

THE IMPACTS OF DIFFERENT LEARNING INTENSITIES ON KINESTHETIC EFL STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

Dedi Aprianto^{*1}, Sutarman^{*2}

dedi@universitasbumigora.ac.id^{*1}, sutarman@universitasbumigora.ac.id^{*2}

Faculty of Engineering^{*1} Faculty of Humanity, Law and Tourism^{*2}

Bumigora University^{*1,2}

Received: January 6, 2025

Accepted: February 13, 2025

Published: March 19, 2025

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the impacts of high, moderate, and low learning intensities on kinesthetic learners' speaking performance in the Bachelor of English Literature program at Bumigora University. Using a quantitative research design, 42 kinesthetic learners were identified through a VARK questionnaire and a validated learning intensity questionnaire, categorizing them into three intensity groups. Speaking performance was assessed based on fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, coherence, and task fulfillment. Data collection included administering both questionnaires and conducting speaking tests. One-Way ANOVA analysis revealed significant differences in speaking performance, with the high-intensity group achieving the highest mean score (91.38), followed by moderate (82.00) and low-intensity groups (70.21). The results confirmed these differences (Sig. 0.000 < 0.05), and Post-hoc analysis indicated that the high-intensity group significantly outperformed the moderate and low groups, with mean differences of 9.385 and 21.174, respectively (Sig. 0.000 < 0.05). The moderate group also significantly surpassed the low group with a mean difference of 11.789 (Sig. 0.000 < 0.05). These findings suggest pedagogical implications for developing instructional strategies to enhance EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic learners. Higher learning intensity significantly improves speaking performance, and further research could explore its effects on other learning styles such as auditory or visual.

Keywords: *Different Learning Intensity, EFL Speaking Performance, Kinesthetic Students.*

DOI: 10.31943/wej.v9i1.374

INTRODUCTION

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction has seen significant changes over the years, particularly with the increasing recognition of diverse learning styles. In this context, one of the key challenges is how to improve students' speaking skills, which are often considered the most complex and demanding aspects of language learning. Among various teaching methods, learning intensity, learning frequency, duration, and depth of learning experiences, all has been identified as a potential determinant of language performance, especially in speaking performance. In relation with learning

intensity, it refers to the depth and engagement of effort that learners invest in their learning activities, often characterized by the time, energy, and emotional commitment dedicated to learning tasks (Chen et al., 2024). It is distinct from learning frequency, pertaining to how often learning activities occur within a given timeframe. While frequency can indicate the regularity of learning sessions, intensity emphasizes the quality and depth of engagement during those sessions (Muslim et al., 2022). A student may study frequently but with low intensity, resulting in superficial understanding, whereas another may engage less often but with high intensity, leading to deeper learning outcomes (Andrietti, 2015). This distinction is crucial in educational settings, as higher learning intensity is often correlated with improved academic performance and retention of knowledge (Andrietti, 2015).

Learning intensity is a crucial factor in improving English speaking skills among kinesthetic EFL learners. It enhances engagement, provides frequent practice opportunities, and fosters better fluency and confidence through interactive activities such as role-plays and simulations. Exposure and intensity of learning play an important role in English language acquisition. Continuous exposure through various media such as video, audio, and direct interaction helps enrich vocabulary and improve fluency. The higher the intensity of exposure, the more effectively students internalize the language. The combination of adequate exposure and high learning intensity accelerates the achievement of optimal language competence. The use of English exposure media significantly improved students' speaking skills and proved effective in creating more interesting, interactive and fun learning in the classroom. In addition, English exposure media provides a deeper understanding of the material compared to conventional learning methods that only rely on textbooks (Gres et al., 2024). Higher learning intensity ensures consistent exposure to the target language, enabling students to receive feedback and reinforce their skills effectively. Without sufficient intensity, learners may face challenges in language retention and oral communication. Therefore, a well-structured, intensive learning approach can significantly enhance speaking performance and overall proficiency for kinesthetic EFL students. However, EFL learners often faced language learning challenges that contributed to decrease their speaking skills. As a study coined from Rizanti et al. (2024), stating that second-semester EFL students face linguistic challenges (limited vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation) and psychological barriers (low self-confidence, anxiety, fear of mistakes). To overcome these, instructors should use strategies like contextualized learning, increased speaking opportunities, leveled materials, and provide constructive feedback to boost confidence and fluency.

