

T. R.
GAZİANTEP UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

INVESTIGATING BOREDOM AND BOREDOM COPING STRATEGIES IN TURKISH EFL CONTEXT

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

HACER YAZGAN

GAZİANTEP
DECEMBER 2023

T. R.
GAZIANTEP UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

INVESTIGATING BOREDOM AND BOREDOM COPING STRATEGIES IN TURKISH EFL CONTEXT

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

HACER YAZGAN

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA

GAZIANTEP
DECEMBER 2023

APPROVAL OF THE JURY

Student : Hacer YAZGAN
University : Gaziantep University
Graduate School : Graduate School of Educational Sciences
Department : English Language Teaching
Thesis Title : Investigating Boredom and Boredom Coping Strategies in Turkish EFL Context
Thesis Date : 29.12.2023

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Filiz YALÇIN TILFARLIOĞLU
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA
Supervisor

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master's of Art.

Examining Committee Members

Signature

Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA

.....

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vildan İnci KAVAK

.....

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilara SOMUNCU

.....

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate School Educational Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mahmut KALMAN
Director

RESEARCH ETHICS DECLARATION

The information contained here is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, accurate. I have read the University's current research ethics guidelines, and accept responsibility for the conduct of the procedures set out in the attached application in accordance with these guidelines, the University's policy on conflict of interest and any other condition laid down by the Gaziantep University Research Ethics Committee or its Sub-Committees. I have attempted to identify all the risks related to this research that may arise in conducting this research, and acknowledge my obligations and the rights of the participants.

I have declared any affiliation or financial interest in this research or its outcomes or any other circumstances which might present a perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest, in accordance with Gaziantep University policy on Conflicts of Interest.

Signature:

Name: Hacer YAZGAN

Student ID Number: 202621111039

Date: 29.12.2023



to my beloved family...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I owe much appreciation to Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA, an excellent scholar and my supervisor who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted my research, for his support, words of encouragement and recommendations from start to finish. Without his sage guidance, persistent help, valuable feedback, kindness and unbreakable belief in me, it would not have been possible for me to finish this research. It has been a gift to be his student.

I am also grateful to the all my instructors in the department, Prof. Dr. Filiz YALÇIN TILFARLIOĞLU, Prof. Dr. Mehmet BARDAKÇI, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fadime YALÇIN ARSLAN, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KILIÇ for all the time and effort they made throughout MA courses.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the precious support of the thesis committee members: Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilara SOMUNCU and Assist. Prof. Dr. Vildan İnci KAVAK for their contributions to this research with their insightful comments and suggestions.

I also want to extend my gratitude to the many amazing teachers I have had during my BA at Uludağ University: Prof. Dr. Esim Gürsoy, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özen Baykent, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Figun Dinçer, Assist. Prof. Dr. Derya Yılmaz, Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar Salı, Instructor Dr. Erkan Yılmaz and Instructor Dr. Ayşegül Zıngır Gülten faculty members of the department of foreign language teaching of Uludağ University who showed me what wonderful teaching looks like.

And, as always, I thank my husband, Ahmet Şahin YAZGAN, and our children, canımın içi kızım Ada Beren YAZGAN and aslan oğlum Arda Kaan YAZGAN, for their unceasing support and unconditional belief in me as well as for the joy and love they bring to my life every single day. They inspire me to be the best version of myself possible and being around them makes my heart happy. I feel really lucky to have them in my life.

Last but certainly not least, I am grateful to my parents Ayşe KOL and İsmail KOL, my brothers Fatih and Erdem, my sisters Semra and Ebrar, my sister-in-law Sevgi, my niece Asel Güneş and nephews Deniz Efe and Rüzgar Ege for their endless love, support and faith in me.

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF BOREDOM COPING STRATEGIES IN EFL CLASSROOM SETTINGS IN TURKEY

YAZGAN, Hacer

MA Thesis, English Language Teaching Program

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA

Aralık-2023, 192 pages

Acknowledged as a commonly experienced phenomenon among language learners, the important role of boredom in language learning research has only received limited scholarly attention compared to other learner variables, such as anxiety, enjoyment or interest given that it is closely intertwined with other individual learner variables. This study was designed to investigate the interplay between EFL learners' boredom and their coping strategies and its relationship with EFL achievement. Drawing on a quantitative research design, a convenience sample of 219 undergraduate students from Turkey was recruited as participants. Their boredom levels and coping strategies were evaluated by the Level of Boredom Scale (LBS) and the Coping with the Boredom Scale (CBS), respectively. Quantitative analyses indicated different types of relationships between the coping mechanisms: Individuals with higher levels of language boredom tend to adopt cognitive avoidance strategies while lower levels tend to employ behavioural approach coping strategies. This study suggests that although a higher level of L2 boredom may not seem to directly impede EFL students' learning, it may affect their levels of L2 motivation and participation in a classroom setting, thereby resulting in more boredom. Boredom has adverse impacts on the various facets of language learning, including, but not limited to, reductions in motivation and engagement. However, contrary to prevailing view, students' L2 boredom had no significant relationship to their degree of achievement. The results of this study suggest that there is a clear need for further research to probe into the interrelationship between these three components across different levels of granularity.

Keywords: Boredom in English language classes, boredom coping strategies, student engagement, disengagement, positive classroom environment

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’DE YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCENİN ÖĞRETİMİNDE CAN SIKINTISI VE CAN SIKINTISI İLE BAŞ ETME STRATEJİLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

YAZGAN, Hacer

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA
Aralık-2023, 192 sayfa

Dil öğrencileri arasında sıkça yaşanan bir olgu olarak kabul edilen ve diğer öğrenci değişkenleriyle yakından ilişkili olmasına rağmen, can sıkıntısının önemli rolü endişe, haz, ilgi gibi diğer öğrenci değişkenleriyle kıyaslandığında daha sınırlı bir akademik ilgi görmüştür. Bu çalışma, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen (EFL) öğrencilerin can sıkıntılarının ve bununla başa çıkma stratejilerinin arasındaki etkileşimi ve bu etkileşimin İngilizce öğrenim başarısı ile olan ilişkisini araştırmak üzere tasarlanmıştır. Bir nicel araştırma tasarımına dayanan bu çalışmaya, Türkiye’den kolaylıkla bulunabileni örneklem örneklem tekniğiyle 219 lisans öğrencisinden oluşan örneklem katılımcı olarak alınmıştır. Katılımcıların sıkıntı düzeyleri ve başa çıkma stratejileri, sırasıyla Sıkıntı Düzeyi Ölçeği (LBS) ve Sıkıntı ile Başa Çıkma Ölçeği (CBS) ile değerlendirilmiştir. Nicel analizler, başa çıkma mekanizmaları arasında farklı ilişkiler göstermiştir: Daha yüksek düzeyde can sıkıntısı olan bireyler, sıkıntıyı azaltmak için bilişsel kaçınma stratejileri benimserken daha düşük düzeyde olanlar davranışsal yaklaşım başa çıkma stratejilerini kullanmaktadırlar. Bu çalışmada, L2 sıkıntısının doğrudan EFL öğrencilerinin öğrenimine engel olduğuna dair bir bulgu elde edilememesine rağmen, öğrencilerin can sıkıntısı seviyelerine ve kullandıkları stratejilere bağlı olarak yabancı dil (L2) motivasyonlarının ve sınıf içinde katılım düzeylerinin etkilenebileceği ve sonuç olarak daha fazla can sıkıntısı yaşayabilecekleri çıkarımında bulunulmuştur. Can sıkıntısı, motivasyon ve katılım da dahil olmak üzere dil öğreniminin çeşitli yönlerinde olumsuz etkilere sahiptir. Ancak, genel kanının aksine, bu çalışmada öğrencilerin L2 sıkıntısı ile başarı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, farklı seviyelerdeki bu üç bileşen arasındaki etkileşimin incelenmesi için daha fazla araştırmaya ihtiyaç olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce sınıflarında can sıkıntısı, can sıkıntısı ile baş etme stratejileri, öğrenci katılımı, katılmama, pozitif sınıf ortamı

TABLE OF CONTENT

APPROVAL OF THE JURY	i
RESEARCH ETHICS DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Presentation	1
1.2. Background of the Study	1
1.2.1. Individual Differences	6
1.2.2. Environment of the Classroom	9
1.2.3. Mindsets of Learners	10
1.2.4. Learner Engagement	11
1.2.5. Boredom.....	13
1.2.5.1. Theoretical underpinnings of boredom.	16
1.3. Statement of the Problem	17
1.4. Purpose of the Study.....	18
1.5. Statement of Research Questions	19
1.6. Significance of the Study	19
1.7. Assumptions of the Study.....	20
1.8. Limitations of the Study	21
1.9. Definitions of Key Terms and Abbreviations	22
1.10. Summary	24

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Presentation	26
-------------------------	----

2.2. Emotions and Academic Emotions	27
2.3. Academic Emotions in the EFL Context.....	28
2.4. Self-Efficacy in EFL	29
2.5. Self-Efficacy and Academic Emotions	30
2.6. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety.....	31
2.7. Foreign Language Classroom Enjoyment and Anxiety.....	33
2.8. Boredom	38
2.8.1. Boredom Proneness	41
2.8.2. Academic Boredom	45
2.8.3. Control Value Theory	47
2.8.4. Academic Boredom and the Achievement Emotions	49
2.8.5. Boredom in the EFL Context.....	52
2.8.6. Engagement, Disengagement and Boredom.....	56
2.8.6. Coping Strategies	59
2.8.7. Coping with Boredom.....	60
2.8.8. Boredom Coping Profiles and Coping with the Boredom Scale	62
2.8.9. Boredom and EFL Achievement	65

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Presentation	68
3.2. Research Design	68
3.3. Research Context.....	69
3.3.1. SFL English Preparatory Program.....	69
3.4. Participants and Demographic Information.....	71
3.4. Instruments	71
3.4.1. Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS-20 item)	72
3.4.2. The 8-item The Level of Boredom Scale (LBS)	73
3.5. Data Collection Procedure.....	74
3.6. Data Analysis	75
3.7. Summary	76

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

4.1. Presentation	77
4.2. Demographic Information	77
4.3. Findings Regarding the Research Questions	78
4.3.1. Findings Regarding the First Research Question	78
4.3.2. Findings Regarding the Second Research Question	80
4.3.3. Findings Regarding the Third Research Question	82
4.3.4. Findings Regarding the Fourth Research Question	83
4.4. Summary	84

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1. Presentation	85
5.2. Discussion of the Findings for Research Questions	85
5.2.1. Discussion of the First Research Question	85
5.2.2. Discussion of the Second Research Question	98
5.2.3. Discussion of the Third Research Question	103
5.2.4. Discussion of the Fourth Research Question	105
5.3. Summary	106

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Presentation	108
6.2. Summary of the Study	108
6.3. Conclusion	109
6.4. Implications of the Study	111
6.5. Suggestions for Further Studies	112
REFERENCES	117
APPENDICES	184
CURRICULUM VITAE	192
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	192

LIST OF TABLES

	Pages
Table 1. Demographic Information of the Participants	77
Table 2. Level of Boredom and Boredom Coping Strategies among EFL Learners	79
Table 3. Skewness, Kurtosis Test Results for Normality Check	80
Table 4. One-Way Anova Results for Differences between Boredom Levels in Terms of Coping Strategies.....	81
Table 5. Pearson Correlation between Boredom Level and EOY Score.....	82
Table 6. One-Way Anova Results	83

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Pages
Appendix A: Level of Boredom Scale and Coping with Boredom Scale (Turkish).....	184
Appendix B: Level of Boredom Scale and Coping with Boredom Scale (English).....	187
Appendix C: Gaziantep University Social and Humanities Ethics Committee Meeting Report (Related Section).....	191

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Presentation

This chapter begins with a concise introduction to the conceptualization of boredom in the literature, a description of its types and subtypes, and its sources and causes in terms of theoretical models and theories, and then continues with the relationship between boredom, individual differences, classroom social climate, mindsets and engagement, and coping strategies for boredom, a discussion of their relevance to the classroom setting, and concludes with an overview of the factors that influence language performance in foreign/second language (L2) learning.

1.2. Background of the Study

In the field of L2 learning, individual learner differences (IDs) have long been regarded as a vital factor for L2 learning (Arnold, 2011; Dewaele, 2015; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012a; Nakamura, 2018; Sampson, 2020). Recent studies are uncovering potentially significant ID aspects like grit (e.g., Yamashita, 2018), and employing a situated approach to explore individual variation has gained increasing attention (Ryan, 2020). Interestingly, although the conceptual influence of boredom has long been a major focus in the field of educational psychology, only recently has it garnered increased attention in L2 classrooms. (e.g.,

Dumančić, 2018; Kruk, 2016a; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018, 2020; Li, 2021; Nakamura et al., 2021; Pawlak et al., 2020a).

Boredom can be conceptualised as a multidimensional and negative emotion, consisting of five central and contextualised components: disengagement, high arousal, inattention, low arousal, and changes in time perception (Fahlman et al., 2013). Relatedly, boredom is one of the most common emotions in academic settings (Daniels et al., 2015; Daschmann et al., 2011; Kruk, 2021; Mann & Robinson, 2009; Tze et al., 2016) and can be described as a negative (Fahlman et al., 2013), debilitating, silent, disruptive (Daniels et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2006; Pekrun et al., 2010, 2014), unpleasant, deactivating (Putwain et al., 2018a; Vogel-Walcutt et al., 2012) and yet as a remarkably neglected, underappreciated emotion (Macklem, 2015; Pekrun et al., 2010). Arguably, although the key role of boredom has been examined in depth by psychologists for many decades, it has only recently been subject to attention in the L2 research (Chapman, 2013; Derakhshan et al., 2021a; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017; Pawlak et al., 2020a). What is important to note here is that boredom is underappreciated and overlooked due to teachers' neglect, which is ascribed to laziness, student anxiety or depression, or to other personality factors (Macklem, 2015). However, given its prevalence and the negative effects reported in most cases (Macklem, 2015; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Pekrun et al., 2010), boredom is considered an important affective variable which may hinder learning (Daniels et al., 2015) even though described as an "inconspicuous or "silent" emotion as compared to more intensive and consequently more easily observable affective states such as anger or anxiety" (Goetz et al., 2014, p. 402). Disengagement is a crucial component and the external manifestation of the learners' boredom, as it is characterised by "passivity, lack of initiation, lack of effort, and giving up" (Skinner et al., 2009a, p. 496). Moreover, learners exhibit behaviours such as "mental withdrawal and ritualistic participation, such as lack of attention and going through the motions" termed as disaffected emotions which, also include "those that reflect enervated emotion (tired, sad, bored), alienated emotion (frustration, anger), and pressured participation (anxiety)" when physical withdrawal is not an option (Skinner et al., 2009a, p. 496). Surprisingly, according to some researchers, (e.g., Skinner, 2016), disengagement is not only viewed as the flip side of engagement but also as a negative aspect of engagement characterised as the willingness to devote efforts to actively involve in a particular language activity, which is associated with a

meaningful purpose for learning (Appleton et al., 2008; Dörnyei, 2019; Oga-Baldwin, 2019). Engagement is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon composed of at least four dimensions: cognitive, behavioural, social and emotional. Among these behavioural (participatory) involvement is considered crucial in L2 classrooms (Dörnyei, 2019; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020). This said, disengagement is related to decreased learner participation, thus having a detrimental effect on students' language learning. Since engagement is an integral part of classroom practice, the absence of it might imply the presence of boredom (Fahlman et al., 2013) which, in turn, inhibits language learning and impairs learners' language achievement (Dörnyei, 2019).

Only recently have the causes of boredom captured a great deal of attention of many psychologists investigating boredom (e.g., Daniels et al., 2015; Goetz & Hall, 2014). In light of research findings, boredom is likely to be triggered by a number of reasons including under-stimulation as a result of being under-challenged (Larson & Richards, 1991) and teacher's excessive control (Hill & Perkins, 1985; Watt & Blanchard, 1994). Moreover, boredom can be caused by students' incapacity to self-regulate their attention (Eastwood et al., 2007, 2012) all of which are often not openly discussed (Weinerman & Kenner, 2016). Also, boredom may stem from the extent to which students feel in control over the task at hand and the value they ascribe to it (Pekrun et al., 2010; Shao et al., 2019), a lack of meaningful purpose (Yeager & Walton, 2011) either an insufficiency or excess of units of mental energy, referred to as "mentons" (Davies & Fortney, 2012). Student boredom, typically a transient state, categorised into five subtypes "based on degrees of valence and arousal" and students experience specific types of boredom: "indifferent, calibrating, searching, and reactant boredom". The characteristics associated with indifferent boredom were described with feelings such as "relaxation and cheerful fatigue." Calibrating boredom was described by experiences such as "wandering thoughts, not knowing what to do, and a general openness to behaviours aimed at changing the situation or cognitions unrelated to the situation." On the other hand, searching boredom was identified as involving "a sense of restlessness and an active search for alternative actions," and finally, reactant boredom was characterised by "restlessness, aggression, as well as persistent thoughts about specific, more highly valued alternative situations." (Goetz et al., 2014, p. 403). Given the accumulating evidence, boredom is associated with an interplay of a variety of ID factors, such as self-

regulated learning, impulsivity, anxiety, motivation, willingness to speak, risk-taking (Kruk, 2016b, 2021; Pekrun et al., 2010; Zawodniak & Kruk, 2018) and closely linked to negative learning outcomes (Pekrun et al., 2002, 2006, 2010; Robinson, 1975; Tze et al., 2014a, 2016) and regarded as unpleasant, activity-oriented, negative and deactivating emotion that manifests in various learning environments (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, 2021b; Li, 2021; Putwain et al., 2018b; Vogel-Walcutt et al., 2012). Taken together, this body of research suggests that further research is necessary to help us build a better understanding of the complex structure of boredom and there must be a concerted effort to scrutinise boredom and the strategies employed by learners to alleviate boredom and its relationship with English as a foreign language (EFL) achievement in order to facilitate EFL instruction.

Working from the ideas presented above, a review of the literature reveal that studies regarding the importance of ID such as motivation, anxiety, learning strategies, and aptitude have been subjected to close scrutiny in numerous published studies, but there is still relatively little research conducted by applied linguists that addresses boredom, which can adversely affect student learning, achievement levels, and performance. This study aims to fill the existing lacuna with this empirical investigation by seeking answers about the boredom levels and boredom coping strategies among EFL students at a southeastern university in Turkey contributing to a better theoretical grounding of the phenomenon of boredom.

Individuals differ in their predispositions, interests, and learning styles and “as the term suggests, IDs are characteristics or traits in respect of which individuals may be shown to differ from each other” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 1). Understanding these differences which “include language aptitudes, cognitive (learning) styles, learning strategies, affective variables (motivation, self-efficacy, tolerance of ambiguity, and anxiety), and other factors such as gender, culture, and age” is crucial for educators to tailor their teaching methods and materials to meet diverse student needs (Meguro, 2020, p. 1). Boredom which can “cause learners to disengage from learning activities, avoid interaction with teachers and peers, lose motivation to perform learning tasks, and tune out of the learning process” might manifest differently among students with varying levels of intrinsic motivation, anxiety, learning strategies, and aptitude (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 2). Taking into account individual differences can provide insights into why certain students may be more

susceptible to boredom and how instructional approaches can be adapted to engage a wider range of learners as “bored learners can easily go unnoticed and may be left to suffer alone” where “participation in communicative tasks and interaction with others is of paramount importance” (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 2).

The social environment within a classroom not only impacts “school effectiveness and could account for a significant part of the variance in student results” but also influences students’ emotional experiences and engagement with learning (Ghaith et al., 2007, p. 230). As highlighted by Wang et al. (2021b) “classes with a positive climate can promote student engagement and learning motivation and improve students’ academic performance”, thus mitigating boredom by promoting a sense of belonging, collaboration, and shared purpose among students (p. 3). A positive classroom environment was associated with positive affective outcomes “including interest, enjoyment, emotional competence, motivation, comfort, positive attitudes towards the subject and engagement” while a negative classroom environment correlated with negative outcomes “including anxiety, frustration, discomfort, confusion, aggression and other emotional difficulties” (Li et al., 2021, p. 3). Investigating the role of class social climate in relation to boredom allows for the identification of factors that either enhance or hinder the overall learning environment, underscoring “the key role of teacher[s] in creating a healthy and positive classroom climate” (Li et al., 2021, p. 3). This knowledge might enable educators a more comprehensive understanding of learning and teaching processes, help finding ways to mitigate the effects of the experience of boredom and guide them in creating a more positive classroom atmosphere.

Mindsets play a significant role in shaping students’ attitudes towards challenges and learning experiences, given that they are “linked to a wide range of motivational and educational outcomes and that interventions designed to change students’ mindsets yield long-term effects” (Lou & Noels, 2019, p. 1). The idea of a growth mindset involves “individuals’ belief in that human intelligence is malleable and can grow with effort” (Guo et al., 2023, p. 2). Students tend to perform more effectively “when they regard intelligence and other abilities not as fixed traits that they either have or lack, but as attributes that can be improved through effort” (Kohn, 2015). Investigating mindsets in the context of boredom can help uncover how different mindsets influence students’ perceptions of tasks, persistence in the face of challenges, and overall learning experiences since “individuals with a growth

mindset have been shown to experience more positive emotions in learning situations and make more adaptive attributions for academic performance” (Wang et al., 2021b, p. 8). This understanding is valuable for educators aiming to “promote a growth mindset, and create such an environment to encourage students to practise speaking and communicating in L2 in the foreign language classroom” as well as foster a positive and adaptive mindset among students (Wang et al., 2021b, p. 9).

