. Brundage, and M. T. Zeigler, "Public Speaking Attitudes: Does Curriculum Make a Difference?," *Journal of Voice*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 302–307, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.jvoice.2008.09.007.
- [37] A. Arsalan and M. Majid, "Human stress classification during public speaking using physiological signals," *Comput Biol Med*, vol. 133, p. 104377, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.COMPBIOMED.2021.104377.