Recent studies on learning intensities have pointed to their potential in enhancing language skills. However, much of the existing research primarily focuses on general language learning outcomes and fails to address how learning intensity specifically influences EFL speaking performance. This study aims to fill that gap by focusing on kinesthetic learners, a group that learns best through physical activities and hands-on experiences. Kinesthetic learners tend to engage more effectively with interactive learning environments, which may significantly

impact their speaking performance. The assumption is that varying learning intensities, when combined with appropriate kinesthetic activities, may improve the ability of kinesthetic learners to perform better in EFL speaking tasks. In the context of EFL, speaking performance is often influenced by factors such as motivation, confidence, and anxiety. However, the relationship between these variables and the intensity of learning remains underexplored, particularly with regard to kinesthetic learners. This study investigates whether varying levels of learning intensity, namely high, moderate, and low can enhance EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic learners, considering their unique learning preferences.

The effectiveness of different learning intensities in enhancing speaking performance among kinesthetic learners remains unclear. While a great deal of research has examined the impacts of learning intensity on overall language performance, there is limited exploration of its specific effects on speaking skills in learners who engage more actively with physical activities. Furthermore, there is a lack of understanding regarding the optimal learning intensity for kinesthetic learners in improving their EFL speaking abilities. As such, the research problem that this study seeks to address is on how the varying learning intensity impact EFL speaking performance in kinesthetic learners. The hypotheses of this study propose that varying learning intensities affect EFL speaking performance, particularly for kinesthetic learners. The first hypothesis (H_1) asserts that high learning intensity, defined by increased frequency and duration, significantly improved speaking performance compared to moderate or low intensity. The second hypothesis (H_2) suggests that kinesthetic learners with moderate intensity will outperform those with low intensity, though still lag behind those with high intensity. These hypotheses aim to examine how different learning intensities impact speaking outcomes, with the expectation that greater intensity enhanced performance for kinesthetic learners due to their preference for active, hands-on learning.

The relationship between learning intensity and language performance, particularly in speaking, has been explored in various studies, revealing that increased exposure to language practice significantly enhances performance. Jong and Perfetti emphasize that fluency training, through repetition, scales up from sentence-level practice to longer speech segments, thereby improving speaking skills (De Jong & Perfetti, 2011). Similarly, Saeed et al. highlight the importance of learner-learner interaction in developing speaking skills, suggesting that such interactions facilitate comprehension and language learning (Saeed et al., 2016). However, many studies have predominantly focused on reading and writing, leaving a gap in research regarding speaking skills (Abugohar et al., 2019). Moreover, while some studies address the impact of intensity on fluency, they often overlook the differentiation of learning styles. The research findings indicate that kinesthetic learners benefit from active engagement, which may influence their speaking performance (Manipuspika, 2020). Additionally, the role of anxiety and confidence in speaking performance is noted by suggesting that these affective factors can hinder language learners' speaking abilities (Alrasheedi, 2020). Thus, while the correlation between learning intensity and speaking

THE IMPACTS OF DIFFERENT LEARNING INTENSITIES
ON KINESTHETIC EFL STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

performance is evident, further research is needed to explore the nuances of learning styles and their effects on speaking performance.

Research on kinesthetic learning emphasizes the efficacy of active, direct learning methods, particularly for learners who thrive in environments that incorporate physical movement and role-play activities. Studies indicate that kinesthetic approaches, such as simulations and cooperative exercises, enhance engagement and participation among learners, especially in second language contexts (Yıldız et al. 2024; Hahl & Keinänen 2021). However, there remains a notable gap in empirical research regarding the impact of varying learning intensities on the speaking abilities of kinesthetic learners in second language learning. While it is posited that high-intensity, interactive environments may yield greater benefits for these learners, the lack of comprehensive studies to substantiate this claim is evident (Vaezi & Shahroosvand, 2015). Furthermore, the integration of drama and action-based methods has been shown to improve language learning and fluency, suggesting that kinesthetic learning strategies could be particularly advantageous in developing speaking skills (Galante & Thomson, 2016). Despite these insights, the specific effects of different intensity levels in kinesthetic learning environments on language performance remain underexplored, highlighting a pivotal area for future research (Li, 2023; Hassan & Rami 2024).

Existing studies have established a foundational understanding of the relationship between learning intensity and language learning. However, there remains a significant gap in research specifically addressing kinesthetic learners within English as a Foreign Language contexts. Kinesthetic learning, characterized by active engagement through movement and physical activity, has been shown to enhance participation and retention in language learning environments (Gunawan et al. 2023; Yıldız et al. 2024). They emphasize the effectiveness of kinesthetic intelligence in thematic learning, which can be particularly beneficial for EFL learners who thrive on physical interaction (Gunawan et al., 2023). Moreover, studies indicate that kinesthetic learners often experience heightened anxiety in speaking situations, which can hinder their performance (Galante 2018; Alazeer & Ahmed 2019). Integrating learning style theory with models of learning intensity could provide insights into how tailored pedagogical approaches can alleviate such anxiety and improve speaking outcomes for kinesthetic learners (Chavosh & Davoudi, 2016). Therefore, further investigation into this intersection is essential to optimize EFL teaching strategies for diverse learner profiles.