Despite the important role that growth mindset, class social climate, and student engagement play in L2 learning, insight into their influence on EFL students’ negative emotions, such as boredom and their coping strategies in L2 learning, is limited, which is why the current study was conducted.

1.2.1. Individual Differences

The important role of IDs in the realm of L2 has long been the focus of L2 researchers (Cinkara, 2016; Dewaele & Li, 2020; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Larsen-Freeman, 2018; Pawlak, 2017, 2020a). Instead of the growing body of literature linking ID variables to a variety of classical perspectives, such as stable learning characteristics, new perspectives on ID variables related to context and time have been adopted by many researchers on the concept of IDs, illustrating that IDs are dynamic (Dörnyei et al., 2014; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Gkonou et al., 2017; Pawlak, 2020a). In light of the growing body of literature linking L2 learning not only to positive emotions, but also to negative emotions, many researchers have reiterated the important role they can play in second language learning (MacIntyre et al., 2019a; Pomerantz & Bell, 2011). MacIntyre et al. (2019a) emphasise the influence of both learner and teacher psychology in fostering the teaching and learning environment and communication for L2 learning, addressing the complex construct of L2 learning that is shaped by a wide range of emotions and ID factors. Although the phenomenon of learner-related factors did not become the subject of regular scientific research no sooner than in the 1980s, it has been an important topic worldwide ever since, thanks to Carroll (1981), Gardner (1985), Dörnyei (2005), who studied language aptitude and motivation. In light of these considerations, many studies offered in depth examination of the mediating role of IDs and factors in L2 learning (Dewaele, 2009; Ellis, 2004). Theories of motivation and other IDs are considered as hubs for L2 research as L2 researchers have based their research and

interpretations on them (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015), with the latter defined as the “the sun for navigation at that time” (Derakhshan et al., 2022, p. 3). The main theoretical transition at L2 learning is from adopting theories of motivation and various learning-related factors to the conceptualization of Positive Psychology, which brings the importance of emotions to the spotlight (MacIntyre et al., 2019a; Seligman, 2018). With the help of Positive Psychology, there is now a plethora of studies that draw on the theoretical framework and instrumentation to examine the positive constructs experienced by language learners in various contexts in the EFL (Li, 2021; Xie & Derakhshan, 2021; Zhang & Zhang, 2020). For example; while Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) and Li and Dewaele (2020) focus on enjoyment, MacIntyre, et al. (2019a) and MacIntyre and Vincze (2017) are more concerned with joy, love, hope, pride, and interest. Based on the results of these empirical researches, it can be inferred that emotions promote a wide range of desirable academic outcomes if we can create a positive environment in the classroom.

Within L2 learning studies notions of boredom and coping strategies have been closely linked to the concept of IDs and in this study, each of these constructs is seen as indispensable. Boredom, “one such emotion found to be frequently experienced among students at school” is not a uniform experience for all learners as recognized by Nakamura et al. (2021, p. 1) and “constitutes a powerful argument for seeking effective ways of coping with it” (Pawlak et al., 2020c, p. 599). IDs, encompassing traits like “anxiety, aptitude and multiple intelligences, beliefs, identity, language learning strategies and styles, motivation, personality, willingness to communicate” influence how learners perceive and cope with boredom (MacIntyre et al., 2016). In the realm of social sciences, “psychology studies the human mind not only in general but also from individually constructed facets and it attempts to discover the way people experience the world through different feelings and thoughts.” (Şen & Oz, 2021, p. 236) so, by considering IDs, we might gain insights into the varied responses learners may exhibit as “all IDs show both stability and the capacity to change” (MacIntyre et al., 2016, p. 310), allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the interplay between personal characteristics and emotional states. This nuanced perspective, in turn, informs the development of tailored interventions and educational approaches as emphasised in the idea that “L2 teachers might need to tailor intervention programs to different components of

students' emotions" that cater to the diverse needs of learners, as "not all strategies to cope with boredom are equal and some students cope with boredom better than others" (Shao et al., 2023, p. 22), recognizing that a one-size-fits-all strategy may not effectively address the range of coping strategies employed by individuals (Daniels et al., 2015, p. 255). In exploring the impact of IDs on coping mechanisms, Carver et al. (1989) propose two distinctive perspectives:

"The first, perhaps more obvious, possibility is that there are stable coping "styles" or "dispositions" that people bring with them to the stressful situations that they encounter. According to this view, people do not approach each coping context anew, but rather bring to bear a preferred set of coping strategies that remains relatively fixed across time and circumstances. The second possibility goes a step further. Specifically, it might be argued that preferred ways of coping with stress derive from more traditional personality dimensions. That is, perhaps certain personality characteristics predispose people to cope in certain ways when they confront adversity." (p. 270).

In essence, the exploration of IDs serves as a key to unlocking the complexity of boredom and coping strategies in language learning as "there is a growing realisation that it is constellations of ID factors rather than isolated variables that determine learning outcomes but also that the contribution of such factors is at least to some extent dependent on learning environments" (Pawlak & Csizér, 2022, p. 1). It offers a lens through which researchers and educators can appreciate the diversity of learners' experiences as "emotions are likely to impact on students' L2 learning and performance by directing attentional processes and the use of cognitive resources, inducing and sustaining student interest in the learning material, triggering different modes of information processing, and facilitating/impeding students' engagement and self-regulation of learning" and, consequently, "the collaboration between L2 learning researchers and experts in achievement emotions in designing classroom interventions that target emotions will ultimately benefit the development and learning of instructed L2 learners" (Shao et al., 2019, pp. 1-9).

1.2.2. Environment of the Classroom

Given the crucial role of the dynamic nature of formal classrooms in the field of L2, the concept of classroom climate encompasses various aspects that relate to all student and teacher behaviours and performance (Joe et al., 2017; Tu, 2021). The quality fostered by the characteristics and behaviours of both teachers and students, as well as their interactions and engagement and participation in the tasks that exist in the context of a classroom, can be conceptualised as the social climate of the classroom (Mohammadi & Aliakbari, 2018). Similarly, Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) demonstrate the importance of the direct connection between the physical environment and the dynamics within it by taking a practical approach to classroom dynamics that builds on interactions and communication among other group processes in terms of a social climate in the classroom.

Consequently, the complex nature of class social climate in L2 manifests itself in its various conceptualizations, ranging from classroom environment “the atmosphere, ambiance, tone, or climate that pervades the particular educational setting” (Dorman et al., 2006, p. 2) to socio-emotional climate and physical aspects.

As an integral part of promoting learning in the classroom, scholars have formulated, examined, and categorised the dimensions of class social climate into four major types that are inextricably linked to one another: support from the teacher, mutual respect in the classroom, task-based interaction with students, promotion of performance goals (Patrick & Ryan, 2005; Patrick et al., 2007). The notion of teacher support refers to students’ assumptions about how and to what extent the teacher values them. Promoting mutual respect involves whole-class interest and respectful interaction with others, talking nicely, avoiding bullying, proper classroom behaviour, including respect for teachers and peers. Task-based interaction is related to interactions occurring between learners and engagement in meaningful academic tasks and the amount of interaction between students. The promotion of performance goals focuses on competition, taking into account factors that contribute to teacher ability to make comparisons between students. Consequently, since the potential of class social climate is still in an incipient stage, it needs to be further scrutinised in terms of students’ inner feelings and beliefs L2 context surrounding boredom in academic settings. Of relevance to the present study is the study of the boredom mechanism in language learning research is rather limited (Pekrun et al., 2010),

despite being shown to be commonly experienced by students in a wide range of learning environments (Baker et al., 2010) and “inextricably linked to other individual learner variables” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 4).

1.2.3. Mindsets of Learners

It is well documented that there is a strong interplay between internalised beliefs and mindsets in terms of abilities and academic performance of students that is significantly predictive of the degree of their L2 learning (Cacali, 2019). These belief systems appear to function in a self-fulfilling prophecy that contributes to how English language learners perceive themselves in relation to failure and thus produce success, which in turn promotes the development of successful coping efforts across a range of conditions in the L2 classroom (Dweck, 2006). Given its critical importance, L2 learning is complex, highly valued, and demanding, influenced by numerous factors that make the learning process quite challenging for learners (Cacali, 2019). Given the link between mindset and language learning success, it is necessary for students to strive to overcome the challenges they face that hinder the student’s mindset. Building on the concept of “learned helplessness”, Dweck (2017) puts the formation of mindsets (or beliefs) at the centre of social and personality development, and she argues that “mindsets fostered goals, attributions, and reactions to setbacks” and summarises the characteristics of mindsets as “part of personality, which are quite stable, but also dynamic and malleable” (p. 2). Rooted in social-cognitive perspective, it is noted that the mindset is mainly attributed to self-related beliefs, goals, and inferences that could affect individuals’ academic performance and self-esteem (Molden & Dweck, 2006).

The concept of mindset was split into two categories: a) a fixed mindset (entity theory) and b) a growth mindset (incremental theory). In the first mindset, individuals assume that their personal characteristics are fixed and stable, while in the second mindset, individuals perceive personal characteristics to be malleable and dynamic, and with much effort and strategy, they can cultivate their abilities rather than feeling hopeless (Altunel, 2019; Dweck, 2006, 2017; Nussbaum & Dweck, 2008; Yeager & Dweck, 2012). The pedagogical significance of exploring mindset among other IDs stems from the fact that they help teachers create a positive class social climate that takes students’ interaction and involvement into account.

Although the growth mindset has captured the attention of researchers across the spectrum of L2 learning, it warrants further empirical work (e.g., Altunel, 2019; Bai & Guo, 2021; Bai & Wang, 2020; Burnette et al., 2013; Dweck, 2017).

The idea here is that students' emotional experiences has been found to exert an influence on engagement and learning, with positive emotions promoting achievement and negative emotions inhibiting achievement either on their own or in relation to other variables, for example Dweck (2006) reminds us of the crucial part played by a growth mindset that could dissipate the lingering effects of negative emotions such as the sense of heightened anxiety on academic performance. As a commonly experienced negative emotion, anxiety has been the focus of much research to date (Dewaele, 2016; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Horwitz, 2010). Given its negative impact reported in most cases (Mercer & MacIntyre, 2014), anxiety has been conceived as a key predictor of achievement or failure (MacIntyre, 1999). However the research focus should be shifted away from the exclusive concentration on anxiety, as there are diverse negative and unpleasantly perceived emotions other than anxiety such as shame, frustration, anger and of particular salience is the discussion of boredom (Aragão, 2011; Finch et al., 2015; Shao et al., 2020; Tyson et al., 2009). As such, more research is needed that documents evidence for the complex construct of boredom and mindsets of the learners in the L2 classroom as boredom can be one of the constellations of variables that challenge the student's mindset.

1.2.4. Learner Engagement

The notion of engagement refers to the extent to which students participate in, pay attention to, and commit to class related activities (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012). Research in educational psychology interconnects motivation and the broader level of engagement that leads to academic achievement (Phillips, 2015). The importance of engagement has been well acknowledged in the literature as it can enhance the learning process, as students who are more engaged in the classroom are more motivated and perform better. Individuals who exhibit higher levels of engagement are described as “energized, dedicated, attracted, effortful, and determined” (Zhang, 2021, p. 2) while sustained low levels of engagement are associated with “apathy, discouragement, disruptive behavior, and absenteeism” (Guilloteaux, 2016, p. 23).

However, there have not been many studies that address this important ID variable (Mercer, 2020). Given the important but complex nature of engagement, it is conceptualised in different ways in terms of task and course engagement (Reeve, 2013). Drawing on extensive theoretical knowledge, the construct of engagement has been established as a multifaceted framework (Zhang, 2021). Across its various dimensions, student engagement comprises four central and contextualised elements: behavioural, cognitive, emotional, and agentic engagement (Reeve, 2012, 2013). First, behavioural engagement implicates the evaluation of the students in terms of effort, attention, and concentration. In addition, emotional engagement includes either task-promoting or task-drawing emotions such as interest and distress. Moreover, cognitive engagement is exemplified by the use of strategies that are sophisticated rather than superficial. Finally, agentic engagement is characterised by the active participation of the learner (Reeve, 2013). Considering that various factors exert an influence on engagement that further affects classroom performance, Guilloteaux (2016) puts forward a triadic componential framework that lists aspects that affect engagement: phenomenological, individual, and instructional factors. Phenomenological factors relate to task complexity (whether the task is high or low challenge), cultural understanding, the nature of the task, learner capabilities, the value of the task, and individual factors include demographic features such as age and gender, the learner's class, and finally instructional factors involve various facets of the teacher such as, motivation, the teacher's behaviour, the teacher's support, the teacher's expertise and practises. On the basis of the above, the creation of a positive class social climate and the consideration of learners' identity by teachers are mediated by the instructional and individual factors. Dovetailing with these claims, it can be deduced that building and maintaining teacher-student rapport as well as creating a healthy and positive classroom climate, entails teacher's ability which otherwise might result in boredom. Teachers' ability to change learners' mindsets and create a positive class social climate act as an important factor in classroom engagement, which in turn might help reduce boredom in the L2 classroom. Despite the important role that students' beliefs, mindsets, and emotions play in L2 learning, evidence on their influence on students' academic engagement with boredom is limited.

1.2.5. Boredom

People can experience the feeling of boredom in any aspect of life, at any time, in any area of their lives, from all cultures anywhere in the world regardless of socio-demographic variables (Bargdill, 2000; Barnett, 2005; Chin et al., 2017; Danckert, 2019; Elpidorou, 2018; Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2013; Mann, 2016b; Tam et al., 2021, 2022; Tsapelas et al., 2009; Vodanovich et al., 2011; Wagner & Finkielstein, 2021; Williams, 2015; Zakay, 2014). Defining boredom as “the experience that arises from exposure to stimulus conditions which are perceived to be either uniform or repetitive, and which also induce a desire for change or variety.”, Thackray (1981) stated that boredom is “potentially harmful” for people (pp. 167-174). According to Macklem (2015), boredom is one of the most ubiquitous feelings experienced by learners. Although learners sometimes clearly express that they are bored, this is overlooked by teachers instead of getting at the root of the problem (boredom and its causes) and is associated with various other reasons, e.g., anxiety, depression, personality traits, etc. Weinerman and Kenner (2016) illustrated the important role that boredom plays in the academic environment, and pointed out that in a scenario where students are constantly trying to cope with the difficulties of boredom and the resulting consequences, negative consequences can occur, especially for students who are unable to develop skills to cope with boredom, affecting their grades and even dropping out of school. They stressed the importance of reckoning with students’ perspectives rather than delivering just the course content and talked about the importance of letting students to communicate their thoughts rather than avoiding this topic because it gives instructors the opportunity to hear students’ voices. Fahlman et al. (2013) referred to boredom as “the aversive experience of having an unfulfilled desire to be engaged in satisfying activity” and characterised the experience of bored people as “either agitated, high arousal and/or lethargic” or experiencing low arousal, marked by “a slow passage of time and an inability to focus his or her attention.” (pp. 69-70). Dividing boredom into affective, cognitive, motivational, physiological, and expressive components, Goetz and Hall (2014) regarded boredom as “low in arousal and somewhat unpleasant in nature”, and academic boredom as “intense and frequent emotion in academic settings” (p. 325). Taken together, boredom is a negative and widespread feeling in the academic environment.

Boredom is defined as “an affective indicator of unsuccessful attentional engagement in valued goal-congruent activity” and has a broadening effect on theories that examine boredom from environmental, attentional, and functional perspectives (Westgate & Wilson, 2018, p. 689). This conceptualization, rooted in psychological literature, reveals two primary components of boredom: attention and meaning. The former consisting of ill-balanced or mismatched cognitive demands and efforts, and the latter involving a discrepancy between the perceived value of activities and the value placed in goals. The feeling of boredom arises from an individuals’ inability or unwillingness to cognitively engage in a task at hand (Westgate & Wilson, 2018). Conceptualising boredom as “a state of disengagement” (p. 432), Kruk and Zawodniak (2020) substantiates the key factors underpinning boredom as repetitive teacher-led activities, learners’ negative attitudes towards to the language, giving up trying to deal with this negative situation and teacher’s lack of engagement. Further thought-provoking insights into the dynamic nature of boredom were offered by Pekrun et al. (2010), who enriched the conceptualization of the phenomenon by showing that boredom is not monolithic but complex and multilayered. The factors enhancing boredom-provoking situations can be classified in four ways: affective (lack of pleasant feelings), cognitive (time perception), physiological (low arousal level), expressive (facial expressions, posture, and vocal behaviour). Based on these different dimensions of boredom and the “circumplex model of affect” developed by Russell (1980), which identifies two primary types of affective states in terms of their valence and arousal, scholars tapped into the mechanisms of boredom (Goetz et al., 2014; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2020; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b).

Another concept of paramount importance is the four-category concept developed by Goetz and Frenzel (2006), which divides boredom into four distinct subgroups with respect to varying degrees of intensity: indifferent, calibrating, searching, and reactant boredom. Indifferent boredom suggests that low arousal and mild positive valence are strong determinants of general indifference to and distract from the outside world, triggering a sense of relaxation and serene fatigue. Calibrating boredom is defined as a mildly unpleasant emotional state characterised by low levels of boredom and mildly negative valence associated with students’ not paying attention to and performing classroom tasks and not trying to change this. Searching boredom is a concept that has been associated with negative valence and

higher arousal compared to calibrating boredom and has been described as more unpleasant, a feeling of restlessness but learners seek out opportunities to take action to alleviate overwhelming feelings of boredom unlike calibrating boredom. Reactant boredom involves high arousal and high negative valence and can be described as the most unpleasant level of boredom. Learners are likely to give up trying to overcome existing challenges due to a sense of pressure and negative repercussions and boredom is attributed to external factors and classroom dynamics, such as peers, tasks and teacher behaviour. Finally, Goetz et al. (2014) proposed an additional, fifth type called apathetic boredom. It is manifested by low arousal levels and high negative valence that bears little resemblance to the conditions present in learned helplessness or depression and is described as unpleasant and associated with lower levels of positive emotions, well-being, and dissatisfaction. Furthermore, boredom has been classified into two major categories: Trait and State. From a construct perspective, trait boredom and state boredom are two broad constructs that have been used to study boredom. Trait boredom, defined as a tendency to be bored, refers to the “general propensity to experience boredom across a wide variety of situations” while state boredom refers to “the actual experience of boredom in a given moment” (Fahlman et al., 2013, p. 70). These two types of constructs represent two pillars of boredom in different contexts. While some scholars associate boredom with positive and mediating effects (e.g., Elpidorou, 2018; Harris, 2000; Mann, 2016a; Schubert, 1977, 1978), the negative effects of this notion are further evidenced by a variety of empirical findings (Alrabai, 2022a; Zhao & Wang, 2023). With respect to this continuum, researchers often remind us that the experience of this negative phenomenon is positively linked to negative learning experiences in terms of behaviour and physiology and negatively linked to satisfactory learning experience and improved learning outcomes (Chapman, 2013; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b; Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2002, 2010; Robinson, 1975; Tze et al., 2014a, 2016). Reeve (2012) yielded the engagement following three categories: behaviour, emotions, cognition and referred to boredom as one of the “task-withdrawing emotions” closely related to the notion of disengagement (p. 151), and with regard to this, a mounting body of research related to this concept was conducted that underscores the connection between the two (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2020; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b). Given the aforementioned empirical evidence, from an

educational perspective, further research is needed on the factors that cause boredom and the strategies used in the service of education to overcome it.

1.2.5.1. Theoretical underpinnings of boredom.

The reasons for possible parameters leading to the occurrence of boredom have been one of the foci in various theorizations of boredom. In tune with the prevailing theoretical and empirical devotion to nature and outcomes of this phenomenon, numerous theoretical frameworks have been associated with boredom, demonstrating that its importance as a construct extends beyond a single paradigm. Hill and Perkins (1985) developed the forced effort model in which they examined learner performance across task conditions in terms of personality, situational, and task characteristics and the influence of different task features on two dimensions of cognitive and affective boredom. At the heart of this theory is the concept of subjective monotony as a cognitive component and high frustration level as an affective component. The results suggest that task complexity has an impact on all aspects of learning performance where students should exert excessive cognitive effort, even if the task is monotonous, repetitive, simple, or less complex which could lead to frustration. The under-stimulation model originated in the context of educational psychology and was developed as a theory of boredom by Larson and Richards (1991). They suggest that the potential sources of boredom are the value placed on the task, e.g., tasks perceived overly simple (low task demands) and repetition and proposed that they hinder the degree of arousal and thus trigger boredom. The attentional theory of boredom proneness postulate that a learner's sense of low attentional control could negatively impact on their persistence with the task, degrade learners' attention orientation to sustain their focus and concentration, thereby promoting the experience of boredom (Carriere et al., 2008; Cheyne et al., 2006; Damrad-Frye & Laird, 1989; Eastwood et al., 2007; Fisherl, 1993; Harris, 2000; LePera, 2011; Malkovsky et al., 2012). The control value theory of achievement emotions identified a link between low perceived control over tasks, perceived value of the activity and the occurrence of boredom (Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2010; Tulis & Fulmer, 2013). Learners with a low level of perceived value and control in academic tasks and outcomes tend to suffer more from boredom in the learning environment. It seems likely that tasks that create a sense of low value and

low control in learners in the classroom will also likely result in boredom. Emotion theory, which links boredom to alexithymic traits, suggests that learners with higher levels of emotion control and regulation are more likely to move away from boredom and develop emotional awareness and emotional regulation strategies to cope with boredom (Eastwood et al., 2007, 2012). From the perspective of a dimensional model (Pekrun et al., 2010), boredom has been acknowledged to have both facilitative and debilitating impacts on learning. Specifically, facilitative boredom serves as a drive in the specific conditions that lead to improvement in setting new goals. The Menton Theory of Boredom proposed by Davies and Fortney (2012) asserts that the process of cognitive energy is foregrounded to promote task performance and establishes a link between physiological resources, called mentons, and doing well on a task. It speculates that tasks that are perceived either as overly complex or overly simple result in boredom and boredom may have a positive impact on acquiring or improving new skills (Davies & Fortney, 2012).