Based on the background of the study, research problem, and the research gap found that a research question guides this study are as follows: 1) To what extent does high, moderate and low learning intensity impact EFL speaking performance in kinesthetic learners? This question aimed to investigate the influence of learning intensities on the speaking performance in the kinesthetic learners, providing insights that could inform pedagogical practices and curriculum development in EFL contexts.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study used a quantitative research design. The focus of the research was to examine the impacts of varying learning intensities on the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking performance in kinesthetic learners. The quantitative approach is suitable as it allows for the collection of numerical data, which can be analyzed statistically to identify patterns and relationships between learning intensity and language performance.

Research Setting, Population and Samples

The research was conducted at the Bachelor of English Literature study program, Bumigora University, Mataram. This setting is crucial as it identifies the study program in which English study program was carried out, providing context for the population and sample of participants. The population for the study comprised 58 students. However, for the purpose of this research, the sample was drawn from the students with a kinesthetic learning style, as identified through a demographic analysis of the population. Based on the distribution of learning styles, 42 students were classified as kinesthetic learners divided into high, moderate and low intensities. These students were selected as the sample for this study, with the remaining 16 students categorized as visual and auditory learners not being part of the sample. The criteria for selecting kinesthetic learners included their identification as kinesthetic learners, based on an assessment of learning styles, which guided the sample selection process. The use of this specific sample ensured a focused investigation of the impacts of learning intensity on speaking performance among kinesthetic learners. The numbers of the identified kinesthetic EFL students included into samples for this current study on varying learning intensities on EFL speaking performance amongst the kinesthetic students, as follows:

Table 1. The Demographic Information about Population and Sample Size

Semester/Academic Year	Number of Population	Visual Students	Auditory Students	Kinesthetic Students		
				High Intensity	Moderate Intensity	Low Intensity
I /2024-2025	14	2	4	4	2	6
III/2023-2024	10	4	2	3	3	5
V/2022-2021	15	-	2	4	2	5
VII/2021-2020	19	2	-	2	3	3
Sub-total				13	10	19
Total of (n)	58	8	8	42		

Research Instruments

The study used three key instruments for data collection: (i) a VARK (Visual, Auditory Reading/Writing, Kinesthetic) questionnaire is to identify students' preferred learning styles, to specifically categorize participants and focus on kinesthetic learners. This categorization enables the study to analyze the impacts of varying learning intensities on the English-speaking performance of kinesthetic learners, ensuring targeted and relevant data collection aligned with the research objectives. (ii) a learning intensity questionnaire which assessed students' perceptions of their learning intensity by classifying them into low,

THE IMPACTS OF DIFFERENT LEARNING INTENSITIES ON KINESTHETIC EFL STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

moderate, and high intensity groups, based on their frequency and intensity of engagement with EFL activities, and (iii) an English speaking performance test was designed to assess the speaking abilities of EFL students, focusing on fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, coherence, and task fulfillment. This test provides a standardized measure of English-speaking performance, allowing for an evaluation of how varying learning intensities impact the speaking skills of kinesthetic learners.

The VARK questionnaire are valid and demonstrated high reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.84. This confirms the questionnaire as a reliable and valid tool for categorizing students' learning styles, ensuring high-quality data aligned with the research objectives. The results of Pearson correlation coefficients affirmed learning intensity questionnaire's validity was valid. Additionally, it demonstrated high reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.85, indicating its consistency in measuring students' perceptions of their learning intensity. These findings confirm the questionnaire's suitability for evaluating the intensity of students' engagement in EFL activities. Lastly, the English speaking performance test demonstrated strong psychometric properties. The Difficulty Level (Pj) averaged 0.60, indicating moderate difficulty. The Discrimination Index (rjx) averaged 0.55, showing the test's effectiveness in distinguishing between higher and lower performers. Reliability was high, with Spearman-Brown and Split-Half coefficients of 0.85 and 0.82, respectively. These results confirm that the test is both valid and reliable for assessing English speaking performance, especially among kinesthetic learners with varying learning intensities.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection procedures involved three key steps. First, students completed the VARK questionnaire to identify their preferred learning styles (Visual, Auditory, Reading/Writing, or Kinesthetic), enabling the categorization of participants based on their learning preferences. Next, students filled out the learning intensity questionnaire, which assessed their self-reported engagement with EFL activities, categorizing them into low, moderate, or high-intensity groups. Finally, students participated in the English speaking performance test, where their speaking abilities were evaluated through an English performance test focusing on fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, coherence, and task fulfillment. These steps collectively provided comprehensive data on students' learning styles, intensity levels, and speaking performance.

Data Analysis Technique

For data analysis, the study employed One-Way ANOVA to compare the speaking performance scores of students across three learning intensity groups low, moderate, and high. This technique helped identify any significant differences in speaking performance based on varying levels of learning intensity. Prior to conducting the ANOVA, assumptions of normality (data distribution) and homogeneity of variance (equal variances across groups) were verified to ensure the reliability and validity of the results. The analysis provided valuable insights into how different levels of learning intensity influenced students' speaking performance. Before conducting the One-Way ANOVA, the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were tested. The normality test by using

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk showed the *Sig.* value in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is 0.200 for all groups, while in Shapiro-Wilk test each group has a *Sig.* value of 0.583 (High), 0.290 (Moderate), and 0.111 (Low). Since all *Sig.* values are greater than 0.05, the data is declared normally distributed for all levels of study intensity. These indicated that the data were normally distributed. However, the homogeneity of variance test or the Levene's Test revealed a significant result $p = 0.000$, indicating unequal variances across groups. Therefore, this study used the Games-Howell post-hoc test, which is appropriate when data is not homogeneous.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

The findings of this study aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impact of varying learning intensities on EFL kinesthetic students' speaking performance. The study explores significant differences in speaking proficiency across high, moderate, and low learning intensity groups. The following section presents the key results derived from these analyses, highlighting the variations in speaking performance amongst the different intensity levels.

EFL Speaking Performance Test's Mean Scores by Kinesthetic Learners across Different Learning Intensities

The following table presents the mean scores of EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic learners across three different levels of learning intensity, namely high, moderate, and low. These scores reflect how varying degrees of engagement and exposure to learning activities influence the speaking performance of learners with a kinesthetic learning style. By analyzing the mean scores, standard deviations, and score ranges, the data highlights the significant differences amongst the varying learning intensities on EFL speaking performance outcomes, as follows:

Table 2. Mean Scores of Kinesthetic Students' Speaking Performance

Descriptives								
EFL Speaking Performance								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
High Intensity	13	91.38	2.468	.684	89.89	92.88	87	95
Moderate Intensity	10	82.00	3.682	1.164	79.37	84.63	75	87
Low Intensity	19	70.21	8.128	1.865	66.29	74.13	58	84
Total	42	79.57	10.957	1.691	76.16	82.99	58	95

The descriptive statistics reveal significant differences in EFL speaking performance among the kinesthetic learners across varying levels of learning intensity, highlighting the positive effects of higher intensity on student outcomes. The high-intensity group demonstrated the highest mean score of 91.38, with a

THE IMPACTS OF DIFFERENT LEARNING INTENSITIES
ON KINESTHETIC EFL STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

narrow range of scores 87 to 95 and a low standard deviation of 2.468, indicating consistent and high performance. This suggests that high-intensity learning is highly effective in enhancing the speaking abilities of kinesthetic learners, most likely due to greater involvement of EFL learning and continuous practice. In contrast, the moderate-intensity group achieved a lower mean score of 82.00, with slightly greater variability with standard deviation 3.682 and a score range of 75 to 87. Although their performance was comparatively less consistent, it remained better than the low-intensity group, whose mean score was the lowest at 70.21. The low-intensity group exhibited the greatest variability in scores, with a standard deviation of 8.128 and a wide range of 58 to 84, reflecting significant disparities in their speaking performance. These results underline the pivotal role of learning intensity in shaping the speaking performance of EFL kinesthetic students. The consistently higher scores observed in the high-intensity group suggest that increased exposure, engagement and active participation in learning activities significantly enhance EFL speaking performance. Conversely, low learning intensity impacts lower EFL performance and greater inconsistency, emphasizing the importance of frequent, intensive and immersive learning for kinesthetic learners.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether there are significant differences in EFL speaking performance across three groups of students, categorized by learning intensity (high, moderate, and low). The ANOVA results indicate a significant variation in the mean speaking scores among the groups. The F-statistic was found to be 49.841 with a corresponding p-value of 0.000, which is below the threshold of 0.05. This suggests that the students' speaking performance varies significantly based on their learning intensity levels.