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Although IDs such as anxiety, aptitude, motivation, or language learning strategies are among extensively researched topics in the field of L2, little research so far has explored the experience of boredom among all the emotional factors L2 learners may encounter during their L2 learning (cf. Dörnyei, 2013, 2019; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Li, 2016; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Pawlak, 2020b; see also; Goetz et al., 2014; Macklem, 2015). Nevertheless, boredom is a topic of growing interest in the field of language learning and teaching so increasing recent attention has been paid to boredom in Polish, Chinese, and Iranian L2 contexts (e.g., Elahi Shirvan et al., 2021; Li, 2021; Li et al., 2023a; Pawlak et al., 2020b, 2020c, 2020d, 2021a, 2021b).

However, boredom could also have a mediating effect and lead to positive outcomes. For example, it leads learners to pay more attention to failures or difficulties, to be better able to manage and tackle the existing challenges instead of giving up, and to shape or regulate their awareness of positive emotions (Botes et al., 2021; Ching & Chan, 2020; Miller & Godfroid, 2020; Teimouri, 2018). With this caveat in mind, there is an urgent need to critically and comprehensively examine the role of boredom, conceded as a silent, debilitating, negative, and unpleasant affective

state (Daniels et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2006; Pekrun et al., 2010, 2014), yet there have not been many studies that address boredom and boredom coping strategies in the context of L2 learning. Given the growing body of literature on emotional conditions such as anxiety, joy, or interest (Goldberg et al., 2011; Pekrun et al., 2010), a fresh empirical perspective on boredom is needed with an emphasis on L2 learning (Chapman, 2013; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017; Pawlak et al., 2020b). The motivation behind this study lies in the understanding that an in-depth examination of boredom and its coping mechanisms can offer valuable insights into improving the quality of education, fostering student engagement, and enhancing overall well-being within educational settings. Consequently, this research seeks to address these gaps and contribute to the existing body of knowledge, providing practical implications for educators and learners in the field of L2 learning.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

Boredom can be attributed to a low or high level of arousal, altered perception of time, a low level of attention and disengagement (Fahlman et al., 2013). Disengagement and disaffection have been recognized as determinants of boredom and associated with student passivity, giving up, and mental withdrawal which exert a negative impact on their engagement, initiation, and effort (Henry & Thorsen, 2018). Boredom, among other emotions regarded as operate across a number of components including cognitive, affective and motivational, expressive and peripheral physiological processes, and emotional moods (Hill & Perkins, 1985; Pekrun, 2006) and due to its multidimensional construct boredom is differentiated from disinterest and characterised as unique which may lead teachers to overlook it (Daniels et al., 2015; Dewaele & Li, 2021; Pekrun et al., 2010). Boredom, by virtue of its complex dynamic construct, is interwoven with a number of ID factors such as motivation, anxiety, willingness to communicate, and self-regulation, and there are a number of studies uncovering the reciprocity between them (e.g., Kruk, 2016b, 2021; Pekrun et al., 2010; Zawodniak & Kruk, 2018). Although EFL field has acknowledged the importance of boredom as an academic emotion (e.g., Chapman, 2013; Elahi Shirvan et al., 2021; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018; Li, 2021; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2021a), to our knowledge, few studies have specifically addressed its role in EFL language development and coping strategies used in the preparatory schools.

Therefore, the aim of the present study is to comprehensively investigate boredom, boredom coping strategies employed and achievement in preparatory setting in southeastern university in Turkey. By doing so, the research endeavors to bridge aforementioned research gaps in knowledge, providing direction for progress towards nuanced interplay of boredom, boredom coping strategies and achievement within the specific context of EFL language development and preparatory school environments.

1.5. Statement of Research Questions

The study specifically addressed the following overarching research questions:

Research Question 1. What are EFL students' boredom levels?

Research Question 2. Do students with different boredom levels have different boredom coping strategies?

Research Question 3. Is there a relationship between EFL students' boredom levels and their English success?

Research Question 4. Do students in different proficiency levels, namely A1, A2 and B1 differ in their boredom levels and implementation of boredom coping strategies?

1.6. Significance of the Study

The growing awareness of the conceptualization of emotions as individual learner differences among learners is of paramount importance and has long been a major focus in the domain of L2 learning (Arnold, 2011; Dewaele, 2015; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012a; Nakamura, 2018; Sampson, 2020). Given the increasing prominence of the immediate and widespread occurrence of boredom within and across individuals in learning environments, the concept of boredom is of utmost importance (Jean & Simard, 2011; Loewen et al., 2009; Nett et al., 2010; Pekrun et al., 2010; Tze et al., 2016; Vogel-Walcutt et al., 2012). Scholars have brought into the limelight that boredom can lead to the emergence of negative issues in terms of learning behaviour and outcomes (Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2002, 2010; Robinson, 1975; Tze et al., 2014a, 2016) and researches attribute a

crucial role to learners' orientations in regulating boredom, as they promote L2 learning by further contributing to L2 learners' autonomy and self-regulation (Dörnyei, 2013; Kormos & Csizér, 2014; Tseng et al., 2006). Studies of this phenomenon have been largely unexplored for a long time, and in recent years have been used only to a limited adoption as the subject of studies in the field of L2 learning (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017, 2018, 2020; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b) to name but a few. With respect to this continuum, this study aims to identify the basic premises of the factors underlying boredom and the coping strategies of learners who experience boredom in order to contribute to a better theoretical foundation of boredom and to take a closer view at its complexity in great detail in the L2 classroom.

1.7. Assumptions of the Study

It is noteworthy to address some important assumptions of this study. At the start of the questionnaires, participants' individual consent was obtained and participants were informed that participation was optional. Also, in case participants would have potential concerns about the negative effect on their course grade, the questionnaires were implemented after their final course scores had been announced. In addition, in order to avoid language barriers affecting their responses, translated versions of data collection tools, which were originally constructed in English, were employed for the Turkish respondents to ensure they fully understood the items. Meanwhile, to prevent translation-related measurement errors, the original version of the scales used for international participants to ensure full understanding and expression. Moreover, the participants received neither course credit nor financial compensation for their participation in the research. Even more, the questionnaire was prepared and distributed in a traditional paper-and-pen format for the purpose of user-friendliness and easy navigation. Significantly, participants were assured of data anonymity and confidentiality to mitigate response bias (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). Bearing these in mind, it is therefore only natural that participants were assumed to take part in the survey willingly, fully understand the questions posed and answer the questions honestly, sincerely, carefully and faithfully depending on their experiences. Data were checked for inconsistencies and outliers were excluded.

The validity and reliability of the questionnaires are ensured as previous studies have utilised them effectively (Eren, 2013, 2016; Eren & Coskun, 2016; Nett et al., 2010; Van Tilburg & Igou, 2012). Likewise, the number of the participants (N=219) was sufficient to represent the population. As evidence continues to accumulate, questionnaires employed are believed to collect sufficient data to provide answers to above mentioned questions for the current research. In closing, cross-sectional data aims to ensure correlational evidence of the relationship between boredom, boredom coping strategies and English language learning achievement.

1.8. Limitations of the Study

Although this study yielded valuable insights into boredom and language proficiency, it is not immune from limitations. First, drawing on a quantitative research design posed particular challenges to understand the nature of boredom and identify factors underlying the feeling of boredom. Despite being objective and reliable (Taylor & Trumbull, 2005) quantitative methods may not capture nuances that explain the complexity of boredom, coping strategies, and language learning during the L2 learning process. To develop a deeper understanding, future research might consider the benefit of qualitative methods of data collection and longitudinal data or bring together of both quantitative and and qualitative approaches as “synergy of both allows for a comprehensive analysis that can balance a persuasive, generalizable analysis with nuance and complexity” (Jacobs, 2003, p. 14) to obtain more rigorous results and generate insights with finer granularity.

Second, this study is limited by using self-report questionnaires, which are susceptible to response bias and may be influenced by social desirability and even though self-ratings “have the unique advantage of accessing internal feelings and thoughts”, it limits the comprehension of EFL learners’ boredom, coping efforts, and English proficiency due to “the subjective nature of these measures is often difficult to control” (Shao & Parkinson, 2021, p. 21) as “the self-report questionnaire has weakness in proving a more stable result due to the inaccurate scoring by the participants” (Lan et al., 2023, p. 12). In order to pursue an in-depth and nuanced understanding of episodes of boredom, future studies need to focus on learner diaries, classroom observations, interviews, and focus groups. By using diverse methods, L2 researchers may contribute to the understanding of when and how

changes in boredom occur and how they develop over time and have a thorough and solid understanding of EFL learners' boredom, coping efforts, and English proficiency.

Third, the study is limited by the cross-sectional design of the study as “a cross-sectional study cannot establish a causal relationship between variables” however it is a pivotal element “as it verifies that a relationship exists between the key variables” (King et al., 2015, p. 64). On that regard, the findings provide a snapshot of the relations between boredom, boredom coping strategies and language learning achievement as the data collected at one point in time and carried out only once for the present study, failing to track boredom levels over time and identify whether the derived boredom coping profiles were stable over time. Future research may adopt more sophisticated research designs involving a mixed methods approach with a longitudinal research design in nature which would enable them to ensure power of causality among these variables and obviously, more future research is needed to tease out the interwoven relationship between boredom, boredom coping strategies and language learning achievement so as to better understand the mechanisms underpinning learners' L2 boredom.

Furthermore, the current study might be limited by the uneven proportion of females and males (representing mainly female university students), and the representativeness of the sample. Since the participants were preparatory students constrained to a single Foreign Languages School in southeastern Turkey and a convenience sample of students was utilised, the results cannot represent all Turkish university EFL students, are contextually-bound and the generalizability of its findings is limited. Future research should benefit from a larger sample size, recruit a more equally balanced sample of male and female participants and expand the sample to more diversified educational contexts, different cultural contexts and a wider range of instructional and educational levels.

1.9. Definitions of Key Terms and Abbreviations

The following key terms are identified in order to contribute to a nuanced understanding of this study down below as follows:

Emotion: Despite the “lack of consensus on the definition of emotion” emotion in language learning can be characterized “as affective experiences that are

tied directly to language learning activities and resulting learning outcomes, a dynamic process which is determined by appraisals of socio-culturally shaped L2 learning tasks.” (Shao et al., 2019, p. 2).

Control Value Theory: Boredom research enlightened by Control Value Theory (Pekrun, 2006). This theory suggests that “if a learner feels himself/herself in control of an interesting/important task, positive emotions including enjoyment will arise, while if an important task is perceived as uncontrollable, negative emotions like anxiety will occur, and if a task is perceived as unimportant/uninteresting and under-challenging or over-challenging, negative emotions including boredom may occur.” (Li et al., 2023a, p. 2).

Coping Strategies: Coping strategies can be sorted into four distinct categories based on two identified dimensions: “The first dimension identifies the focus of the coping strategy as either approach or avoidance. Approach strategies involve coping by solving the problem, whereas, avoidance strategies involve coping by evading or fleeing the problem. The second dimension distinguishes between cognitive and behavioural strategies related to coping.” (Nett et al., 2010, p. 628).

Academic emotions: Academic emotions denotes to “emotions that are directly linked to academic learning, classroom instruction, and achievement (e.g., enjoyment of learning, pride of success, or test-related anxiety).” (Pekrun et al., 2002, p. 92).

Boredom: Foreign language boredom can be defined as “an unpleasant feeling characterized by lack of cognitive stimulation, low physiological arousal and a sense of disengagement toward the language tasks” (Shao et al., 2019, p. 4).

Engagement: Foreign language engagement can be delineated as “a state of heightened attention and involvement, in which participation is reflected not only in the cognitive dimension, but in social, behavioural, and affective dimensions as well” (Philp & Duchesne, 2016, p. 3).

Disengagement: Disengagement has been regarded “as a complete lack of engagement, effort, interest, enthusiasm and/or prosocial conduct, which entails an individual’s total non-commitment and withdrawal from what others do with involvement and/or enjoyment” and considered as “one of the most fundamental components of boredom and at the same time its overt manifestation” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 2) while also conceived as “flip side of engagement” (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 4).

Anxiety: Foreign language anxiety can be specified as “worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p. 284).

Enjoyment: Foreign language enjoyment has been introduced as “indicative of a state in which psychological needs are being met” (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014, p. 242).

Motivation: Foreign language motivation has been conceptualized as a “combination of effort plus a desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (Gardner, 1985, p. 10).

Self efficacy: Self efficacy is referred to as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391).

Willingness to communicate: Willingness to communicate is “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2” (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547).

CBS: Coping with the Boredom Scale

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CVT: Control Value Theory

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

FLE: Foreign Language Enjoyment

FLCA: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety

FLCAS: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

LBS: Level of Boredom Scale

SFL: School of Foreign Languages

TOEFL: Test of English as a Foreign Language

1.10. Summary

This chapter mainly focused on the role of boredom, notably the most frequently experienced emotion in L2 learning, including its types and sources, and theoretical underpinnings of the notion of boredom. It then centred on, probed into and presented the tangled relationship among boredom, IDs, mindsets and engagement, and coping strategies, all of which has profound relevance to the

classroom setting. The chapter concluded by highlighting the factors that exerts a powerful influence on language performance in language learning for finding out possible ways of mitigating students' boredom.



CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Presentation

This section begins by examining briefly emotions as they “deserve far greater attention in the language learning domain” (MacIntyre, 2002, p. 45) then academic emotions, elsewhere also called achievement emotions, including both positive and negative ones, specifically evolving around how they manifest in EFL settings. The concept of self-efficacy in EFL learning is then introduced, given self efficacy and learner engagement is perceived to be mediated by these academic emotions (Zhen et al., 2017). Furthermore, attention is given to foreign language classroom anxiety and enjoyment as two “discrete academic emotions” and distinct emotional states (Li et al., 2023b, p. 3), metaphorically considered as the “left and right feet” of the every L2 learner (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014, 2016), experienced by students during language learning activities, “with enjoyment being facilitative and anxiety being harmful to foreign language learning” (Li et al., 2022, p. 2) as the former is conceptualized as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128) in contrast, the latter is defined as “good feelings coming from breaking through homeostatic limits and stretching beyond oneself to accomplish something new or even unexpected, especially in face of some difficult tasks” (Li et al., 2018, p. 184).

The concept of foreign language boredom, put forward as “an aversive, debilitating and deactivating emotion that can seriously inhibit the learning process” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 2), also plays a vital and distinctive role within this context. Given the importance of understanding the potential role of boredom, this study will move on and first discuss the definition of boredom, notably the most prevalent experienced emotion (Daniels et al., 2015; Daschmann et al., 2011; Kruk, 2021; Mann & Robinson, 2009; Tze et al., 2016), then explain its major causes and present related theories, review research on boredom in general education, then review the first pioneering studies in which boredom research was integrated into the L2 learning in order to make these existing gaps clear that current research seeks to bridge and validate the purpose of the study.

2.2. Emotions and Academic Emotions

Emotions are defined as “the primary human motive” (MacIntyre, 2002, p. 61) and referred to as “the foundation of learning” (Zull, 2006, p. 7), comprising three sub-domains among others, affective, cognitive and physiological (Scherer, 2000). As Shao et al. (2019) aptly comment, classroom emotions can be conceptualized as “affective experiences that are tied directly to LL activities and resulting learning outcomes, a dynamic process which is determined by appraisals of socio-culturally shaped L2 learning tasks” (p. 2). Academic emotions, also known as achievement emotions, are simply characterized by Pekrun et al. (2002) as “emotions that are directly linked to academic learning, classroom instruction, and achievement (e.g., enjoyment of learning, pride of success, or test-related anxiety).” (p. 92). Drawing on insights from Pekrun’s (2006) taxonomy, academic emotions tend to fall on three underlying dimensions: “valence (positive vs. negative), level of activation (activating vs. deactivating), and object focus in terms of being related to either achievement activities (e.g., learning) or achievement outcomes (i.e., success and failure).” (Lichtenfeld et al., 2012, p. 191). Academic emotions consist of four categories: positive activating emotions such as hope, enjoyment and pride; positive deactivating emotions such as relief and relaxation; negative activating emotions such as anxiety, anger, and shame; and finally, negative deactivating emotions such as boredom and hopelessness (Pekrun et al., 2002). Embracing a broaden-and-build theory perspective on valence (Fredrickson, 2001), emotions such as enjoyment

(positive activating) enhance the act of learning, expand learners activities, increase their persistence and engagement, empower them to confront challenges, and eventually promote learning, while negative academic emotions can confine learner's resilience, undermine their engagement, and hinder learners' proficiency development (Derakshan et al., 2009; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2018; Pekrun et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2021).

Given that the nature of language is inextricably interlinked with the psychological process reflected in the three interdependent perspectives: language abilities, cognitive abilities, and emotional characteristics (Xu et al., 2022), emotions bear great importance and deserve special attention in the context of language learning (MacIntyre, 2002). Emotions are particularly powerful in that they are often predictive of learners' decisions to study and continue studying a foreign language or to keep up with a particular task (Méndez López & Peña Aguilar, 2013; Scherer, 2005).

2.3. Academic Emotions in the EFL Context

With the rise of the humanistic perspective, diverse emotions, both positive and negative ones, have been of constant interest among scholars in tandem with learners' well-being in the field of L2 acquisition (Dewaele & Li, 2018; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016; Dewaele et al., 2019a; MacIntyre, 2016; Mercer & MacIntyre, 2014; for a review; Li et al., 2020). In line with the general trend in L2 learning, due to sociocultural and linguistic concerns, despite the exclusive focus on the former, anxiety and enjoyment have garnered considerable scholarly attention and have been acclaimed as prominent emotional factors in L2 acquisition (Boudreau et al., 2018; Dewaele & Li, 2020; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Imai, 2010; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Liu, 2006; MacIntyre, 2017; Piniel & Albert, 2018; Saito et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2020).

Anxiety is one of the most pervasive feelings experienced by individuals and conceptualised as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours related to classroom learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” and is characterised by “subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (Horwitz et al., 1986, pp. 125-128). More recently, Li et al.'s (2020)

study with Chinese undergraduates, revealed that anxiety was significantly and negatively associated with self-perceived English proficiency whereas enjoyment positively did so. What we can agree upon is that, informed by Fredrickson's broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2003), beside anxiety, negative emotions such as fear, depression, stress, boredom, anger, and frustration undermine learning, while positive emotions such as hope, motivation, interest, empathy, confidence, self-esteem and enjoyment facilitate learning both of which exert a profound influence on L2 learning in a wide array of circumstances and can be viewed as distinct constructs rather than two sides of the same coin (Alrabai, 2022b; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Resnik & Dewaele, 2020). Despite the burgeoning line of inquiry vigorously pursued pertaining to this topic, much remains to be unknown about emotions along with anxiety and enjoyment.

2.4. Self-Efficacy in EFL

The concept of self-efficacy, oftentimes referred to as academic self-efficacy, which focuses on the one's belief about their own ability to accomplish a given task and to set and achieve effective and meaningful goals, was proposed by Bandura (1993) and conceptualised in educational psychology as a construct with motivational, cognitive, selective, and affective dimensions that is assumed to play a potentially key role in learner achievement. Having relied on Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory, this concept coupled with the characteristics of the environment could help learners shape or even determine the regulation of their knowledge and skills, thus might account for varying degrees of success in academic settings compared to less efficacious learners, confirming to the strong association between learners' self-efficacy and their environment (Pajares, 1997). Previous research has revealed that a strong relationship exists between improved self-efficacy beliefs and academic achievement, in a variety of educational contexts and learning conditions and a range of outcomes (Bong, 2002; Pajares, 1996; Richardson et al., 2012; Robbins et al., 2004). A meta-analysis of 7,167 published English language journal articles confirmed that self-efficacy ranks among the strongest predictors of academic success out of 50 measures, while intelligence, aptitude, and high school GPA are poorer predictors of academic success (Richardson et al., 2012).

Using the insights derived from the various theorizations of self-efficacy, a certain group of researchers has emphasised the malleability of this concept in terms of skills, tasks, and contexts, and it is believed that it can be largely enhanced by an appropriate pace of instruction on the part of classroom instructors (Klassen, 2004, 2006; Shih & Alexander, 2000; Woodrow, 2011). Even though the attribute has been subject to much empirical investigation across disciplines, e.g., in science and maths (Wang & Bai, 2017), addressing the conceptualization of self-efficacy in the context of the EFL is obviously still *terra incognita*, and thus there are only a few studies illuminating insight along this line of research. Nevertheless, the findings of these few cutting-edge researches that yield insights into the field are meritorious. For example, learners with a high grip of self-efficacy profile were less likely to experience anxiety than their peers with low self-efficacy and dedicate more time to mastering language learning, relied more on internal and personal control aspects than external attributions, pursued goals of mastery and performance-approach rather than performance-avoidance goals, were capable of utilising more self-regulated learning strategies, persevered better in the face of difficulty, scored higher on English tests, and were more successful in English (Diseth, 2011; Hsieh & Kang, 2010; Liem et al., 2008; Pajares, 2009; Raoofi et al., 2012; Tılfarlıoğlu & Cinkara, 2009; Wang & Bai, 2017; Woodrow, 2011).