Table 3. ANOVA Results for Speaking Performance Across Different Learning Intensity Groups

ANOVA					
EFL Speaking Performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3538.051	2	1769.025	49.841	.000
Within Groups	1384.235	39	35.493		
Total	4922.286	41			

The results of the ANOVA test for EFL speaking performance show a significant difference among the three groups of the EFL students; high intensity, moderate intensity, and low intensity in terms of their speaking performance. Specifically, the *Sig.* $0.000 < 0.05$. This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores between the groups. Therefore, It can be concluded that the three groups of students (high, moderate, and low intensity) do not have the same EFL speaking performance's mean scores.

To further explore the differences in EFL speaking performance across the three learning intensity groups, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using Games-

Howell test. This analysis allows for pairwise comparisons between the groups to identify specific differences in their mean scores. The following table presents the results of these comparisons, highlighting significant differences in speaking performance among the groups of learning intensity.

Table 4. Post-Hoc Comparisons of EFL Speaking Performance Across Learning Intensity Groups

Multiple Comparisons						
Speaking Performance Games-Howell						
(I) Learning Intensity	(J) Learning Intensity	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High Intensity	Moderate Intensity	9.385*	1.351	.000	5.88	12.89
	Low Intensity	21.174*	1.986	.000	16.19	26.16
Moderate Intensity	High Intensity	-9.385*	1.351	.000	-12.89	-5.88
	Low Intensity	11.789*	2.198	.000	6.33	17.24
Low Intensity	High Intensity	-21.174*	1.986	.000	-26.16	-16.19
	Moderate Intensity	-11.789*	2.198	.000	-17.24	-6.33
*, The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

The post-hoc analysis using the Games-Howell test was conducted to assess significant differences in EFL speaking performance across the three learning intensity groups; high intensity, moderate intensity, and low intensity. The results indicate notable differences between the groups in their speaking performance. First, the comparison between the high intensity group and the moderate intensity group revealed significant *Sig.* value $0.000 < 0.05$ that suggests that the high intensity group significantly outperformed the moderate intensity group in EFL speaking performance. Similarly, the comparison between the high intensity group and the low intensity group also statistically showed significant *Sig.* value $0.000 < 0.05$, indicating that the high intensity group had significantly better speaking performance than the low intensity group. Lastly, the comparison between the moderate intensity group and the low intensity group revealed a statistically significant *Sig.* value $0.000 < 0.05$, demonstrating that the moderate intensity group performed significantly better than the low intensity group in terms of EFL speaking performance. Thus, the findings of the post-hoc analysis indicate significant differences in EFL speaking performance across the three intensity groups. Specifically, the high intensity group consistently outperformed both the moderate intensity and low intensity groups, with the moderate intensity group also showing high performance compared to the low intensity group. These results underscore the importance of learning intensity in influencing EFL speaking proficiency.

Discussion

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the relationship between learning intensity and EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic

learners. The findings strongly showed that higher levels of learning intensity significantly enhance speaking proficiency, while lower intensity levels lead to less consistent and poorer performance. It aligns with that kinesthetic learners thrive in immersive and engaging environments, which facilitate active participation and enhance language learning (Yıldız et al., 2024; Panambur et al., 2014). Furthermore, immersive experiences, such as those provided in virtual environments, have been found to foster experiential learning, which is particularly beneficial for kinesthetic learners (Porter & Castillo, 2023). This finding also aligns with the notion that active involvement in learning activities leads to better outcomes in language proficiency, as kinesthetic learners often require direct experiences to fully grasp language concepts (Escabusa & Luzano, 2024). Thus, the findings of the study resonate with existing literature, emphasizing the importance of learning intensity in enhancing EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic learners. The high-intensity group consistently outperformed both moderate and low-intensity groups underscore the efficacy of immersive and intensive language-learning environments. A study by Parra et al. highlight that frequent language exposure directly contributes to language development, particularly through phonological memory (Parra et al., 2011). Intensive learning approaches have been-linked to enhanced implicit learning, suggesting that immersion can significantly boost language proficiency. Moreover, kinesthetic learners benefit from interactive and participatory settings, where high levels of involvement provide ample opportunities for practice, reinforcement, and feedback; elements essential for mastering speaking skills. This aligns with the notion that interaction is a key component in successful language learning, as it fosters meaningful communication and enhances motivation (Tahir et al., 2018). Thus, the combination of high-intensity engagement and interactive learning environments appears to be particularly beneficial for language learners.