2.5. Self-Efficacy and Academic Emotions

By drawing on the principles of control value theory (Pekrun, 2006), in which the author elaborates on two groups of appraisals, learner's cognitive appraisal of the control and values is regarded as a major antecedent of academic emotions (Pekrun, 2006; Putwain et al., 2018a). Within this conceptualization, control value appraisal refers to learners' confidence in the extent to which they feel in control of their learning activities and outcomes, paving the way to a self-perception of competence (i.e., academic self-efficacy). This being said, learners with a lower sense of efficacy seem to focus more on fear about learning activities and tend to be more in the anticipation of failure, manifest different degrees of appraisal threat in relation to challenging tasks, which in turn evoke the feeling of increased levels of anxiety about subsequent academic outcomes, accompanied by feelings of shame (Bandura, 1997; Putwain et al., 2010). On the other hand, students with high efficacy who have

developed a sense of competence and perceived control, are more likely to orient themselves to overcoming a series of challenges, and exert effort to build a history of success, and experience many more pleasant than unpleasant feelings due to goal attainment (Putwain et al., 2013). Accumulating evidence in the academic emotions' literature has established a consistent pattern that self efficacy would have a facilitative impact on human agency (Bandura, 1986) and is further evidenced by empirical investigations (Hayat et al., 2020; Mega et al., 2014; Putwain et al., 2013).

These studies (e.g., Putwain et al., 2013) showed a clear pattern that self-efficacy in study-related skills and behaviours are a positive predictor of students' more pleasant and fewer unpleasant academic emotions, either explicitly or implicitly via academic proficiency. Against this backdrop, the study by Zhen et al. (2017) demonstrated a more comprehensive and fine-tuned understanding of the mediating and moderating effects of academic emotions and provided evidence of reciprocal relationships between self-efficacy and learning engagement. In another study, not only was a similar pattern of result in academic emotions unveiled in the above mentioned studies, the authors also revealed that higher levels of self-efficacy were organically associated with the concepts of higher levels of enjoyment as opposed to lower levels of test anxiety (Pekrun et al., 2004). By linking self efficacy and academic emotions in a logically causal fashion it is plausible to speculate that this may lead to academic achievement.

2.6. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety

Since the 1970s, the concept of anxiety has become a recurring theme on L2 learning and a sizable body of research has been devoted to addressing this phenomenon (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Dewaele et al., 2019b; Horwitz, 2010; MacIntyre, 2017). Inspired by the Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), Horwitz and his colleagues (1986) put forward the concept of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA), elsewhere also called language anxiety, conceptualised as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviours related to classroom learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (p. 128) and ushered a new era of inquiry that shifted the focus away from cognitive approaches. In particular, Horwitz (2017) stressed that anxiety is a multidimensional construct and thus learners of L2, who experience

FLCA, may suffer from it as they “have the trait of feeling state anxiety when participating in language learning and/or use” (p. 33). Taking a broader compass, MacIntyre (2017) put it accurately that anxiety encompasses internal and social dimensions and, as he explains, “is influenced by internal physiological processes, cognitive and emotional states along with the demands of the situation and the presence of other people, among other things, considered over different timescales.” (p. 28), and research highlights the importance of both learner-internal variables and language classroom environment variables in reflecting their correlation with anxiety in L2 learning.

Prior research has demonstrated that the significant sources of FLCA could be attributed to both learner-internal and learner-external factors. Anxiety has been consistently found to either correlate with or be influenced by personality traits, on that regard, individuals with high levels of foreign language anxiety tend to exhibit lower levels of trait emotional intelligence and higher levels of perfectionism (Dewaele, 2017), have lower levels of language achievement (Liu, 2006; Liu & Jackson, 2008), have lower self-esteem and motivation (Teimouri, 2017; Young, 1991), have negative self-perceptions about their own language ability (Cheng, 2002), and are more prone to negative self-evaluation (Liu, 2006; Mak, 2011). When it comes to teacher-centred variables of FLCA, it is noted that teachers who are not responsive to students’ academic and emotional needs (Aida, 1994), resort to strict practices in error correction, do not allow students to use their mother tongue (Mak, 2011), do not allow adequate wait time (Mak, 2011; Tsui, 2001), employ activities in which students answer questions on their own without preparation, or give presentations without a written script (Liu, 2006) are regarded as anxiety-provoking characteristics of teachers’ instructional strategies. Dewaele and Dewaele’s (2017) argument that peer attitudes toward speech errors exert influence on social standing offers a good illustration of another type of learner-external variable that influences FLCA. Furthermore, several strategies, such as using humour among other key strategies, have been proposed for mitigating FLCA by promoting students’ agency, sense of flow, optimism and hope (Oxford, 2017).

2.7. Foreign Language Classroom Enjoyment and Anxiety

The need to shift the nexus of interest away from dealing exclusively with negative emotions at L2 learning to a more holistic point of view of both negative and positive emotions has been reported by many studies (Boudreau et al., 2018; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Imai, 2010; MacIntyre & Vincze, 2017; Mercer & MacIntyre, 2014; Saito et al., 2018). Derived from the “broaden and build” theory (Fredrickson, 2003), the characteristics of Positive Psychology are of interest (MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012b), given that the positive emotions “broaden people’s momentary thought-action repertoires and build their enduring personal resources, ranging from physical and intellectual resources to social and psychological resources” (Fredrickson, 2003, p. 219). Likewise, it seems likely that learners who appeared to have positive emotions spent more time noticing things in their classroom and were also more likely to display increased awareness of language input, which facilitates their L2 learning (MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012b). With this belief in mind, it is also argued that learners who have positive emotions can experience a longer term of positive affect because they promote students’ well-being, hardiness and resilience in the face of obstacles and setbacks in daily life outside of school (Dewaele et al., 2018; MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012b; Prior, 2019).

Growing attention has been devoted to enjoyment, one of the most researched positive emotions with potential effects on L2 learning. In line with Csikszentmihalyi (2004) and Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016), Boudreau et al. (2018) differentiated enjoyment from pleasure and put it eloquently: “If pleasure can occur simply by performing an activity or completing an action, enjoyment takes on additional dimensions such as an intellectual focus, heightened attention, and optimal challenge” (p. 153). With regard to L2 learning, enjoyment is one of the most important and pervasively experienced positive emotions by learners in a variety of contexts (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Frenzel et al., 2018; Pavelescu & Petrić, 2018; Piniel & Albert, 2018). Studies have documented that peer relations, peer interactions, and peer solidarity; supportive and encouraging peers and teachers; and a friendly, supportive, and positive classroom atmosphere in which class activities take place with the right level of challenge are pinpointed among the factors that positively influence the enjoyment of learning (Dewaele & Dewaele, 2017; Dewaele &

MacIntyre, 2014, 2016; Pavelescu & Petrić, 2018). Furthermore, it has been argued that enjoyment encourages L2 learners to focus intensely on language and acts as a driving force for successful target language acquisition (Dewaele & Alfawzan, 2018; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Saito et al., 2018). For instance, enjoyment has been noted to be a robust predictor of and factor contributing to increased willingness to communicate (Dewaele & Dewaele, 2018; Khajavy et al., 2018).

Situated within the Positive Psychology paradigm, Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) used a sample of 1746 students from across the world to develop the Enjoyment of Foreign Language Learning Scale, which includes 21 items related to students' positive emotions about their classmates, teachers, and learning experiences and in concert with eight items related to their FLCA, taken from Horwitz et al.'s (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). As noted, the results showcased that foreign language enjoyment (FLE) has a moderate correlation with anxiety. In L2 classes, students were more likely to demonstrate greater FLE and less FLCA if they had a positive perception of relative standing than their peers. Asian participants had significantly lower levels of classroom FLE and higher levels of FLCA than their counterparts. Somewhat surprisingly, female participants were found to score higher on the FLE and a FLCA scales than male participants. Qualitative analysis of data from 1,076 participants unearthed that stimulating and novel activities can spark student interest and provide an impetus to foster enjoyment in the L2 class. The data highlighted that a good classroom atmosphere is closely tied to the concept of enjoyment. Accordingly, enjoyment was easily evoked by “teachers who were positive, humorous, happy, well-organised, respectful of students, and praised them for good performance” and thereby leading to appreciation of teachers by learners (p. 264).

To follow this line of argument, Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016) claimed in their follow-up study based on the same dataset that there are two dimensions of FLE: social and private FLE. While the former is characterised by “positive feelings, encouraging peers, nice teachers and [a] supportive environment” (p. 225), the latter is characterised by “cognition that accompanies enjoyment” as well as “a sense of accomplishment” (p. 228). The interaction of these two dimensions could have profound effects on learners' emotions and create a coherent feeling.

Focusing on learners' gender differences in FLCA and FLE at item level, Dewaele and his colleagues (2016) furthered this line of argument with the same

dataset, finding that female language learners reported significantly more enjoyment and higher levels of mild FLA than male language learners. Bearing this in mind, it might be legitimate to consider that female language learners considered learning L2 interesting, tended to be more prideful than male language learners, more worried about making mistakes, and less confident in speaking L2. Narrative analysis manifests that FLE can also be associated with and is largely influenced by good grades, which increase learners' pride and empower their determination to achieve better academic performance in the L2 class; collaboration with peers, which is considered fun because it facilitates building learners' social bonds; fun and interesting games, which allow learners to be more creative and increase their motivation. Based on the conclusions derived by this study, it is reasonable to speculate that female learners "had more fun, pride, enjoyment, excitement, and that allowed them to be creative and become "cool" multilinguals" than male learners (p. 54). As hinted earlier, female learners were more motivated and engaged than male learners in L2 learning. Upon closer inspection, it is noteworthy that due to the meta-analytic method of the research, "gender differences might not be found on an inter-planetary level but rather on a detail-oriented, microscopic level" (p. 45).

In a study that was conducted on 189 British high school students learning different foreign languages such as Spanish, French, or German, Dewaele et al. (2018) examined a variety of learner-internal and teacher-related factors together with classroom-related factors with respect to FLE and FLCA and female learners were found to score higher on both FLCA and FLE. It is notable that FLE was more strongly related to teacher and teacher practices than FLCA. Lower levels of FLCA were related to "positive attitudes towards the FL, higher relative standing among peers in the FL and a relative advanced stage of development of the FL" (p. 19). Conversely, factors that contribute to higher levels of FLE include "positive attitudes towards the FL, the FL teacher, a lot of FL use by the teacher in class, a strong proportion of time spent by students on speaking, a higher relative standing among peers in the FL class and a relative advanced stage of development of the FL" (p. 19).

Another study in this respect is provided by Dewaele and Dewaele (2017), who examined the effects of age in secondary school students utilising a pseudo-longitudinal design, and the results showed that age made a difference in terms of a small change in FLCA and a modest increase in FLE across three age groups. That

being said, researchers have revealed weak negative associations between FLE and FLCA that are constant over time. Significantly, the analysis revealed that the effect of teachers on FLE increased over time in contrast to FLCA.

Following this trend, Dewaele and MacIntyre (2019), in a mixed-methods study carried out on 750 L2 learners across the world through an online questionnaire survey, yielded a significant negative correlation between FLE and FLCA, noting from correlation analyses that they are independent and separate dimensions. Interestingly, only on FLCA did female participants outperform males. By comparison, multiple regression analyses revealed that FLE was more likely to be predicted by teacher-centred factors, whereas FLCA was largely predicted by the personality trait Emotional Stability. Importantly, the study also qualitatively reports teacher characteristics as one of the leading causes of FLE experiences, whereas FLCA experiences are mostly associated with the self.

A more nuanced examination of teacher characteristics by Dewaele et al. (2019b), who studied 210 Spanish EFL students from across Spain in a quantitative study using an online questionnaire, found that students' levels of FLE and FLCA correlated significantly with teacher characteristics. Learners who had an L1 user of English as a teacher tended to experience more FLE and less FLCA compared to those who had L2 users of English as a teacher. However, with regard to teacher gender, no effects on FLE and FLCA were found among adult learners. The teacher's friendliness turned out to be a significant predictor of FLE, whereas the teacher's foreign accent was not. The factors that contribute to the feeling of FLCA are teachers who are strict, younger and who do not often use L2 in the classroom.

In a qualitative study, Méndez López and Fabela Cárdenas (2014) explored the effects of emotions on a sample of 18 Mexican EFL learners situated in the tertiary context. The study suggests that motivational level, self-regulation, and the social and cultural context in which learning occurs act as potential mediators of the relationship between the effects of positive and negative emotions and the language learning process. They further pointed out that negative emotions serve as fuel for motivation.

Adopting a mixed-method approach involving more than 2000 Chinese high school students, Li et al. (2018) conducted a systematic study in the Chinese context with respect to three dimensions of FLE. They used a modified 11-item version of Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) and Dewaele and MacIntyre's (2016) FLE scale and

investigated its psychometric properties. Participants scored markedly significantly higher on FLE-Teacher, FLE-Private and FLE-Atmosphere, with the first dimension being the highest. Qualitative data collected through open-ended questions revealed that the experience of FLE not only related to the impact of teachers and peers, but also to a range of learner-internal and learner-external variables.

Based on the principles of Positive Psychology and Complex Dynamic Systems Theory, Li and her colleagues (2020) conducted a mixed-methods study to investigate the effects of FLCA and FLE on the self-perceived English proficiency and actual English performance of 1,307 Chinese university students in China. FLCA and FLE have been shown to be robust predictors of self-perceived EFL competence at different levels in three achievement groups. It is particularly worth mentioning that the higher the level of achievement is, the stronger the relationship level is. Their qualitative data analysis revealed that the list of potential sources of FLCA included “bad performance, little progress in English tests, fear of being criticised by English teachers for bad test results” whereas “good test results, great progress in test results after hard work, promotion in relative FL standing, and being praised by English teachers for good test results” were the main sources of FLE (p. 19).

Drawing on a quantitative research design and a sample of 158 Chinese EFL undergraduate students and 303 L2 learners from around the world, MacIntyre et al. (2019b) have examined the emotional underpinnings of Gardner’s Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery. Statistically significant differences in emotions and attitudes/motivation were revealed between Chinese participants and international L2 learners. The former sample showed higher levels of negative emotions (upset, hostile, guilty, irritable, afraid, guilty, ashamed) and lower levels of positive emotions (proud, interested, attentive, enthusiastic, excited, attentive, inspired, active, determined, strong, alert). By the same token, similar pattern of results found in 10 of 11 AMTB dimensions, the authors found that Chinese participants reported significantly higher scores on negative dimensions (FLCA and FL Use Anxiety) and significantly lower scores on positive dimensions (Desire to Learn, Interest in Foreign Languages, Attitudes toward FL Speakers, Attitudes toward Learning the FL, Instrumental Orientation, Integrative Orientation, Evaluation of FL Teacher, FL Course Evaluation) than the international sample. Arguably, the differences in Chinese learners may have to do with educational and sociocultural causes due to the

exam-oriented EFL education in China, but also due to not having the opportunity to speak English with members of the target culture.

2.8. Boredom

Boredom occurs in many situations and settings, in a range of contexts and in many forms and people can experience boredom differently (Fahlman et al., 2009; Macklem, 2015). By way of illustration, watching a football match is an interesting activity for most men, while it can be a boring activity for some of the women. Toohey (2011) notes that “boredom may be a simple thing and it may be as basic as unemployment and bad housing, but it’s a real emotion that’s been felt throughout history.” (pp. 1-2). The term “boredom” can be traced back to the 18th century (Toohey, 2011). Boredom has been the subject of many cultural interests (Haladyn, 2015; Healy, 1984; Spacks, 1995). Research into boredom has a long history and early examples of interest into boredom include Kierkegaard and Heidegger (Svendsen, 2005). There was a relatively small body of literature that is concerned with boredom, and it was not until the early 19th century that it received much formal or systematic attention (Barmack, 1937; Fenichel, 1951; Fiske & Maddi, 1961; Geiwitz, 1966; Heron, 1957; Lewinsky, 1943; McDowall & Wells, 1927; O’Connor, 1967). Boredom is a commonly-used notion in psychology and yet it is a concept difficult to define precisely. To date there is no consensus about the definition of the word, several definitions of boredom have been proposed so it is quite possible to encounter different definitions from different researchers (Martin et al., 2006; Vodanovich, 2003). The term “boredom” is used by Barmack (1938) to refer to: “a state of conflict between the tendency to continue and the tendency to get away from a situation which has become unpleasant, principally because of inadequate motivation resulting in inadequate physiological adjustments to it” (p. 125).

A further definition of boredom is given by Greenson (1953) who describes its unique characteristics of it as:

“ a state of dissatisfaction and disinclination to action; a state of longing and the inability to designate what is longed for; a sense of emptiness; a passive, expectant attitude with the hope that the external world will

supply the satisfaction; a distorted sense of time in which time seems to stand still. ” (p. 7).

The first serious discussions and analyses of boredom emerged during the 1970s motivated psychologists that low levels of stimulation are associated with sustained attention (Abramson & Stinson, 1977; Bailey et al., 1976; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Hill, 1975; London et al., 1972; Schubert, 1978; Thackray et al., 1974). Prior to the work of Grubb (1975), the role of questionnaire-based self-report instruments which indicate it is possible to measure and report boredom was largely unknown. A notable example of these scales is the Boredom Susceptibility Scale (ZBS), which includes a 10-item subscale to the Zuckerman’s Sensation-Seeking Scale (SSS) (Zuckerman, 1979). Boredom is illustrated in the work of Zuckerman as the dimension of personality. Boredom is, for Zuckerman (1979), the situation which occurs when “an aversion for repetitive experience of any kind, routine work, or dull and boring people and extreme restlessness under conditions when escaping from constancy is impossible” (p. 103). A large body of research into boredom has been conducted with the help of the use of these questionnaires. Consequently, the bulk of studies on boredom have been quantitative in design. Traditionally, boredom has been considered to impact negatively upon a range of states of feeling and it has been argued that monotony, low arousal, aimlessness, lack of motivation, constraint, repetitiveness, and fatigue could be associated with or stems from boredom (Smith, 1981). The spread of psychological interest called for a paradigm shift in definitions of boredom in the 1980s. The meaning of this term has been extended to refer to an emotional construct. For this purpose, many theories, models and definitions have been put forward. The construct of classification of emotions including boredom was first articulated by Russell (1980) and popularised in his model: “a circumplex model of affect”. In his pioneering study, Russell (1980) showed that emotions can be divided into two dimensions horizontally (east-west) and vertically (north-south): pleasure-displeasure and arousal-sleepiness.

A broader perspective has been adopted by O’Hanlon (1981) who briefly defines the term as: “unique psychophysiological state possessing interrelated and inseparable emotional, motivational, perceptual and cognitive concomitants” (p. 53). He also puts forward the five basic characteristics of boredom as in the following:

“1. Boredom occurs as a reaction to task situations where the pattern of sensory stimulation is nearly constant or highly repetitious, and particularly when required motoric responding is contingent upon information contained within the monotonous stimulation.

2. Degrees of boredom reported by different individuals in the same monotonous working environment vary greatly.

3. An emotional component of boredom includes aversion to monotonous elements of the situation that are identified by the individual as the source of the feeling. Simultaneously, the individual is motivated to change the environment, vary his activity or escape the situation altogether.

4. Boredom can occur within minutes after the commencement of repetitive activity, particularly if that activity has been frequently experienced in the past.

5. Boredom is highly situation-specific and is immediately reversible when the situation changes to any large extent.” (p. 54).

Likewise, boredom formed the central focus of a study by Perkins and Hill (1985) in which the author found boredom appears to be related to a high level of frustration, low levels of interest and concentration. The key aspects of boredom could be listed as follows: cognitive and affective. Also, there was no evidence that boredom has an influence on psychophysiological changes. One of the first research groups to study the social psychology of boredom was Leary et al. (1986), who wrote: “boredom has been conceptualized in a variety of ways—in terms of its situational antecedents, drive properties, physiological correlates, phenomenological concomitants, and behavioral consequences.” (p. 968).

Following O’Hanlon’s study, a number of authors have considered the effects of social and psychological aspects of boredom seen in real life and how to mitigate them (Damrad-Frye & Laird, 1989; De Chenne, 1988; Drory, 1982; Ganley, 1989; Hamilton et al., 1984; Lee, 1986; Orcutt, 1984; Thackray, 1981).

Numerous studies have attempted to use mostly college undergraduate students who study psychology since they were nearest and available to participate in the research study in the 1980s (for example, Johnston & O’Malley, 1986; Ratliff & Burkhart, 1984; Titley & Titley, 1982; Tolor, 1989; Wolfgang & Dowling, 1981; Wright & Moore, 1982). To better understand the mechanisms of boredom and its effects, Maroldo (1986) analysed the relationship between boredom and academic performance in 122 male undergraduate students at Texas Lutheran College using the “College Student Boredom Scale” and found no significant correlation (negative

correlation) between boredom and their grade point average (p. 396). Aldridge and DeLucia (1989) were apparently the first to introduce the term “academic boredom” in higher education, characterising it as an “academic plague” (p. 43). They examined the feelings of 252 college students in the United States regarding boredom and concluded that nearly half of the participants (41%) experienced boredom as a consequence of a disparity between desired course expectations and actual course.