On the other hands, it reveals the moderate-intensity engagement in language learning, while not as effective as high-intensity methods, still yields significant benefits over low-intensity approaches. This finding underscores the importance of incremental improvements in learning intensity, which can lead to noticeable gains in language performance. Research indicates that even modest increases in the frequency and duration of learning activities can enhance language learning outcomes, particularly in speaking skills (Rohmah & Emaliana 2020). Moreover, the additional benefits of moderate engagement suggest that learners can achieve substantial progress without the necessity of high-intensity methods. This is particularly relevant in educational settings where resources may be limited, and high-intensity programs are not feasible. Studies have shown that learners who engage in moderate-intensity practices can still experience improvements in their speaking abilities, as these practices provide a more conducive environment for language practice compared to low-intensity methods (Rohmah & Emaliana 2020). The implications of this are significant for curriculum developers and educators, as they can design programs that incorporate moderate-intensity learning strategies to maximize student outcomes. Furthermore, the evidence suggests that the effectiveness of moderate-intensity

learning is not merely a function of time spent but also of the quality of engagement during these learning activities. The moderate-intensity learning strategy provides a balanced approach that can help learners transition from low to high-intensity learning environments, ultimately fostering better language proficiency. This reinforces the idea that pivotal changes in learning intensity can lead to cumulative benefits, enhancing overall language performance over time. This approach not only aids in skill retention but also encourages the practical application of language in real-world contexts, thereby enhancing overall language learning outcomes (Humaira et al., 2022).

In contrast, low learning intensity shows inconsistency in language development. This inconsistency is particularly detrimental for kinesthetic learners, who thrive in active learning environments. Research indicates that less immersive and more passive learning contexts often lead to poorer language learning outcomes, especially for learners who require hands-on experiences to effectively grasp language concepts. A study has shown that active participation in language learning correlates positively with proficiency levels, while passive exposure results in diminished language skills (Abutalebi & Clashen 2014). Moreover, the relationship between engagement and language proficiency is further elucidated by findings that highlight the importance of motivation and emotional factors in language learning. Motivation has been identified as a crucial affective variable that influences learners' commitment to language practice, which is essential for developing speaking proficiency (Oroujlou & Vahedi 2011). Additionally, the emotional understanding and cognitive engagement of learners play a significant role in their language performance, as learners who are emotionally and cognitively invested in their learning tend to exhibit better outcomes (Conte et al., 2019). This is particularly relevant for kinesthetic learners, who may struggle in environments that do not facilitate active participation and engagement.

Furthermore, the impact of exposure frequency to language practice cannot be overstated. Research has consistently shown that learners who engage in regular and varied language activities demonstrate higher levels of proficiency compared to those with sporadic exposure (Sok et al., 2021). This is especially true for kinesthetic learners, who benefit from interactive and dynamic learning experiences that allow them to practice language skills in real-time contexts (Abutalebi & Clashen 2014). The lack of such immersive experiences in low-intensity learning environments contributes to the observed performance variability, underscoring the necessity for tailored instructional strategies that accommodate diverse learning styles and promote active engagement. In conclusion, the notable differences in performance among low-intensity language learners can be linked to their irregular involvement in learning activities, compounded by the passive nature of their learning settings. The study supports the broader view that active engagement, motivation, and regular language practice are essential for successful language learning, especially for kinesthetic learners who benefit from more interactive and practical learning methods.

The significant differences among the EFL student groups highlight the significant role of learning intensity in enhancing language outcomes, particularly

THE IMPACTS OF DIFFERENT LEARNING INTENSITIES ON KINESTHETIC EFL STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

for kinesthetic learners. Research indicates that active engagement in the learning process, such as through blended learning environments, significantly improves language proficiency (Guan, 2023). Kinesthetic learners benefit from immersive experiences that promote active participation, which aligns with findings that emphasize the importance of learning frequency and intensity in language learning (Li, 2023). Moreover, integrating technology, such as podcasts and AI tools, into EFL curricula can further enhance students' speaking skills by providing diverse and interactive learning opportunities (Juhansar et al., 2022). These insights suggest that EFL curricula should prioritize intensive, hands-on learning experiences to optimize speaking performance among students, thereby fostering a more effective language learning environment (Rohmah & Emaliana 2020).