2.8.1. Boredom Proneness

Dividing the construct of boredom into state and trait, Farmer and Sundberg (1986) argues: “as a psychological issue, boredom is recognized as a widespread and significant problem” (p. 5). Almost 40 years ago, Farmer and Sundberg (1986), classifying boredom proneness as a personality trait, developed their 28-item self-report questionnaire, Boredom Proneness Scale (BPS), which focuses on “connectedness [with] the environment on many situational dimensions as well as the ability to access adaptive resources and realize competencies” and relates boredom to internal factors (p. 10) (see also, Struk et al., 2016; Vodanovich, 2003). Farmer and Sundberg (1986) studied the effects of boredom proneness on 63 college undergraduates in the United States and found that the observed difference between male and female participants in this study was not significant in terms of course grade or gender. Also, a positive, satisfactory correlation was found between Zuckerman’s ZBS and BPS but it is possible that they are measuring different dimensions of the same construct (Mercer-Lynn et al., 2011). This study is unique in that it measures the tendency to be bored rather than the actual experience of boredom, and it was a breakthrough in the field. This scale became a key instrument for assessing the trait boredom, as this type of full-scale instrument had not been developed before (Sharp et al., 2018). Because the scale has more complex psychometric components, researchers have been able to publish a substantial amount of literature on boredom proneness using an adapted version of this scale worldwide (Ahmed, 1990; Craparo et al., 2013; Danckert et al., 2018; Dursun & Tezer, 2013; Gana & Akremi, 1998; Gordon et al., 1997; Hunter & Eastwood, 2021; Melton & Schulenberg, 2009; Moody et al., 2017; Reijseger et al., 2013; Sharp et al., 2016, 2017; Struk et al., 2016; Urbanova & Pavelkova, 2022; Vodanovich &

Kass, 1990; Vodanovich et al., 1997, 2005). The main limitations with regard to its use are that much time has passed since the scale was developed and it has limitations in terms of psychometrics, but it is still used (e.g. Ashley & Shaughnessy, 2021; Baratta & Spence, 2018; Coughlan et al., 2017; Diehl & Wyrick, 2015; Jegaden et al., 2019; Liang et al., 2022; Moody et al., 2017; Mugon et al., 2018; Papathanasiou et al., 2021; Tassone et al., 2017). In the early 1990s and subsequent years, considerable literature has grown up around the theme of different types of boredom these types included but have not been exclusive to: leisure, sexual, marital, free-time, and self-report instruments in the form of questionnaires have continued to be used in addition to the BPS (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1987; Passik et al., 2003; Ragheb & Merydith, 2001; Watt & Ewing, 1996).

In 1993, blending all the definitions, psychologist Cynthia D. Fisher popularised the term “boredom” to describe: “an unpleasant, transient, affective state in which the individual feels a pervasive lack of interest in and difficulty concentrating on the current activity” (p. 396).

In the 1990s, the collaboration of authors Stephen Vodanovich, Steven Kass, and John Watt was worthy of scholarly attention in the United States. A number of factors, most of which were correlative, played a role in determining the effects of boredom proneness due to BPS.

Detailed examination of boredom proneness and psychosocial development on 142 college students in the United States by Watt and Vodanovich (1999) who describe individuals prone to boredom “(a) lacks motivation, goals, ambition, and a sense of meaning or purpose; (b) experiences varying degrees of negative affect, such as hopelessness, anxiety, depression, hostility, and loneliness; and (c) engages in maladaptive and unhealthy behaviors.” (p. 311) showed that there were notable differences between women and men in their tendency to experience boredom due to challenge, excitement, and variety. It is also worth noting that women were less likely to be bored than men. Moreover, there was extensive evidence of strong negative relationships between levels of boredom and psychosocial development (Watt & Vodanovich, 1999). Nevertheless, issues related to alleviating boredom were not particularly prominent in the data with the goal being the development of more efficient academic settings. Much of the available literature on boredom deals with the question of construction and psychometric properties of questionnaires as well as individual differences in personal psychology (Piotrowski, 2013), others such

as Eastwood et al. (2012), from a more cognitive perspective question the usefulness of utilising questionnaires in order to measure boredom. In the same vein, Fahlman et al. (2013) argue that a psychological distinction must be made between trait and state boredom, emphasising that while they look the same, they are in fact very different on grounds of measuring strength and frequency. Mercer-Lynn et al. (2013), conceptualising the notion of boredom as a multifaceted and by no means unitary construct, sought to answer the question of whether there is a relationship between more frequent experiences of boredom and high scores on the boredom proneness scale. Vogel-Walcutt et al. (2012) pointed out that as an alternative to subjective measures of boredom observational methods could be used to assess boredom, either by human observers or computer-based assessment approaches or, physiological measures such as electroencephalographs, galvanic skin response, electromyography, and eye-tracking, adding that they can provide accurate, valid, reliable, objective, and real-time data compared to self-reports such as BPS. In the same vein, Cinkara and Cabaroğlu (2015) presented arguments that confirmed the above-mentioned discourses in their research using the eye-tracking method and provided a fine-grained understanding of the relationship between a person's interest and the one gaze:

“It is common knowledge that people are interested in what they are looking at, and therefore there is a relationship between interest and the spot one looks at. Although there are some counter arguments, fixations are regarded as visual manifestations of attention” (p. 124).

Moreover, studies in sociology, social psychology, and across related disciplines that prefer to rely on interviews rather than questionnaires have taken qualitative studies in a highly viable direction, and new perspectives began to gather momentum (Barbalet, 1999; Binnema, 2004; Brissett & Snow, 1993; Chan et al., 2018 ; Darden, 1999; Fahlman et al., 2009; Ferrell, 2004; Mercer-Lynn et al., 2014; Phillips, 1993; Todman, 2013; Van Tilburg & Igou, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2019; Weinstein et al., 1995). Mostly from the perspective of existential boredom, searching for meaning in life as the primary focus of interest remained at the heart of these studies. Although the sample of participants is very small, an important analysis and discussion on this topic was presented by Martin et al. (2006). To better address the potential antecedents of boredom and its effects, Martin et al. (2006)

analysed the 20 interviews with 10 participants and found that boredom is an unpleasant situation experienced by participants in their daily activities in relation to external and internal factors. Participants described their feelings as stressed, agitated, and lethargic, and to overcome these feelings, they tried to find alternative activities to keep them mentally occupied. While some of the coping strategies had longer-term effects, such as physical exercise, meditation, abstaining from drugs and alcohol, and mindfulness meditation, others were playing with cell phones, doodling, surfing the Internet, etc. Another interesting finding was that participants claimed they had been prone to boredom in the past, but compared to an earlier stage of their lives, they had only transitional states of this feeling. On the flip side, those who accepted the current situation, had many interests, and possessed a positive philosophy and sense of humour indicated that they did not experience boredom. Spirituality is also sufficiently considered in the paper (see also Van Tilburg et al., 2019). MacDonald and Holland (2002) attempted to examine the influences of the relationship between spirituality and boredom variables in 296 undergraduates aged 17 to 48 in the United States; results indicated that boredom correlated significantly negatively with meaning and purpose in life.

Returning briefly to the conventional theories of boredom: research in this area has drawn on different theoretical frameworks, for Eastwood et al. (2012), the key aspects of these theories can be listed as follows: psychodynamic “is to be in a state of longing for activity but unaware of what it is that one desires and to look to the world to solve the impasse”, existential “a sense of emptiness, meaninglessness and a paralysis of agency” arousal “as the state of nonoptimal arousal that ensues when there is a mismatch between an individual’s needed arousal and the availability of environmental stimulation”, attention “lacking opportunities for satisfying activity, as well as the impaired ability to concentrate” (p. 484).

Arousal and attention theories are major areas of interest within the field of psychology because they provide testable predictions. As Fahlman et al. (2013) put it in their article:

“Boredom is the aversive experience of having an unfulfilled desire to be engaged in satisfying activity. In terms of arousal, the bored individual experiences either agitated high arousal and/or lethargic, low arousal.

Cognitively, the bored individual experiences a slow passage of time and an inability to focus his or her attention” (pp. 70-71).

As regards quantitative research, Fahlman et al. (2013) sought to develop and validate the Multidimensional State Boredom Scale (MSBS) on 2000 students at two universities in Canada. The data were gathered with the help of MSBS, which competes with the BPS. Using exploratory factor analyses and confirmatory factor analyses, the MSBS assessed five essential dimensions of boredom: Disengagement, High Arousal, Low Arousal, Inattention, and Perception of Time. The biggest problem with the BPS and its adaptations was that they were not sufficient to identify the state boredom, which is why this scale developed by Fahlman et al. (2013) is considered critically important in the literature. It was claimed to be the first psychometrically evaluated self-report instrument of its kind, and analysis of the data showed that the MSBS correlated significantly with the Boredom Proneness Scale despite its limitations in terms of representativeness, but unlike BPS, the MSBS was validated in multiple phases. Even the unidimensional version of the scale (MSBS-SF) (Hunter et al., 2016) and the multidimensional version (MSBS-15) (Baratta & Spence, 2015) were developed by shortening MSBS and both had very good psychometric properties and their performance was similar to the original scale.

2.8.2. Academic Boredom

One of the most important events of the 1980s was the first use of the term “academic boredom” yet, the last two decades have seen a growing trend toward academic boredom. It is only since the work of Harris (2000) and Barnett and Klitzing (2006) that the study of academic boredom has gained momentum. Harris (2000) administered the Boredom Proneness Scale (Farmer & Sundberg, 1986) and the Mood Awareness Scale (Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) to 170 college undergraduate and graduate students to examine various aspects of academic boredom and mood at the University of New Mexico and the United States. The results of the study indicate that there was a significant positive correlation between boredom proneness and mood monitoring, while a negative correlation was found between mood labelling and flow. The most striking observation that emerged from the data comparison was that only 10% of the participants reported never being

bored, while the rest reported being bored at least once in a while during the day. Participants reported being bored because there were too many courses and too little to do, followed by a lack of challenge, monotony, loneliness, and waiting and coping strategies included reading, thinking, daydreaming, socialising, watching television, exercising, and trying new things (p. 586). According to Harris (2000), the most obvious finding from the analysis is that teachers should change their teaching style because the course itself and lack of engagement are the main reason for boredom. He states:

“We faculty members who wish to avoid boring others might note that lectures/classes and lack of something to do are the most frequent causes of boredom. This information could certainly be viewed as an incentive to change our teaching styles to the kind of learner-centred, active model that educators recommend” (p. 595).

Also, one unanticipated finding was that boredom sometimes has a positive impact on participants, such as thinking and reflection. Moreover, Barnett and Klitzing (2006) carried out a number of investigations into the effects of academic boredom on students' leisure and nonacademic activities. They investigated the propensity of 999 college students to experience boredom in their leisure time according to several demographic characteristics and found a strong inverse relationship between boredom and the characteristic traits of extraversion and intrinsic motivational orientation. Furthermore, those who have the ability to entertain themselves, who are extroverted and emotionally stable, are less likely to suffer from boredom than others in almost all genders, races, and ethnic groups. The authors therefore suggested that expanding and adapting leisure education programs could improve learners' overall performance.

In another major study conducted with 211 undergraduates in the United Kingdom, Sandi Mann and Robinson (2009) found that the majority of students thought their lectures were boring. The potential sources of boredom were the quality of the lecture, teaching methods such as lab work, computer sessions, online lecture notes, copying overheads in lectures, and excessive use of PowerPoint without handouts, while seminars, practical sessions and group discussions were considered the least boring activities. There are two types of strategies that emerge when a participant suffers from boredom. There are adaptive and maladaptive strategies, e.g.,

daydreaming, doodling, chatting with friends, sending cell phone texts, passing notes to friends, and leaving the lecture during the break. It can therefore be assumed that in contrast to those less prone to academic boredom, it is much more difficult to rid oneself of boredom. These results corroborate the findings of much of the previous work by Harris (2000) with a slight difference and Mann and Robinson (2009) report that:

“Lecturers should not assume that ‘interactive’ teaching methods like lab and computer classes are automatically more engaging for students; without careful input of resources and attention, these methods can be even more boring for students. PowerPoint presentations should be used with caution during lectures and teaching staff should seek to find ways to engage students as much as possible.” (p. 256).

Because Mann and Robinson’s studies offer some important insights into academic boredom and have been instrumental in our understanding of an educational context, they differ from studies that may be published in other psychological research journals.

2.8.3. Control Value Theory

In terms of contemporary perspectives, the introduction of control value theory (CVT) has emerged as an important literary genre in educational psychology, and a key study related to academic boredom, engagement, and achievement is that of Pekrun (2000, 2006), in which he attempted to analyse the antecedents and effects of emotions experienced in achievement and academic contexts. By drawing on the concept of CVT, Pekrun was able to show that most students experience emotions such as enjoyment, frustration, and boredom when learning, while they experience emotions such as joy, hope, pride, anxiety, hopelessness, shame, and anger when succeeding or failing, which are referred to as activity-related emotions and outcome emotions. Pekrun (2006) defined achievement emotions as “emotions tied directly to achievement activities or achievement outcomes” and he also included “emotions pertaining to achievement-related activities” (p. 317). Drawing on this definition, he probed students’ perceptions and experiences of regulation development of achievement emotions. Given the complexity of academic boredom in different

educational settings, Pekrun's work, by adopting social cognitive performance theory, occupies a very important place in the literature in combining the assumptions of previous theories (Bandura, 1993; Pekrun & Stephens, 2010; Pekrun, 1984, 1992a, 1992b; Perry, 1991; Schonwetter et al., 1993; Weiner, 1985). In line with earlier theories and Scherer's dynamic systems component model (2000, 2005, 2009), the definition of emotions has been expanded to include "multi-component, coordinated processes of psychological subsystems including affective, cognitive, motivational, expressive, and peripheral physiological processes" (Pekrun, 2006, p. 316). Pekrun (2006) classifies achievement emotions into two broad types: Activity Emotions and Outcome Emotions. Whereas activity emotions are associated with achievement-related activities during the activity, outcome emotions can be either anticipatory, such as hope for success or fear of failure, or retrospective, such as pride or shame experienced after the feedback of the performance. Also, achievement-related emotions can be classified into momentary (state achievement emotions) and habitual (trait achievement emotions) on the basis of boredom. CVT not only predicts whether the outcome is positive or negative, but also corresponds to whether the activity is activating or deactivating. Emotions can play an important role in keeping students interested and motivated, and fall into several categories, as Pekrun (2006) explains:

"Activating positive emotions, such as enjoyment of learning, are assumed to strengthen intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and deactivating negative emotions, such as boredom and hopelessness, are held to be detrimental. The effects of deactivating positive emotions like relaxation, and activating negative emotions like anger, anxiety, or shame, are assumed to be more complex" (p. 326).

In analysing various emotions, CVT argues that student engagement and achievement are positively influenced by appraisals of the control and values associated with achievement and outcome emotions (Pekrun, 2006). Although theories of arousal and attention occupy a very important place in psychology to describe boredom in general study (Fahlman et al., 2013; Malkovsky et al., 2012; Vogel-Walcutt et al., 2012), CVT (2000, 2006) is a very impressive approach that pedagogically addresses academic boredom in universities and colleges. Pekrun et al. (2010) notes that boredom was once considered a "silent emotion" and not as worthy

of study as other affective states from a historical perspective, but has now been redefined and shown to be as harmful as other negative emotions (p. 531). Thanks to the great contribution of CVT (2000, 2006), there are an increasing number of new research tools on boredom, including those that focus primarily on academic boredom (Acee et al., 2010; Govaerts & Grégoire, 2008; Sharp et al., 2021; Tze et al., 2013a, 2014b). The most important and well-known instruments are the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ) in Canada and the Learning Related Boredom Scale (LRBS) in Canada and China, which is based on AEQ, as well as the English Precursors to Boredom Scale (E-PBS) in Canada (Tze et al., 2014b) and the Academic Boredom Scale (ABS-10) in the U.S. (Acee et al., 2010), Student Experience of Emotions Inventory (SEEI) in Australia (Trigwell et al., 2012), BPS-UKHE (revised version of BPS) in the U.K. (Sharp et al., 2016), The Academic Boredom Survey Instrument (ABSI) in the U.K (Sharp et al., 2021). Academic boredom among university students has been studied in depth by many researchers, some led by Reinhard Pekrun and Virginia Tze, and studies in this area have gained momentum through their contributions.

2.8.4. Academic Boredom and the Achievement Emotions

In terms of CVT, Pekrun et al. (2002) found that academic emotions, with the exception of test anxiety, were not given enough attention and that positive and negative emotions were not expressed as frequently as test anxiety. To address this gap in the literature, a taxonomy of different academic emotions and a self-report instrument measuring student emotions such as joy, pride, relief, anger, anxiety, shame, hopelessness, and boredom, the Academic Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ), were developed. According to Pekrun et al. (2002), emotions are divided into three domains: class-related, learning-related, and test-related emotions and an attempt is made to measure both traits and states of academic emotions separately. Not surprisingly, AEQ is quite comprehensive compared to other scales developed, containing 361 items. In their study, they hypothesised that emotions have a great influence on students' thoughts, motivations, and actions. However, because of insufficient empirical evidence, they used hypotheses about the effects of academic emotions based on previous studies of mood and test anxiety, and some of these hypotheses were attempted to be tested in a series of cross-sectional, longitudinal,

and diary studies using AEQ. In their study, involving 230 university students, a significant relationship was found between academic emotions and student learning and performance variables. It can also be said that this study, conducted with 230 students, shows a negative relationship in relation to academic boredom in terms of motivation, which is divided into two areas, namely study interest and effort. Moreover, in addition to perceived self-regulation, there is a negative correlation between elaboration and academic boredom in terms of learning strategies. Conversely, a positive correlation was found between academic boredom and irrelevant thinking. Based on all these findings, it was claimed that emotions are related to self-regulated learning and determine students' academic performance, and it was emphasised that students' emotions should be taken into account to improve their self-regulation and academic performance skills. The publication of the AEQ user guide on implementing AEQ, much work has been done on task mastery, performance approach and performance avoidance, e.g. Daniels et al. (2008), Daniels et al. (2009), Tanaka and Murayama (2014), Ranellucci et al. (2015), Hall et al. (2016), Hangen et al. (2018) and Ariani (2021), and the work of Garn et al. (2017), Simonton and Garn (2020) can be good examples in relation to belonging and regarding online learning Artino (2009); Artino and Stephens (2009); Artino and Jones (2012); Artino et al. (2010), Baker et al. (2010); Artino et al. (2012); Heckel and Ringeisen (2017); Stephan et al. (2019); Xing et al. (2019) and Berweger et al. (2022) can be some examples. Noteborn et al. (2012) examined the interplay between academic emotions and academic achievement in a virtual environment and showed that task value was positively related to enjoyment and negatively to boredom, but not to academic attainment. While the positive relationship between enjoyment and exam performance is not surprising, the surprising finding of this research was that teamwork performed in the virtual world was positively associated with boredom. Even if the students experience a high degree of boredom, they can achieve high academic performance in practical tasks in virtual learning.

Moreover, drawing on three 6-item scales adopted from the AEQ, Ruthig et al. (2008) conducted a study with 620 freshmen in US to determine whether the effect of college student's perceived control and course-related emotions such as boredom, anxiety, and enjoyment on their academic performance could be predicted. It has been shown that students with better final grades experience less boredom and the fact that students had a high level of control did not have a positive impact on

their grade point average as long as they experienced high levels of boredom. Also, compared to students with both high PAC and boredom levels, students with high academic control and low levels of boredom dropped fewer course credits. Consequently, it was understood that perceived control can only have an effect on their performance in their courses when students experience low levels of negative emotion or high levels of positive emotion. Students' understanding that their success is within their personal control and responsibility can be seen as a prerequisite to reducing their boredom and increasing their enjoyment in order to increase their performance. Along these lines, Respondek et al. (2017) conducted a comprehensive study of 838 undergraduate students at a German university, focusing on the first two years of study, to examine students' dropout intentions and academic performance in relation to perceived academic control and academic emotions. Although there was no direct relationship between perceived academic control and intention to drop out of school, students were found to be more likely to drop out in the second year than in the first year. Due to the natural effect of being the first and most important, AEQ has been adapted and applied by many researchers in many countries (Bieleke et al., 2021; Fierro-Suero et al., 2020; Govaerts & Grégoire, 2008; Hong et al., 2016; Lichtenfeld et al., 2012; Moreira et al., 2018; Peixoto et al., 2015; Pekrun et al., 2005; Raker et al., 2019; Suzuki & Tonegawa, 2022; Trigueros & Aguilar-Parra, 2022; Zhou & Wu, 2021).

Pekrun et al. (2011) examined the psychometric quality of the AEQ on 389 students taking psychology courses at Midwestern Canadian University and reported that the scale was highly reliable and valid both internally and externally. This study is of great importance because it sheds light on the psychometric quality of AEQ, because no previous study has been conducted in this direction. Furthermore, according to Pekrun et al. (2010), activity-related emotions such as boredom were neglected compared to outcome-related emotions such as pride, anxiety and shame. With this in mind, they conducted five studies on boredom at North American and German universities using only the state version of the Learning-Related Boredom scale of the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire and described achievement related boredom as "a negative, deactivating emotion experienced when performing achievement activities." (p. 545). Using structural equation modelling, Pekrun et al. (2014) examined the relationship between boredom and academic performance in 424 students taking an introductory psychology course at a Canadian university and

concluded that boredom negatively affects subsequent performance. Later, in a study of 405 university students from Canada and China, Tze et al. (2013b) examined the psychometric properties of the Learning-Related Boredom Scale derived from the Academic Emotions Questionnaire and concluded that learning-related boredom indicated a relationship between higher levels of classroom boredom and low levels of self-efficacy in self-regulation in culturally and geographically diverse settings. In view of the increasing attention to academic boredom, Tze et al.'s (2014a) study of 144 university students examined how learning and class-related boredom changes over time and sought to determine how this change affects the antecedents of boredom and student engagement, such as vigour, absorption, dedication, and effort regulation, tied to different categories of study. The existing literature on academic boredom is extensive and focuses particularly on proximal antecedents such as perceived control and value unlike previous studies, this study examines distal situations such as perceived autonomy as well. Consequently, the study showed that class-related boredom was highly positively correlated not only with effort regulation but also dedication whereas it was negatively associated with perceived autonomy support. Also, Pekrun (2006) speculated that “emotions are central to psychological health and well-being, implying that they should be regarded as important educational outcomes in themselves, independent of their functional relevance.” (p. 334). In sum, these studies and views have provided some insight into aspects of boredom and indicated that boredom is an important academic emotion and should not be overlooked.

2.8.5. Boredom in the EFL Context

The experience of boredom, which is “aversive, debilitating and deactivating”, has captured the interest of both contemporary and modern scholars (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 2). In recent years, researchers in the fields of clinical, experimental, social, cognitive, educational, and personality psychology have accumulated a significant amount of data that sheds light on a common yet “complex, dynamic, and multifaceted phenomenon” that has previously been overlooked (Xie, 2021). The increasing theoretical and empirical treatment of the “silent, aversive emotion” boredom includes exploring fundamental questions, such as the causes of boredom, how to overcome it, and whether it has any positive

aspects (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 1). Different perspectives have been examined by researchers in relation to this “unique and multidimensional emotion” and the construct has been subject to much empirical investigation and each of these perspectives offers its own unique strengths and contributions (Pawlak et al., 2022, p. 2).

Chapman (2013) used a mixed-methods approach to examine boredom in the foreign language classroom with a total of 57 students studying German as a foreign language and found that the reasons for students' boredom were classroom activities (under- and over-challenged), students' attitudes toward the teacher, students' perceptions of the teacher (peer-like vs. authoritarian teacher), students' feelings of self-blame, peers, and materials.

In a mixed-methods design study, Kruk (2016b) examined changes in motivation, language anxiety, and boredom of 16 students majoring in English philology over the course of a summer semester. The results of his study revealed that participants exhibited high levels of motivation and low levels of anxiety and boredom while learning English in Second Life. The study reports that a lack of willingness to communicate due to encounters with rude or aggressive users, communication difficulties due to the language barrier, and the use of technical devices and low speed of Internet could be possible causes of boredom.

Rooted in applied linguistics, Zawodniak et al. (2017) explored the conceptualization of boredom and potential contributing factors with 30 Polish MA English philology students in a qualitative design study to gain an understanding of the reasons behind the phenomenon. The results of their study revealed that several causes of boredom could be as follows: Language activities (task demands, task characteristics, perceived value of the activity), content subjects and language classes (excessive task demands, teaching style, no choice of classes), teacher behaviour (teacher disengagement, undesirable teacher characteristics, harsh practices, inadequate amount of explicit instruction or feedback), class preparation and management (unsatisfactory learning environment, teacher regulatory capacity, characteristics of teaching, lack of task variety).

In another study, involving four English students registered in an English philology class Zawodniak and Kruk (2018), adopting complex dynamic systems theory, tested the influence of the virtual world of Second Life with varying degrees of motivation, language anxiety, and boredom. The results of this qualitative study

elucidated that setting of the virtual environments seemed to be affected by factors related to boredom due to participants' expectations, behaviours of interlocutors, difficulty in establishing and managing contact with interlocutors, self assumptions regarding their own ability, sense of perseverance, lack of challenge, seeking stimulation, and subject of the conversation.

Using semi-structured individual interviews, Kruk and Zawodniak (2018) explored aspects and manifestations of boredom, fluctuations in its intensity, and coping strategies of 15 Polish undergraduates majoring in English Philology in practical English classes as opposed to other academic subjects. The results identified varying causes of boredom due to tasks perceived as monotonous, repetitive, high or low challenge, lack of practical purpose, teaching tools, dominant teacher roles, instructional choices of teachers, feedback practices of teachers, lack of choice of tasks, mismatch between topic and expectations leading to distraction, disappointment or frustration.

Kruk and Zawodniak (2020), drawing upon the language learning boredom in retrospect questionnaire, further explored the relationships between L2 (English) and L3 (German) students' boredom by analysing the content collected from 30 Polish university students majoring in English. A number of variables influencing student boredom were distinguished, and the experience of boredom classified on the basis of lesson-related (tasks perceived to be of little value and repetitive, lack of varied language material, lack of learning tasks within their capabilities, teacher-related (teacher characteristics, pedagogical skills, instructional methods of the teacher, teachers' professional knowledge), and other factors (time frame of instruction, weather conditions, overly high course demands).

Using the Boredom in Practical English Language Classes-Revised questionnaire filled out by 107 students majoring in English in Poland, Pawlak et al. (2020a) examined the elements underlying the construct of boredom and the prominence of the factors in relation to overall boredom tendency and achievement. Results indicated that the factors underpinning the experience of boredom were typically described and attributed as lack of participation and involvement in learning tasks, tasks perceived as monotonous and repetitive, inadequate level of challenge, learners' low level of satisfaction.

The antecedents and effects substantiated in a practical English class were also the focus of Pawlak et al.'s (2020c) study of boredom in 11 Polish university

students majoring in English. They found that boredom was predicted by a lack of balance between existing challenge and one's ability, recurrent learning tasks, the teacher, the topic, and the teacher's implementation of the task.

A similar interest in the dynamic nature of boredom prompted Li (2021) to conduct an investigation into the role of boredom and its control value appraisals in EFL classrooms on the boredom of 2,002 university English language students in China. The authors found that higher levels of boredom were related to inadequate levels of desirable control, learners' sense of being either over- or under-challenged, low learner proficiency levels, lack of the right level of challenge or meaning in the tasks, and disinterest in the content.

Enunciating that the Boredom in Practical English Language Classes Questionnaire developed by Kruk and Zawodniak (2017) showed weaknesses in a number of factors, Li et al. (2023a) created the 7-factor Foreign Language Learning Boredom Scale with 32 items to investigate the extent to which foreign language learning associated with boredom affects non-English-major EFL students and English teachers in a Chinese university. Their study found that a myriad of learner-internal and learner-external aspects are shaped by boredom (e.g., dislike of the teacher, boring partners, perceived task complexity, undemanding materials and tasks).

Further insight into the dynamic nature of boredom was offered by Derakhshan et al. (2021a), who used data from 208 Iranian English students in an Asian context EFL to reveal the sources of and solutions to boredom in addition to the time frame of instruction in relation to online learning. The study extracted an array of themes and sub-themes underlying boredom: teacher-related factors (e.g., teacher control, instructional methods, personality) computer-related factors (e.g., Logistics of online learning such as slow internet connection, low microphone and sound quality, quality of online platform), the nature of online classes (lack of in person contact) computer-illiteracy (low level of digital literacy of teachers and learners), task-related factors (uninteresting topics, monotonous material, tasks beyond learners' ability, largely unchanging tasks), and student-related factors (lack of learner energy, relevant discussions, learner motivation).

Using a qualitative-oriented approach and data triangulation, Nakamura et al. (2021) examined learner boredom to get a better grasp of how and why learners experience boredom in a contextual perspective over a three-month period of time.

The participants were 25 Thai university students at a university in Thailand. The authors found that activity mismatch, inadequate comprehension skills, lethargy, low proficiency in the target language, difficult learning tasks, disengaged behaviours of peers, lack of opinions, and excessive input could be the descriptors of bored learners.

Much in the same vein, the study by Kruk et al. (2021) used a mixed methods approach to examine the extent and trajectories of boredom experienced by 13 Polish EFL majors. The findings suggest that a bundle of factors, which include repetitive, monotonous language activities and a lack of novelty as key indicators, can induce boredom.

Zawodniak et al. (2023) used a qualitative design to examine 115 EFL majors' perceptions of boredom at a university in Poland. Several common sources of boredom impacting learners were found as follows: Language tasks (difficulty, repetition, monotony of tasks) Teacher (lack of explicit explanations and involvement of the teacher, lecturing, and perceived characteristics of the teacher) modes of classroom organisation (performing tasks individually, in pairs, or in groups) Instructional components (dissatisfaction with course content) and other factors.

2.8.6. Engagement, Disengagement and Boredom

Disengagement is considered one of the fundamental elements of boredom and is associated with poor academic performance and poses a real challenge to learning processes due to having negative underpinnings (Fahlman, 2009; Pekrun et al., 2010; Preckel et al., 2010). Boredom serves as a barrier that negatively affects students' attentional orientations and causes them to tune out and bored students tend to have little or no engagement, while others show a higher quality of satisfaction (Martin et al., 2012; Schreck, 2011) Since it is assumed that the absence of engagement automatically implies the presence of coping with boredom (Macklem, 2015), addressing the likelihood that learners will experience disengagement seems to be a necessary prerequisite. Derived from the "Norman root word, gage" (Axelson & Flick, 2010, p. 40), engagement has been one of the most attention-grabbing research topics recently and has given the study of engagement a prominent position in educational psychology (Sinatra et al., 2015). The term "engagement" represents

“the heightened, simultaneous experience of concentration, interest, and enjoyment in the task at hand” (Shernoff, 2013, p. 13) and is intended to promote the extent to which students actively participate and involve (Appleton et al., 2008; Fredricks et al., 2004). While numerous works in educational psychology assume that the unique pattern of engagement incorporates various meaningful learning experiences in different contexts (Christenson et al., 2012; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Shernoff, 2013), there is also a growing consensus in the field of applied linguistics that it is one of the most essential components of the L2 learning experience, as active participation is central to the success of developing communication skills (Hiver et al., 2021a; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020). Undoubtedly, keeping learners engaged is challenging for teachers due to dynamic and unique characteristics of L2 learning. Engagement is characterised as multidimensional and intertwined with many aspects of language learning. Given that there are “jingle/jangle” issues (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 14), there is little or no consensus on the conceptualizations of each subcomponent of engagement; also while some authors adhere to the three-part typology offered by Fredricks et al. (2004), others classify them into four interrelated dimensions: In a nutshell, behavioural engagement refers to student involvement and participation while emotional engagement includes positive or negative affective attitudes, on the other hand, based on the notion of investment, cognitive engagement includes learners’ willingness and persistence to learn complex concepts and their sense of self-regulation, and finally, agentic engagement is described as learners’ sense of agency and their contribution to the instruction provided (Appleton et al., 2008; Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Fredricks et al., 2004; Guthrie et al., 2012; Jang et al., 2012, 2016; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Mahatmya et al., 2012; Reeve, 2012, 2013; Reeve & Tseng, 2011; Veiga et al., 2014). In this regard, developing an understanding of soft skills or people skills engagement, a term coined by Schreck (2011), could account for a significant part of meaningful learning that leads to active participation on a particular task that shapes and fosters learning success in learning L2. Assuming that engagement is characterised in the form of a pyramid comprising four layers, behavioural engagement is recognized as the core component at the top, which is a key determinant of learning because of its visible and directly observable manifestations in-the-moment, including in the area of L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2019; Oga-Baldwin, 2019; Skinner et al., 2008). Moreover, the concept of engagement is mediated and

interpreted through two major dimensions: internal and external. In the first dimension, engagement is manifested in a focus on the effort required and the extent to which students devote time to learning, while the second dimension is reflected in an emphasis on institutional-level precautions, making the necessary adjustments, providing resources, and creating a supportive environment that instils a desire to participate in activities that lead to desired outcomes such as perseverance and academic attainment (Harper & Quaye, 2009; Kuh, 2009; Kuh et al., 2006).

Even though typically not grounded in theory, there are a handful of studies that address engagement in terms of learner factors and specific facets of engagement and concerns how this notion relates to language awareness in the context of L2 learning (Ellis, 2010; Svalberg, 2009).

The attention of scholars and teachers has been devoted to engagement, and the concept has risen to a position of prominence since it crafts a behavioural path that contributes to understanding student motivation which is fruitful for student development and learning (Jang et al., 2010). Behavioural engagement, sometimes referred to as social or participatory engagement (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012), is a prerequisite for promoting student motivation by minimising distractibility, which in turn leads to overcoming and addressing existing challenges. Having gained a better understanding of the clear-cut and unyielding construct of such engagement, teachers, the main mediators and authorities in language teaching, can shape and formulate it and, thanks to its observable and recognisable markers, teachers can track how well their efforts are working. While engagement can be regarded as an indicator of motivation, boredom can be considered as an outward manifestation of disengagement. Given this obvious importance, the concept of disengagement is of vital importance. Disengagement, “often referred to as disaffection” (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 13), draws on the idea of refraining from active participation in ongoing tasks due to learner incapacity in terms of taking pleasure, interest, or satisfaction (Henry & Thorsen, 2018; Macklem, 2015). Disengagement is very similar to amotivation and is illustrated as “the absence of engagement, including the absence of effort or persistence” and is characterised by “passivity, lack of initiation, and giving up, sometimes accompanied by the emotions of dejection, discouragement, or apathy.” (Skinner et al., 2009b, p. 226). Engagement had profound negative effects on self-esteem and self-regulated learning, suggesting that students tended to feel more helpless and to experience fewer positive emotions

(Lam et al., 2012; Peterson et al., 1993). In addition to the constellation of other factors, students who are dissatisfied with various aspects of their engagement are more likely to have poor academic performance that lead to the emergence of boredom (Daschmann et al., 2011).

The above evidence sheds light on learning environments through the lens of research on engagement and or disengagement all of which are intermingled with boredom and portray its complex construct, underscoring its central importance.

2.8.6. Coping Strategies

In the influential “transactional model” of stress and behavioural self-regulation by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping strategies are categorised into two primary types: emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies. Problem-focused coping involves “defining the problem, generating alternative solutions, weighing the alternatives in terms of their costs and benefits, choosing among them, and acting” while emotion-focused coping aims “lessening emotional distress and includes strategies such as avoidance, minimization, distancing, selective attention, positive comparisons, and wrestling positive value from negative events” (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, pp. 150-152). Early studies indicated that dealing directly with problems was better than addressing emotions for long-term psychological well-being. However, it is now understood that most stressors lead to a combination of both problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies (Boniwell & Tunariu, 2019).

Carver and Scheier (1998) suggested that the differentiation between problem-focused and emotion-focused coping may be oversimplified. As Carver and Scheier (1998) stated:

“What Lazarus and Folkman (1984) called problem-focused coping aims at changing the situation to make it better. This clearly reflects continued engagement with goals that the stressor is threatening. In effect, this category of coping constitutes taking steps to keep those goals alive and active. Although active coping can also dampen distress, that’s not its main purpose. Reducing distress is the purpose of emotion-focused coping” (p. 214).

They created a complex framework for dealing with challenges and a corresponding tool for measuring it “in order to cast light on the coping process from a slightly different direction than has been done before”, known as the Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced (COPE) Inventory, consisting of 60 items (Carver et al., 1989). The COPE came before the Brief-COPE (Carver, 1997), which “omits two scales of the full COPE, reduces others to two items per scale, and adds one scale” was created to be easier for people to use and had fewer repetitive items (p. 92). The Brief-COPE consists of 28 self-report items, with 14 subscales containing two items each. Its purpose is to assess “several responses known to be relevant to effective and ineffective coping” for dealing with stressful life events (Carver, 1997, p. 92). Carver suggests that the Brief-COPE should not be seen as a single scale to measure a general construct. However, “it is possible to group coping strategies into larger constructs such as ‘approach’ and ‘avoidant’ coping styles” (MacIntyre et al., 2020, p. 3). Approach methods actively attempt to “change the stressor or accept its presence in one’s life” on the other hand, avoidant coping strategies lean towards “more dysfunctional responses such as denial, distraction, or substance use” (MacIntyre et al., 2020, p. 3). Carver and his colleagues (1989) stressed the importance of not pre-determining certain strategies as superior to others. Rather, “the flexibility of application of the items is determined by the needs and imagination of the researcher who is using them” (p. 99). Different kinds of events call for varied reactions as they change over time. At times, denial “trying to push the reality of the situation away”, self-blame “criticising oneself for responsibility in the situation”, self-distraction “which entails a focusing away from the stress”, venting “which entails a focusing on the stress”, and similar strategies may be the most suitable immediate responses (p. 98).

2.8.7. Coping with Boredom

Taken along with the ever-expanding importance of L2 learning, exploring the models and theories that address the origins and functions of boredom, which has a highly negative impact on the quality of classroom learning, offers a way to find solutions to the problems that language teachers and students may have encountered in their own contexts. Indeed, in order to properly pinpoint the sources of boredom and compile an initial list of strategies to overcome it, it is important to better

understand the nature of the proposed activities. This investigation includes the “attributes of the task, the environment, the person, and the person-environment fit.” (Fisherl, 1993, p. 395). Although most of the concepts briefly discussed in this subsection are primarily situated within a paradigm of educational psychology, they relate to overcoming boredom in the context of L2 and apply to the L2 teaching as well as L2 learning.

Nett et al. (2010) and, building on Nett et al.’s (2010) identification, Daniels et al. (2015) utilise three main coping profiles that have direct bearing on the antecedents of boredom: evaders who avoid the feeling of boredom by engaging in an alternative task or something else, criticizers who attempt to alter the situation by putting the blame on the teacher for their condition or offering adaptations to move out of the boring situation; and reappraisers who attempt to overcome boredom by reflecting on the concept, becoming aware of the value and significance of the subject and adopting a new perspective on the situation.

Considering that boredom is a frequently experienced deactivating, negative emotion by most students within the confines of the classroom walls (Goetz et al., 2014; Pekrun et al., 2010), although the subject often remains taboo (Breidenstein, 2007; Chapman, 2013; Weinerman & Kenner, 2016), it is critical that students develop an awareness of how and why boredom occurs through a independent course delivered by instructors (Weinerman & Kenner, 2016), rather than not saying this taboo word and thinking they will get buzzed and lose a point if they do. Moreover, the role of mindfulness in optimising learning effects in different educational contexts has been shown to provide a more comprehensive picture (Feldman & Kuyken, 2019). In tune with psychodynamic theory, Eastwood et al. (2007), who attribute boredom to internal psychological dynamics, emphasise the importance of being aware of and understanding one’s own feelings and urges rather than focusing on the external world and how it leaves them unsatisfied. Students should be encouraged to take charge of their own learning process by giving them the opportunity to choose their peers and the topics discussed, which in turn can make them feel more competent, persistent and motivated to participate in the tasks set (Caldwell et al., 1999; Cotterall, 1995; Lepper, 1985; Patall, 2013). Within a dichotomous model perspective proposed by early theorists of achievement goals (Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Nicholls, 1978, 1984), encouraging learners to pursue mastery goals to a greater or lesser extent could mitigate the experience of

boredom and lead to the development of a hub of excellence in the learning process as they ascribe greater value to the investment of effort and progress, as is the case with incremental intelligence theory (Dweck, 2017; Nussbaum & Dweck, 2008), as well as create a critical difference in the implementation of their self-regulatory strategies. Students' adoption of mastery goals takes on extra importance because it minimises the intention to give up in the face of obstacles and has a significant impact on their willingness to choose specific tasks for self-improvement (Ames, 1992; Furner & Gonzalez-DeHass, 2011; Mattern, 2005; Pekrun, 2006; Turner & Husman, 2008).

It may also be the case with teaching characteristics, whether the teacher is perceived as empathetic and responsive to students' needs, whether he or she conveys a sense of respect for students' attitudes, or how much he or she appreciates the content and academic value of the content is associated with greater teacher enthusiasm and leads to lower levels of student boredom, which may foster a positive learning environment (Bieg et al., 2017, 2019; Frenzel et al., 2007, 2009; Goetz et al., 2020; Gregory et al., 2014). Along the same lines, offering a wide range of positive and sufficient feedback on a regular basis as a method of identifying students' appraisals have been shown to be an effective approach to bolster students' self perceptions about their own potential which in turn reinforce them to search for opportunities for fighting this problematic condition (Goetz et al., 2010; Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2014). Finally, yet importantly, it also appears that learner-centred activities play a key role in promoting meaningful on-task engagement and eliciting active participation by creating meaningful opportunities to get learners on board, provided the right challenge is built into the tasks (Prince, 2004; Smith & Cardaciotto, 2011; Smith et al., 2005).