This study underlines the pivotal role of learning intensity in enhancing EFL speaking performance, particularly among kinesthetic learners. The evidence suggests that intensive learning environments significantly improve speaking outcomes, as they foster greater engagement and motivation among learners (Burhanuddin, 2023). Kinesthetic learners, meaningful/real learning, benefit from immersive practices that align with their sensory preferences, leading to more consistent and effective speaking skills (Vaezi & Shahroosvand 2015). Conversely, lower intensity learning settings contribute to poorer performance and increased anxiety, as students struggle to engage meaningfully with the material (Theriana 2023; Azarfam & Soufian 2012). The findings align with existing literature that advocates for intensive, interactive learning strategies to optimize language proficiency and address the unique needs of kinesthetic learners (Tusino et al., 2022). This research provides valuable insights for educators aiming to enhance teaching methodologies and improve speaking outcomes in EFL contexts.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The findings of this study indicate that learning intensity significantly impacts EFL speaking performance among kinesthetic learners. The results show that the high-intensity group achieved the best speaking performance, followed by the moderate-intensity group, while the low-intensity group had the lowest performance. This pattern demonstrates that higher engagement, frequency, and intensity in learning activities contribute to better speaking performance outcomes. The analysis confirmed these differences as statistically significant, indicating that the mean scores among the three groups were not equal. Further comparisons clarified these differences, showing that the high-intensity group significantly outperformed both the moderate- and low-intensity groups. Similarly, the moderate-intensity group demonstrated significantly better performance compared to the low-intensity group.. These results underline the importance of frequent and intensive learning practices for enhancing EFL speaking proficiency, particularly for kinesthetic learners who benefit from active engagement. However, the study has limitations, including a relatively small sample size, its focus solely on kinesthetic learners which may limit the generalizability of the findings, limited focus on short-term learning outcomes

without considering long-term effects of learning intensity on speaking performance, and reliance on a single assessment method, potentially failing to capture the complexity of EFL speaking skills. Future research should explore the influence of learning intensity across different learning styles and much larger samples, more diverse populations. For practitioners and policymakers, these results suggest the need for a curriculum development that emphasize high-intensity, immersive learning experiences to improve EFL speaking skills. Teachers are encouraged to design activities that engage students actively and consistently.

The study highlights the significant impact of learning intensity on EFL speaking performance, suggesting that sustained and frequent engagement in learning activities can enhance language proficiency, particularly for kinesthetic learners. However, the study's limitations, including a small sample size and focus on kinesthetic learners, restrict the generalizability of the findings. Future research should explore the effects of learning intensity across various learning styles, larger and more diverse populations, and different educational contexts, as well as investigate its impact on other aspects of language acquisition, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of its role in language development.

REFERENCES

- Abugohar, M. A., Al-Hnifat, M. A., Al-Smadi, O. A., Rashid, R. A., & Yunus, K. (2019). English Language Speaking Skill Issues in an EMP Context: Causes and Solutions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(3), 211. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p211>
- Abutalebi, J., & Clashen, H. (2014). Optimization and Quantization in Gradient Symbol Systems: A Framework for Integrating the Continuous and the Discrete in Cognition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(5), 855–856. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12047>
- Alazeer, A. N. M., & Ahmed, Z. A. (2019). Students' Speaking Anxiety in EFL Classroom. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 100–107. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i4.p581-587>
- Alrasheedi, S. (2020). Investigation of Factors Influencing Speaking Performance of Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(4), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.5>
- Andrietti, V. (2015). The Causal Effects of Increased Learning Intensity on Student Achievement: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Economic Series*, 2015, 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2632002>
- Azarfam, A. A. Y., & Soufian. (2012). Exploring language anxiety regarding speaking skill in Iranian EFL learners in an academic site in Malaysia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(2), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.2p.153>

- Chavosh, M., & Davoudi, M. (2016). The Relationship between Perceptual Learning Styles and Reading Comprehension Performance of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(3), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n3p61>
- Chen, Q., Zhang, Q., Yu, F., & Hou, B. (2024). Investigating Structural Relationships between Professional Identity, Learning Engagement, Academic Self-Efficacy, and University Support: Evidence from Tourism Students in China. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(26), 1–18. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14010026>
- Conte, E., Ornaghi, V., Grazzani, I., Pepe, A., & Cavioni, V. (2019). Emotion Knowledge, Theory of Mind, and Language in Young Children: Testing a Comprehensive Conceptual Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02144>
- De Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency Training in the ESL Classroom: An Experimental Study of Fluency Development and Proceduralization. *Language Learning: Journal Research in Language Studies*, 61(2), 533–568. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00620.x>
- Escabusa, G. N., & Luzano, R. A. (2024). Learning Styles and Academic Performance of IP Learners. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 07(06), 2471–2476. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-07>
- Galante, A. (2018). Drama for L2 Speaking and Language Anxiety: Evidence from Brazilian EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, 49(3), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746205>
- Galante, A., & Thomson, R. I. (2016). The Effectiveness of Drama as an Instructional Approach for the Development of Second Language Oral Fluency, Comprehensibility, and Accentedness. *TESOL Quarterly*, 0(0), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.290>
- Gres, E., Bunau, E., & Regina. (2024). The Influence of English Language Exposure Media on The Students' Speaking Ability: A Pre- Experimental Study on Grade XIII PS Of SMA Santo Fransiskus Asisi Pontianak. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 8(2), 64–84. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v8i2.290>
- Guan, A. (2023). Impact of Blended Learning on EFL Learning and Teaching. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Educational Innovation and Philosophical Inquiries*, 304–310. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/18/20231348>
- Gunawan, S., Syifa, M., Irianto, D. M., & Sukardi, R. R. (2023). Investigates The