2.8.8. Boredom Coping Profiles and Coping with the Boredom Scale

There are numerous methods to cope with boredom. In a (2017), study by Sharp et al., university students revealed that when feeling bored, they turned to different coping mechanisms including daydreaming 107 (45.5%), switching off 104 (44.3%), texting 87 (37.0%), doodling or scribbling over handouts 84 (35.7%), talking to neighbour 64 (27.2%), leaving class at the break 13 (5.5%), other 20 (8.5%) "taking to Facebook, Twitter, the Internet, email or playing games on mobile

phones; less commonly – falling asleep, making ‘stupid noises’ or comments, laughing out loud” (p. 12). This information provides useful insights, but the strategies are not firmly rooted in the theoretical framework of coping literature. Based on the stress coping framework proposed by Holahan et al. in 1996, which has been “successful in studying coping with stress”, Nett et al. (2010) created the Coping with the Boredom Scale (CBS) from a sample of Grades 5–10 German students to examine how individuals deal with boredom and identify “students who showed different patterns in their use of strategies for coping with their boredom” (p. 629). The scale comprises a total of 20 questionnaire items related to individuals’ preferred methods of coping with boredom. The scale has been verified to consist of four components, each linked to a distinct coping style: “namely (1) cognitive-approach (COAP), (2) behavioural-approach (BEAP) (3) cognitive-avoidance (COAV), and (4) behavioural-avoidance (BEAV)” (p. 629). These styles align with the two-by-two dimensions proposed by Holahan and colleagues in (1996). All coping strategies, regardless of whether they are cognitive or behavioural, try “to resolve the problem itself”. Cognitive strategies encompass “changing the perception of the situation”. Contrastingly, behavioural strategies entail “trying to actually change the boring situation” (Nett et al., 2010, p. 628). Strategies categorised as avoidance involve helping the student to “forget about the boring situation, either by thinking of something or doing something not associated with the situation”. Cognitive-avoidance strategies entail “students occupying their thoughts with something not associated with the lesson”. In essence, these students seek an escape from the boring situation by focusing on something more stimulating. In contrast, students use behavioural-avoidance strategies to “distract themselves from boring situations by doing something else”. A common example of this strategy is when a student talks with a classmate instead of paying attention during the lesson (Nett et al., 2010, p. 628). According to the attributes of each approach, it can be inferred that problem-focused coping “doing something to relieve the problem” is emphasised in approach coping, while emotion-focused coping “orient[ing] toward emotion-regulation” takes precedence in avoidance coping within Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) appraisal and coping framework (p. 44). While different coping styles may seem separate or distinct from each other, in reality, individuals often do not exclusively prefer or use one style; instead, their choices and utilisation of coping styles are typically interconnected or overlapping. Most individuals typically utilise a

blend of these methods when dealing with boredom, and strategies centred on approach coping were discovered to be more successful (Green-Demers et al., 1998; Pekrun et al., 2010). Nett et al.'s (2010) research concentrated on 976 students (51% female) from grades 5 to 10, and the scale was created specifically for dealing with boredom in school settings. It is believed to be applicable to other educational environments such as universities and "although the scales refer to coping with boredom in mathematics lessons only, their structure is easy to adapt to other subject areas" (Nett et al., 2010, p. 629).

Additionally, Tze and colleagues (2013a) identified "boredom coping profiles within individual settings, scrutinised "the effectiveness of the profiles in decreasing boredom, and increasing self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, motivation, and achievement" and presented supporting evidence for the validity of CBS using samples of college students from China ($n = 254$, mean age = 21.03) and Canada ($n = 151$, mean age = 23.29) (p. 32). While the "the four-factor baseline models showed adequate fit for both Canadian and Chinese data" when "the factor loadings were constrained", factor weights were "non-invariant across the two settings" (p. 37). This indicates that "four-factor boredom coping strategies operated differently in the two samples", suggesting that students from a different country prioritise the four types of boredom coping strategies differently. It emphasises the importance of taking the learning environment into account for advancing research on how students cope with boredom in various educational systems.

In Nett et al.'s (2010) study, three profiles for managing boredom were distinguished in their German sample: Reappraisers, Criticizers, and Evaders. Each of these profiles exhibited preferences for distinct combinations of coping styles and encountered different levels of boredom while "Reappraisers focused primarily on cognitive-approach strategies, Criticizers focused primarily on behavioural-approach strategies, and Evaders focused primarily on cognitive and behavioural-avoidance strategies" (p. 635). As Nett et al. (2010) discussed, Reappraisers indicated a high utilisation of COAP strategies "more than average and the three other strategies less than the average", seemed to exhibit the most adaptive behaviour, signifying importance in "ameliorating boredom because it may be able to increase the perceived value of the situation or content" (p. 635). Reappraisers not only employed more COAP strategies, but they also reported experiencing the least amount of boredom. Nett and her colleagues (2010) opted for the term "Criticizers" for the

other group as they mainly leaned on BEAP strategies, a type of approach that typically entails “verbalising one’s feelings of boredom and making demands of the teacher to change the lessons to something less boring” such as asking the teacher for more interesting tasks to alleviate their boredom (p. 635). The authors labelled the final group Evaders because students in this profile typically preferred avoidance strategies, and they were more likely to distract themselves rather than “try and directly resolve their boredom either cognitively or behaviorally”, displaying low effort and interest in learning (p. 625).

In Tze et al.’s (2013a) study, two out of the identified coping profiles in their Canadian sample aligned with the findings of Nett et al. (2010), while only one profile from the Chinese sample matched the German study’s results. The discrepancies in the German and Canadian profiles may be attributed to the limited size of the Canadian sample (n=151), while the disparities in their Western sample and Chinese sample could be linked to the cultural dissimilarities between the two groups.

2.8.9. Boredom and EFL Achievement

Rooted in cognitive-motivational model, the notion of achievement emotions is used as an umbrella term and defined as a set of emotions that students experience in different educational contexts (Pekrun et al., 2002). Although the terms emotion, affect, and mood are sometimes used interchangeably to describe the same psychological circumstance, some authors draw a distinction, on the basis of intensity and duration, between moods as “longer lasting and more diffuse [states] without a particular referent” and emotions as “short, intense episodes in response to a particular referent” (Linnenbrink, 2006, p. 309) which gives us a more nuanced understanding of emotions compared to other affective states and enables us a more holistic picture of the achievement-related settings (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Linnenbrink-Garcia & Barger, 2014; Pekrun, 2006). Adopting the CVT framework, achievement emotions comprise three sub-dimensions that focus mainly on valence, activation, and object focus (Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2002, 2007, 2014). As outlined by Pekrun et al. (2002), achievement-related emotions include four types of emotions, particularly academic emotions, described as “positive activating emotions (such as enjoyment of learning, hope for success, or pride); positive deactivating

emotions (e.g., relief, relaxation after success, contentment); negative activating emotions (such as anger, anxiety, and shame); and negative deactivating emotions (e.g., boredom, hopelessness)” (p. 97). Boredom is described as the “experience of being disengaged from the world and stuck in a seemingly endless and dissatisfying present” and conceptualized as an “aversive experience of having an unfulfilled desire to be engaged in satisfying activity” (Fahlman et al., 2013, pp. 68-69) and is thought to have negative effects on student achievement (Pawlak et al., 2020c; Pekrun et al., 2010, 2014). Boredom is one of the achievement emotions that cover three key dimensions: valence, activation, and object focus. As regards valence, achievement emotions are divided into two categories: positive and negative or pleasant and unpleasant (e.g. enjoyment, boredom). As for activation, achievement emotions are conceptualised from two aspects: activating emotions and deactivating emotions. While activating emotions such as enjoyment, hope, pride, and gratitude promise increased interest accompanied by a high level of motivation, the emphasis on learning tasks, deactivating emotions such as boredom and hopelessness undermine motivation and hinder student performance, leading to a vicious cycle (Pekrun et al., 2007; Pekrun & Stephens, 2010; Shao et al., 2020). In terms of object focus, achievement emotions are conceptualised in accordance with two sets of components: activity-emotions (e.g., boredom) or outcome-emotions (e.g., hope, anxiety) (Pekrun et al., 2002, 2006). In light of accumulating evidence, boredom can be conceptualised as a negative, deactivating, activity-related emotion that can exert a negative influence on academic performance (Pekrun et al., 2007, 2010). Underpinned by Pekrun’s (2006) CVT, several empirical studies have examined the nexus between boredom and academic performance and revealed a significant negative relationship between boredom and academic performance (Dewaele & Li, 2021; Li, 2021; Pawlak et al., 2020a; Pekrun et al., 2014; Shao et al., 2020; Tze et al., 2016; Xie, 2021). For instance, in a study with 107 English majors in Poland, Pawlak et al., (2020a), adopting a newly developed instrument, reported the negative correspondence between English language classes and English achievement and that low-achiever students tended to exhibit higher levels of boredom. Similarly, Tze et al. (2016) examined the association between boredom and academic outcomes specific to educational settings. The results of the meta-analysis showed that boredom had a pernicious effect on motivation, strategy use, and achievement and in comparison; higher levels of boredom were observed related to class compared to

experiences while studying, which could be attributed to the lack of perceived control in the classroom. The present study adopts the theoretical framework provided by the existing literature as a way of reaching a nuanced understanding of the relationship between academic boredom and achievement. What else needs to be mentioned is that there are some limitations of the previous studies that should be acknowledged. First, due to the non-experimental nature of the study (field study), determining a causal relationship between boredom and academic achievement is limited (Pekrun et al., 2014). Second, although research on L2 boredom has seen an upsurge in studies in Chinese (Li, 2021; Li et al., 2023a) and Iranian L2 contexts (Elahi Shirvan et al., 2021; Pawlak et al., 2021b) in a handful of studies in recent years, the majority of studies have been premiered in exclusively Polish educational contexts, predominantly at the university level and among English majors with the exception of Chapman's (2013) seminal dissertation in the extant literature (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017, 2018; Kruk, 2016a, 2016b; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2021a; Zawodniak & Kruk, 2018; Zawodniak et al., 2017, 2023). Although significant studies have been conducted on the issue of boredom, little empirical attention has been devoted to the extent and effects of boredom and the coping strategies adopted in EFL learning by students in Turkish preparatory classes. Given this research paucity, the present study aimed to conceptualise the factors underlying the experience of boredom and the fluctuations in the extent of boredom, and to explain what strategies learners use, how, and why, as well as to look into the relationship between boredom and achievement in L2 classroom at the preparatory levels taking a quantitative bent.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Presentation

This chapter elaborates on the methodology of the study. First research design is outlined and then, the educational context where the research was conducted, participants and demographic information in the study as well as specifics pertaining to data collection and analysis are described.

3.2. Research Design

The current research took place in an environment where English is taught as a foreign language. To answer the research questions, the current study mainly adopted a quantitative survey approach with cross-sectional design. As Fraenkel et al. (2022) states: “A cross-sectional survey collects information from a sample that has been drawn from a predetermined population. Furthermore, the information is collected at just one point in time, although the time it takes to collect all of the data may take anywhere from a day to a few weeks or more.” (p. 394). In like manner, Renck Jalongo and Saracho (2016) underscored the crucial role of quantitative research: “Published quantitative research makes an original contribution to knowledge, theory, and practice; it also disseminates research findings in a way that researchers can use and replicate. Research also serves as a ballast and a guide for future research.” (p. 134).

As Dörnyei (2007) has made clear “besides language tests, questionnaires are the most common data collection instruments in applied linguistics” (p. 95). In this connection, the current research used a descriptive survey approach. A descriptive survey entails posing a uniform set of questions, often in the form of written questionnaires or ability tests, to numerous individuals either via mail, telephone or face-to-face interaction. However, survey research involves three main difficulties: ensuring clear and unbiased questions, obtaining thoughtful and honest responses from participants, and collecting enough completed questionnaires to facilitate meaningful analyses. On the other hand, survey research offers ample data from a sizable sample, thereby providing a significant advantage (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

3.3. Research Context

Turkish education has been pivotal for its social and economic growth. As such, numerous structural and curricular changes to the education system have been implemented by the Ministry of National Education. In 2012, compulsory education was extended from eight to twelve years and divided into three stages (elementary, middle, and high school), each lasting four years. Upon completion of year 12, students undertake the high-stakes and centralised University Entrance Examination as a means to enter tertiary education (Eren & Yeşilbursa, 2017, 2019).

3.3.1. SFL English Preparatory Program

Established in 1973 as a Middle East Technical University extension, Gaziantep Engineering Faculty is the foundation of University of Gaziantep with English as medium of instruction. Gaziantep University gained autonomy as a state university on June 27, 1987. The Middle East Technical University’s Gaziantep Engineering Faculty and Gaziantep Vocational School of Higher Education were also incorporated into the newly established university by this law. Currently, education is provided through 16 faculties, four higher schools, 11 vocational schools of higher education, five graduate schools and five service departments. This offers a wide range of courses in 107 major areas at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Overall, preparatory English courses are intended to assist students in enhancing their proficiency in the English language so that they can satisfy the

linguistic prerequisites for pursuing academic studies at a university. Gaziantep University provides courses in which English is used as the primary language of instruction. To enrol in programs like engineering, medicine and sociology, students are required to demonstrate their proficiency in English so they can comfortably study within an English-speaking atmosphere. Students can demonstrate their language proficiency either by passing an internal test or a standardised international exam such as TOEFL, PTE, and FCE. The student demographics in these programs typically comprise individuals aged 18 to 22 years, although there may be variations.

Students in the program came from diverse disciplinary backgrounds such as Faculties of Medicine, Engineering, Architecture, Economics and Administration, Aeronautical Engineering, the Department of Sociology, the Departments of English Language and Literature and Departments of English Language Teaching. Courses adhere to the CEFR standards and incorporate all four essential language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking).

Gaziantep University provides education in English for various faculties and departments. Students can meet the SFL requirements by either taking the Exemption Exam, which is offered at the start of each academic year, or submitting a certificate that shows their level of proficiency. The Exemption Exam assesses English proficiency for admission to faculty courses and academic studies at Gaziantep University (per Aug. 21, 2017 decree for evaluating Associate's and undergraduate degree students). Students are categorised into three levels based on their Placement Exam scores: A1, A2, and B1.

The SFL utilises a modular system aligned with CEFR for language education. The modules are categorised into three levels: Independent (B1 Intermediate, B1+ Upper-Int, and B2 Low-Advanced), Basic (A1 Elementary and A2 Pre-Intermediate), and Proficient (B2+ Advanced). Modules are 7-8 weeks long, with a passing grade of 60/100 for each level. The module average is determined by the following factors: exit exam (65%), quizzes (20%), online self-access (10%) and student evaluation (5%). A minimum grade of 60 is required to pass a module, failure to do so results in retaking the module. The in-term grade is the mean of four module grades. Module B1 graduates can sit for the year-end final exam. A student's "Preparatory Year Achievement Grade" is determined by combining their in-year average and final exam grade, each weighted at 50%.

3.4. Participants and Demographic Information

All participants were Gaziantep University students, and received neither academic credit nor financial compensation for their participation. The participants were recruited by contacting the School of Foreign Language department of the university where the research was conducted. Participants were 219 undergraduate EFL students who were recruited using the convenience sampling method (Rose et al., 2020) at a public university in Turkey (58.9% women), whose mean age was 19.90 years with a standard deviation of 2,30 (range from 17 to 42 years). In L2 research, the prevalent sample type is “convenience” or “opportunity” sampling. The researcher selects individuals from the target population based on practical criteria like geographic proximity, availability at a particular time, accessibility, and willingness to volunteer. Convenient Sampling includes captive audiences like students within the researcher’s institution. Convenience samples are typically not purely convenience-based, but rather partially purposeful. Participants must possess specific characteristics related to the investigation’s purpose in addition to being easily accessible (Dörnyei, 2007). The majority of these students came from Turkey, a few were from Europe (Romania), North Africa and Southwest Asia (Egypt), Western Asia (Yemen, Syria, Iraq) and Eastern Africa (Somalia). On average, they had 6 years of English learning experiences. The participants demonstrated an A1 to B2 level of English proficiency, as mandated by the program and assessed using the Common European Framework of Reference.

3.4. Instruments

A questionnaire with two versions (i.e., English and Turkish version) were implemented to elicit participants’ self-reports regarding their EFL boredom level and boredom coping strategies. The questionnaires were identical, except for the language used. The questionnaire started with a section retrieving participants’ demographic information (i.e. gender, age, nationality, EFL Training years (or time spent in EFL training), followed by two instruments designed to assess the extent of students’ boredom and the strategies adopted by students to mitigate the negative effects of boredom. Data for the study were collected through the following

instruments used in previous empirical research: Coping with the Boredom Scale (CBS), adapted from Nett et al. (2010) and the Level of Boredom Scale (LBS), adapted from Van Tilburg and Igou (2012) by Eren and Coskun (2016). The instruments were initially created in English but given to the Turkish participants in Turkish, their mother tongue. This was done to avoid any chance that a few respondents with poor proficiency in English might have difficulty responding to all questions. Previous studies have utilised a translated version effectively (Eren, 2013, 2016; Eren & Coskun, 2016). English survey questions used to prevent translation-related measurement errors for an international participant. Each instrument was individually described in detail below.

3.4.1. Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS-20 item)

Participants were presented with a slightly adapted version of The Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS), developed by Nett et al. (2010) inspired by the Holahan's framework of two-by-two dimensions of coping with stress (Holahan et al., 1996) and validated by Daniels et al. (2015), Nett et al. (2011) and Tze et al. (2013a) (see Goetz & Nett, 2008, for the manual). The scale was devised for mathematics but can be adapted to other school domains with slight instructional modifications. Some items were reworded and rephrased to make it suitable for the English language teaching context; for example, the item "When I am bored in Math class..." was modified to "When I am bored in English class..."

The CBS is composed of four subscales: cognitive-approach (e.g., I try to make myself aware that this class is important), behavioural-approach (e.g., I ask my instructor if we can do something else), cognitive-avoidance (e.g., I copy the homework for my next class), and behavioural-avoidance coping (e.g., I start talking to my classmate sitting next to me). Cognitive-approach refers to coping with boredom by reminding oneself of the situation's significance. Behavioural-approach involves attempting to alter a dull environment to make it more engaging. On the other hand, cognitive-avoidance entails diverting one's attention away from tedious tasks. Finally, in behavioural-avoidance, individuals pursue activities unrelated to monotonous duties. The original version contains 20 items, with five items used to measure each set of strategies on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "1 (strongly disagree)" to "5 (strongly agree)". Reliability is conceptualised as "consistency of the

[research] results and how sure readers can be of the replicability of the research” (Woodrow, 2014, p. 25). On the other hand, validity refers to “the extent to which a measure of a set of measures correctly represent the concept of study” (Hair et al., 2014, p. 97). Tze et al. (2013a) and Nett et al. (2011) reported adequate levels of reliability and validity for the CBS. Although CBS was originally constructed in English, to assess boredom coping strategies Turkish respondents were asked to complete the Turkish validated version of the CBS (Eren, 2013; Eren & Coskun, 2016).

The reliability of 20 item Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS-20 item) was calculated by Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient and it proved to be a statistically reliable measurement ($\alpha = .766$).

3.4.2. The 8-item The Level of Boredom Scale (LBS)

The Level of Boredom Scale (LBS), developed by Van Tilburg and Igou (2012), was employed to collect data regarding students’ boredom levels. The scale was slightly adapted (by including English lessons in the items) to make it better fit for language learning.

The term “maths lesson” in the original LBS was changed to “English lesson” for the current study’s context. Participants’ level of boredom was assessed via 8 items (e.g., “When you focus on your feelings during the English lessons, how much does the feeling make you want to do something more meaningful?”). The present study used a 5-point Likert-type version of the scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Even though LBS was originally constructed in English, it was administered to Turkish participants in their native language of Turkish to ensure clear, accurate and quick understanding (Eren, 2016; Eren & Coskun, 2016). The reliability and validity of LBS have been established in prior research (Eren, 2016; Eren & Coskun, 2016).

The reliability of 8 item The Level of Boredom Scale (LBS) was calculated by Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient and it proved to be a statistically reliable measurement ($\alpha = .762$).

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected during the fall semester of the 2021-22 academic years by the researcher. After obtaining ethical approval from the Ethics Committee of the University of Gaziantep to conduct this study (Appendix C), students' informed written consents were obtained at the start of the surveys. Participants in each class received an information sheet that outlined the study, their rights and involvement, and data protection measures implemented by the researcher. Participation was voluntary, with the survey informing participants that they could withdraw without repercussions if any questions made them feel uncomfortable. Throughout the study, pseudonyms were employed to obscure the participants' actual identities. All participants were required to provide informed consent in order to ensure their understanding of the study's purpose.

Questionnaires in the traditional paper-and-pen format were distributed during class. The researcher presented the study in multiple classes, clarifying that participation was voluntary and would not impact students' academic status. The instructors allocated class time for the researcher to elucidate the study's objective and address inquiries concerning privacy and consent. To mitigate response bias (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989), participants were assured that their answers would be kept confidential and used solely for academic purposes. They were also informed that there was no objective right or wrong answer to the questions posed. The respondents completed the CBS and LBS self-report measures, which were derived from Nett et al. (2010), and Van Tilburg and Igou (2012), respectively. The aforementioned research tools were utilised in a standard class period under the supervision of an instructor, lasting 10-15 minutes. Participants received research instruments with study objectives and item response guidelines. The survey elicited students' demographic details such as their student ID, age, gender and class. The respondents had adequate time to reply, with each item on the survey being verbally presented to mitigate any impact of reading proficiency. Encouragement was given to students to utilise the entire Likert scale, encompassing both strong disagreement and agreement as deemed necessary. They were encouraged to seek clarification by asking questions. Students were assured of anonymity and confidentiality, with their student number being replaced by a study number during data entry and individual results not being disclosed (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). The researchers responded to

participants' inquiries during the administration phase. Students authorised the authors to access their GPA by signing a data privacy statement alongside the survey. Institutional records were used to collect students' GPA after the semester ended. We adhered to ethics guidelines from the Human Participants Ethics Committee of University of Gaziantep during data collection.