- Implementation of Kinesthetic Intelligence-based Thematic Learning: A Case Study in Elementary School's Second-Grade. *Equator Science Journal (ESJ)*, 1(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.61142/esj.v1i1.2>
- Hahl, K., & Keinänen, N. (2021). Teachers' Perceptions of Using Drama- and Other Action-Based Methods in Language Education. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, 9(2), 27–25. <https://doi.org/10.24191/cplt.v9i2.16437>
- Hassan, D. M. K., & Rami, Z. (2024). Exploring Nuances in Second Language Acquisition: An Error Analysis Perspective. *Migration Letters*, 21(4), 294–298. <https://doi.org/10.59670/ml.v21i4.7319>
- Humaira, H. W., Syihabuddin, Damaianti, V. S., & Sumiyadi. (2022). The Effectiveness of Drama-Based Language Teaching in Improving students' oral language skills: Longitudinal studies. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 17(12), 4451–4462. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i12.8111>
- Juhansar, Budiono, N. R., Yusalda, F., Prasetya, S. Z., Puspitasari, C. R., & Prasetyoaji, A. (2022). EFL Students' Perceptions of Utilizing Podcasts towards Learning-Teaching Performance. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(2), 2290–2300. <https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v6i2.3334>
- Li, Y. (2023). Research on the Application of Learning Frequency in Cultivating Language Sense in Second Language Acquisition. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 6(22), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2023.062219>
- Manipuspika, Y. S. (2020). Learning Styles of Indonesian EFL Students: Culture and Learning. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(1), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no1.8>
- Muslim, F., Ekawarna, E., Ramalia, A., Wirayuda, R. P., & Chen, D. (2022). Learning Intensity and Visual Learning Style on Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 6(2), 385–396. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v6i2.40312>
- Oroujlou, N., & Vahedi, M. (2011). Motivation, Attitude, and Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 994–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.333>
- Parra, M., Hoff, E., & Core, C. (2011). Relations among Language Exposure, Phonological Memory, and Language Development in Spanish-English Bilingually Developing 2-Year-Olds. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 108(1), 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2010.07.011>
- Porter, S. I., & Castillo, M. S. (2023). Effectiveness of Immersive Language

- Learning: An Investigation into English Language Acquisition in Immersion Environments Versus Traditional Classroom Settings. *Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(3), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.62583/rseltl.v1i3.18>
- Rizanti, B. R., Thohir, L., & Apgrianto, K. (2024). Problems and Practical Needs in Learning Speaking in Higher Education. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 8(2), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v8i2.296>
- Rohmah, K., & Emaliana, I. (2020). EFL Students' Speaking Achievement And Its Relationship With Epistemic Beliefs. *IJETA: Nternational Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 9(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.15642/IJET2.2020.9.2.131-140>
- Saeed, K. M., Khaksari, M., Eng, L. S., & Ghani, A. M. A. (2016). The Role of Learner-Learner Interaction in the Development of Speaking Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(2), 235–241. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0602.03>
- Sok, S., Shin, H. W., & Do, J. (2021). Exploring which test-taker characteristics predict young L2 learners' performance on listening and reading comprehension tests. *Language Testing*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532221991134>
- Tahir, Z. M., Haron, H., & Kaur, J. (2018). A Review of Ubiquitous Language Learning Environment. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, 12(1), 275–281. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijeecs.v12.i1.pp275-281>
- Theriana, A. (2023). Understanding the Strategies Employed By Efl Learners To Overcome Speaking Anxiety in the Classroom. *NextGen Education Review Journal*, 1(2), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.58660/nextgen.v1i2.38>
- Tusino, Perdanakusuma, H., Dewi, P., & Saputro, W. T. (2022). Synchronous Learning in Speaking Class: English as a Foreign Language Learners' Voices. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(1), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i1.7867>
- Vaezi, S., & Shahroosvand, H. R. (2015). Iranian EFL Learners' and Teachers' Sensory Preferences and the Learners' Speaking Ability. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 3(2), 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v3i2.7627>
- Yıldız, D., Fidan, U., Yıldız, M., Er, B., Ocak, G., Güngör, F., Ocak, İ., & Akyıldız, Z. (2024). Development and Evaluation of an Image Processing-Based Kinesthetic Learning System. *Applied Sciences*, 14, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14052186>