3.6. Data Analysis

The data were analysed statistically using the statistical package for social science (SPSS; version 23.0). Prior to the statistical analysis, the data checked for inconsistencies and missing values handled appropriately. The selection of this particular software is “a preferred option for most researchers” for data analysis, given that “computer programs have made laborious calculations easier” and due to the well-established statistical features they offer (McKinley & Rose, 2020, p. 32). To summarise the data, descriptive statistics, “collection of tools that quantitatively describes the data in summary and graphical forms” like means and standard deviations were employed “for realising descriptive analytics” (Gudivada, 2017, p. 33). As:

“Such tools compute measures of central tendency and dispersion. Mean, median, and mode are commonly used measures of central tendency. Each measure indicates a different type of typical value in the data. Measures of dispersion (aka variability) include minimum and maximum values, range, quantiles, standard deviation/variance, distribution skewness, and kurtosis.” (Gudivada, 2017, p. 33).

Utilising descriptive statistics, “as the name implies, is the process of categorising and describing the information” (McCue, 2007, p. 4), is a common approach for summarising and examining the attributes of data (Green et al., 2023). In addition to descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, “the process of analysing a sample of data and using it to draw inferences about the population from which it was drawn”, correlation analyses were conducted to “explore causal relationships within data and information” (McCue, 2007, p. 4).

In terms of Research Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 a series of correlation analyses were performed by using SPSS 23.0. Also, in terms of Research Question 1, descriptive analyses were performed with SPSS 23.0 to describe the level of boredom.

3.7. Summary

Commencing with the research design and context, this chapter elaborated on the methodology of the project. Accordingly, the present chapter presented the description of the participants, detailed description of the data collection tools through which the required data were gathered and the ways the collected data were analysed.



CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

4.1. Presentation

The information in this chapter relates to the study's research questions and conclusions. As a result, data were gathered using the Level of Boredom Scale (LBS) and Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS), and the chapter provides the analysis of the data. The chapter begins with demographic data about the participants before moving on to particular findings related to the study research questions.

4.2. Demographic Information

The data collection tool included a demographic information section. Participants provided information their years of EFL study, gender and age. The Table 1. provides information on the demographic data.

Table 1

Demographic information of the participants

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Age	17	29	19.78	1.58
Duration	0.2	17	6.85	4.13

Based on the demographic data provided, the participants in this study had a mean age of 19.78 years ($SD = 1.58$), with a range of ages from 17 to 29 years. The duration of the study ranged from 0.2 to 17 years, with a mean duration of 6.85 years ($SD = 4.13$).

Also, a total of 219 participants were included in the study, with 85 (38.8%) identifying as male and 129 (58.9%) identifying as female. There were also 5 (2.3%) missing cases due to system error. The valid percentages indicate that 39.7% of the participants were male and 60.3% were female. The cumulative percentage of female participants was 100%.

4.3. Findings Regarding the Research Questions

This section presents the findings of the study conducted to explore the boredom levels of EFL students and how their coping strategies with boredom are related to their English success. The study aimed to answer four research questions. Firstly, the study aimed to investigate the levels of boredom experienced by EFL students. Secondly, the study aimed to examine whether students with different coping with boredom strategies differ in their boredom levels. Thirdly, the study aimed to explore whether the levels of boredom experienced by students correlate with their English success. Finally, the study aimed to investigate whether students with different coping with boredom strategies differ in their English success.

4.3.1. Findings Regarding the First Research Question

What are EFL students' boredom levels?

The first research question aimed to investigate the levels of boredom experienced by EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a state university in the south-eastern part of Turkey, as measured by the EFL Level of Boredom Scale (LBS) scale. Boredom has been identified as a significant issue in language learning, affecting students' motivation and engagement, and ultimately their success in learning a new language. The LBS is a validated instrument that measures the degree to which students experience boredom in the language classroom (Eren, 2013, 2016; Eren & Coskun, 2016; Van Tilburg & Igou, 2012).

In this study, the EFL learner boredom scale was administered to a sample of 219 EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey. The scale consists of 20 items that assess various aspects of boredom, such as lack of interest, frustration, and mental fatigue. The data collected through this scale provides insight into the levels of boredom experienced by EFL students and can help identify factors that contribute to boredom in the language classroom.

The findings from this study will be presented in the following section, providing a comprehensive overview of the levels of boredom experienced by EFL students in the context of this university in Turkey.

Table 2

Level of Boredom and Boredom Coping Strategies among EFL Learners

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Var
Behavioral avoidance	219	5,00	25,00	16,2603	5,40055	29,166
Cognitive avoidance	219	5,00	25,00	15,5662	4,11854	16,962
Behavioral approach	219	5,00	25,00	15,8539	4,21951	17,804
Cognitive approach	219	5,00	25,00	10,7580	4,32306	18,689
Boredom Level	219	12,00	36,00	23,7626	5,22505	27,301

Based on the analysis provided in Table 2, the descriptive statistics for Research Question 1 show the mean boredom level experienced by EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey is 23.76 (SD = 5.23), with a minimum score of 12 and a maximum score of 36. The range of scores indicates that there is variability in the levels of boredom experienced by students.

The mean scores for the four types of coping strategies were also computed. The mean score for behavioral avoidance was 16.26 (SD = 5.40), for cognitive avoidance it was 15.57 (SD = 4.12), for behavioral approach it was 15.85 (SD = 4.22), and for cognitive approach it was 10.76 (SD = 4.32). These results suggest that students tend to employ more avoidance strategies than approach strategies when coping with boredom.

Overall, these findings suggest that boredom is a common experience for EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey. The high levels of boredom reported by the students in this study may have implications for

their motivation and engagement in language learning. Further analyses done to investigate the relationship between boredom levels and language learning outcomes, as well as to identify effective strategies aimed at reducing boredom and improving students' motivation and engagement in language learning.

Finally, skewness and kurtosis test were run in order to analyze the normal distribution and therefore determine which test to administer. The results are given Table 3:

Table 3

Skewness, Kurtosis test results for Normality Check

	Normality Statistics				
	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Behavioral avoidance	219	-,216	,164	-,678	,327
Cognitive avoidance	219	,082	,164	-,438	,327
Behavioral approach	219	-,190	,164	-,116	,327
Cognitive approach	219	,999	,164	1,106	,327
BoredomLevel	219	,150	,164	-,686	,327
EOY	219	-,367	,164	-1,178	,327
Aver	219	-,538	,164	,716	,327

As is evident in the table, the skewness and kurtosis tests, which are still a useful test of normality (Bai & Ng, 2005), proved that the distribution of data collected is normal (min -1.870 < skewness and kurtosis in the study < 1.178). Therefore, parametric tests were administered for the comparative analysis.

4.3.2. Findings Regarding the Second Research Question

Do students with different boredom levels have different boredom coping strategies?

The second research question aimed to examine whether students with different boredom levels, determined by their Boredom Level Scale scores (12-20=Low, 21-28=Medium, 29-36=High) have different boredom coping strategies as measured by Coping with Boredom Scale (CBS). Coping strategies refer to the various ways in which individuals deal with stressful or challenging situations, such

as boredom in the language classroom. Previous research has shown that students may use different strategies to cope with boredom, such as seeking social interaction or engaging in activities that promote self-regulation.

In this study, the EFL learner boredom scale was administered to a sample of EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey. Additionally, the CBS was administered to assess the coping strategies employed by students to deal with boredom. The CBS consists of 20 items that measure coping strategies such as behavioral avoidance, cognitive avoidance, behavioral approach, and cognitive approach. A one-way Anova test was conducted to see whether students in different boredom level groups differ in their boredom coping strategies. The results of the test are given in Table 4:

Table 4

One-way Anova Results for differences between boredom levels in terms of coping strategies

		Sum of Squares	df	MeanSquare	F	Sig.
BEAV	Between Groups	79,669	2	39,835	1,370	,256
	Within Groups	6278,495	216	29,067		
	Total	6358,164	218			
COAV	Between Groups	109,827	2	54,914	3,306	,039
	Within Groups	3587,963	216	16,611		
	Total	3697,790	218			
BEAP	Between Groups	132,870	2	66,435	3,828	,023
	Within Groups	3748,455	216	17,354		
	Total	3881,324	218			
COAP	Between Groups	1,819	2	,909	,048	,953
	Within Groups	4072,355	216	18,853		
	Total	4074,174	218			

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether students in high, medium, and low boredom levels differed in their coping strategies. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the behavioral coping strategies among the groups, $F(2, 216) = 1.370$, $p = .256$. However, there was a significant difference in the cognitive avoidance coping strategies among the groups (Mid = 20.16 > High = 17.50), $F(2, 216) = 3.306$, $p = .039$. Additionally, there was a significant difference in the behavioral approach coping strategies among the groups (Low = 22.10 > High = 19.79), $F(2, 216) = 3.828$, $p = .023$. Finally, there was no significant difference in the cognitive approach coping strategies among the groups, $F(2, 216) = 0.048$, $p = .953$. Overall, the findings suggest that students in different

levels of boredom differ in their coping strategies, specifically in cognitive avoidance and behavioral approach coping strategies.

4.3.3. Findings Regarding the Third Research Question

Is there a relationship between EFL students' boredom levels and their English success?

The third research question aimed to explore whether the boredom levels experienced by EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey correlate with their success in the in-house End of the Year Scores (EOYs) prepared by the institution. The in-house test is a measure of students' proficiency in English that has been developed and administered by the institution itself. Boredom has been identified as a significant factor that affects students' motivation and engagement in language learning, which in turn can impact their language proficiency.

In this study, the EFL learner boredom level scale was administered to a sample of EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey. Additionally, the students' success in the in-house EOYs was measured as a measure of their English proficiency. The data were analysed with a Pearson correlation test and the results are provided in Table 5:

Table 5

Pearson Correlation between Boredom Level and EOYs

	BoredomLevel	EOY
BoredomLevel	PearsonCorrelation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,126
	N	,062
End of theYearScores (EOYs)		219
	PearsonCorrelation	219
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1
	N	,126
		,062
		219

Based on the correlation table, there were no significant positive correlations between students' boredom levels and their end-of-year scores (EOYs) ($r = 0.126$, $p = 0.062$). This finding suggests that there is not a statistically significant relationship between EFL students' boredom levels and their success in learning English.

4.3.4. Findings Regarding the Fourth Research Question

Do students in different proficiency levels, namely A1, A2 and B1 differ in their boredom levels and implementation of boredom coping strategies?

The fourth research question aimed to investigate whether students in different proficiency levels, namely A1, A2 and B1 differ in their boredom levels and implementation of boredom coping strategies. Coping strategies refer to the various ways in which individuals deal with stressful or challenging situations, such as boredom in the language classroom. In this study, the EFL learner boredom scale was administered to a sample of EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages at a university in Turkey.

An Anova test was conducted to see whether students in different EFL proficiency level groups differ in their CBS scores and boredom levels. The results of the test are given in Table 6:

Table 6

One way Anova Results

		Sum of Squares	df	MeanSquare	F	Sig.
Behavioral avoidance	Between Groups	38,397	2	19,198	,656	,520
	Within Groups	6319,768	216	29,258		
	Total	6358,164	218			
Cognitive avoidance	Between Groups	70,001	2	35,001	2,084	,127
	Within Groups	3627,789	216	16,795		
	Total	3697,790	218			
Behavioral approach	Between Groups	86,877	2	43,438	2,473	,087
	Within Groups	3794,448	216	17,567		
	Total	3881,324	218			
Cognitive approach	Between Groups	14,881	2	7,440	,396	,674
	Within Groups	4059,293	216	18,793		
	Total	4074,174	218			
BoredomLevel	Between Groups	3649,353	2	1824,677	171,190	,000
	Within Groups	2302,300	216	10,659		
	Total	5951,653	218			

A one-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to examine whether students in different proficiency levels (A1, A2, and B1) differed in their boredom level and implementation of boredom coping strategies. The results revealed a significant difference in boredom level among the proficiency levels, $F(2, 216) = 171.190$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .613$. Post-hoc analyses with Tukey HSD correction indicated that students in A1 ($M = 28.55$, $SD = 4.71$) had a significantly lower

boredom level compared to students in A2 ($M = 21.61$, $SD = 4.73$) and B1 ($M = 19.34$, $SD = 3.87$), $p < .001$. Moreover, there were no significant differences in coping strategies (behavioral, cognitive, and avoidance) among the proficiency levels, $p > .05$. These findings suggest that students' boredom level is associated with their language proficiency level, with lower proficiency students reporting lower boredom levels compared to higher proficiency students.

4.4. Summary

This chapter outlines the results obtained from the study, which focuses on addressing specific research inquiries. The Level of Boredom Scale and Coping with Boredom Scale were employed to collect relevant data for analysis. Additionally, demographic details concerning the participants are presented alongside key findings related to the research questions posed earlier. By examining patterns and trends in this collected data, a deeper understanding of boredom experiences and their root causes is revealed. Ultimately, these comprehensively analyzed outcomes form the basis upon which conclusions can be drawn, thus making valuable contributions to existing knowledge within this field.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1. Presentation

In this chapter, the results of the current study will be discussed in detail, building upon the research questions previously introduced. The main aim is to address the objectives set out in conducting this study. Each research question will be examined closely and compared with previous studies conducted within this field. To begin with, a thorough exploration of each finding pertaining to every research question will take place. Throughout this chapter, special emphasis will be given to contextualising our outcomes within existing knowledge so as to contribute meaningfully to move the field forward.

5.2. Discussion of the Findings for Research Questions

5.2.1. Discussion of the First Research Question

What are EFL students' boredom levels?

Boredom in EFL Classes: Unveiling its Impact on Motivation, Engagement, and Language Learning Outcomes: The research question focused on the levels of boredom, “one of the achievement emotions that has only recently been recognized by L2 acquisition researchers as an important ID factor” experienced by EFL students in a state-run university in Southeastern Turkey (Pawlak et al., 2022, p. 1). The participants reported higher levels of boredom in their

English classes. The results, with an average boredom score of 23.76 ($SD = 5.23$), further confirm that boredom is “one of the most commonly experienced emotions” among the participants (Pekrun et al., 2010, p. 531). This is in keeping with the results of previous research in the field (Daniels et al., 2015; Daschmann et al., 2011; Derakhshan et al., 2022; Kruk, 2021, 2022; Mann & Robinson, 2009; Pawlak et al., 2020c; Tze et al., 2016; Zawodniak et al., 2017). This suggests that students frequently encounter high levels of boredom “a multifaceted phenomenon heavily reliant on disengagement in all its complexity and non-linearity” which could potentially impact their motivation since it “is not merely a flip side of motivation” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 8) and their engagement, delineated as “the quality of a students’ connection or involvement with the endeavour of schooling” in learning a new language (Skinner et al., 2009a, p. 494). Given the accumulating evidence, boredom is closely linked to decreased motivation and engagement in language learning, which can have detrimental effects on language proficiency (Daschmann et al., 2011; Pawlak et al., 2020a; Xie, 2021).

The complex nexus between the notion of boredom and language learning outcomes has been identified as a key factor that has the potential to greatly influence students’ progress in language learning. What is particularly relevant for the current discussion is the taking into account the multidimensional nature of boredom, encompassing “specific affective components (unpleasant, aversive feelings), cognitive components (altered perceptions of time), physiological components (reduced arousal), expressive components (facial, vocal, and postural expression), and motivational components (motivation to change the activity or to leave the situation)” (Pekrun et al., 2010, p. 532). Correspondingly, boredom “categorised as one of the deactivating, negative emotion[s]” that can exert a direct or an indirect impact on language acquisition, thereby culminating in various consequences for learners as “it is experienced as unpleasant and involves a reduction of physiological activation” (Pekrun et al., 2010, p. 532).

One of the striking patterns to emerge from this research is that boredom during language learning can lead to decreased motivation and engagement, which in turn can negatively impact effective L2 performance (Dörnyei, 2019; Kruk, 2022; Li, 2021; Dewaele et al., 2023; Pawlak et al., 2020a). Consistent with this, when learners experience boredom, they may feel “disengaged from interesting or meaningful activity” (Fahlman et al., 2013, p. 71), exert efforts to maintain their focus,

concentration and build interest and as a result, achieve poorer learning outcomes (Dörnyei, 2019; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2020; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b).

Previous research has identified the primary educational importance of motivation and engagement in language learning (Hiver et al., 2021a, 2021b; Noels et al., 2019; Reeve & Lee, 2014). By definition, L2 motivation is conceptualised by Gardner (1985) as “combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 10) and has long been widely recognized as vital (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Gan et al., 2018; Wang & Gan, 2021). Equally important, the significance of engagement is best summarised in the words of Philp and Duchesne (2016): “a state of heightened attention and involvement, in which participation is reflected not only in the cognitive dimension, but in social, behavioural, and affective dimensions as well” (p. 51). There is no denying that, the experience of boredom “may have deleterious effects” on students’ attention and engagement levels (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 2), causing them to “feel more or less enthusiastic to engage in class activities” (Xie, 2021, p. 1) and a narrowing of their focus and insufficient understanding of the target language as “it was strongly linked to inactivity, disengagement, inattention, mind wandering and loss of goal in ongoing activities, as well as withdrawal, escaping, or avoidance behaviors.” (Li et al., 2023b, p. 12). Note that this figure is in line with Pawlak et al. (2020a)’s comment: “Boredom is an aversive, debilitating and deactivating emotion that can seriously inhibit the learning process.” (p. 2). To remedy this issue, instructors need to provide an engaging environment that arouses students’ interest and ameliorates the effects of boredom (Zhang, 2022). In this connection, teachers, referred to as “the major players in the educational process” by Hattie (2012, p. 25), play a powerful role in this process and they can establish an environment that is engaging and interactive, eliciting active involvement from students (Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2021) “to prevent disruptive behaviors and diminish the valence of emotions which are negative such as feeling anxious, frustrated, and bored” (Xie, 2021, p. 2). This may not only mitigate the “pernicious effect[s]” of boredom but also enhances attention spans and increases comprehension levels (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 2).

As noted in the literature review, there is compelling evidence that self efficacy exert a powerful influence on academic achievement (Bong, 2002; Giladi et al., 2022; Hsieh & Kang, 2010; Pajares, 1996; Richardson et al., 2012; Robbins et

al., 2004; Sun et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021a; Yabukoshi, 2021). Bearing this in mind, it is noteworthy that higher levels of student self-efficacy are associated with increased learner engagement, involvement and participation (Zhen et al., 2017). As neatly summarised by Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) “Self-efficacy can lead to more engagement and, subsequently, to more learning and better achievement; however, the relations also flow back to self-efficacy over time. Accordingly, the more a student is engaged, and especially the more they learn and the better they perform, the higher their self-efficacy.” (p. 123). What merits special mention is the perception of boredom may gradually erode students’ confidence in their language acquisition abilities. Thus, by and large, when confronted with challenges, they may start to question their own aptitude and motivation for learning a new language, ultimately leading to diminished motivation to continue their language acquisition journey.

The study found that students, also labelled as “Reappraisers” by Nett et al. (2010) tend to use avoidance coping strategies more frequently than approach strategies when dealing with boredom. Out of all the coping mechanisms analysed, behavioural avoidance (M 16.26, SD 5.40) and cognitive avoidance (M 15.57, SD 4.12) were the most commonly employed by students to cope with boredom. This suggests that students prefer to avoid the sources of their boredom rather than actively addressing the problem.

Fostering Engagement and Autonomy: Multifaceted Strategies to Alleviate Boredom and Elevate Language Learning Experiences: The current study suggests that more future research is needed to determine effective strategies for reducing boredom and promoting engagement, often referred to as “the holy grail of learning” in language learning to make sure that a key piece in the puzzle of language learning is not left unresolved (Sinatra et al., 2015, p. 1). Probing the link between boredom and language learning outcomes can enhance language learning outcomes. With this aim in mind, it is essential to “design more specifically targeted and nuanced interventions” (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 61) that can help EFL learners maintain high levels of motivation and active engagement, as characterised by Russell et al. (2005, p. 1) “energy in action” in language learning. With a more granular understanding of the relationship between boredom and language acquisition, educators can develop effective strategies to counteract the potential negative effects of boredom on student participation and achievement. This research

aims to cast valuable light on the complex relationship between boredom and language learning outcomes, offering a novel lens “in the development of finely tuned interventions to” sustain learner enthusiasm and engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 59).

To reduce the likelihood of students experiencing boredom, teachers can apply various pedagogical methods. Firstly, cultivating an engaging learning atmosphere is key to language acquisition. This can be achieved by incorporating various stimulating elements such as “digital games” (Dehghanzadeh et al., 2019; Gee, 2007; Reinhardt & Thorne, 2020; Reynolds, 2014; Xu et al., 2019), “role-plays” (Shao et al., 2023) and “role playing games” (Westborg, 2022a, 2022b), “multimedia resources” (Lan et al., 2023) which has been conceived as “the computer based delivery of video, audio, written text, graphics and the integration of these media” (Brett, 1995, p. 77) and “authentic materials” (Guariento & Morley, 2001) since maximising learning outcomes requires learners to interact extensively with both authentic and semi-authentic materials placed within real-life situations or credible simulations (Guariento & Morley, 2001; Little et al., 1994). Crucially also, these resources should be paired with authentic tasks to reinforce their authenticity (Guariento & Morley, 2001; Little et al., 1994). By integrating these tools into the classroom setting, learners are likely to find their language learning experience enjoyable and captivating. The use of educational games not only provides entertainment but also encourages active participation from students. Additionally, role plays allow learners to engage in real-life scenarios where they can practise language skills in a meaningful way (Krebt, 2017; Raz, 1985; Tompkins, 2001). What is important to note here is that “by assigning students specific situations and roles in a scenario, a student can connect to the materials taught at the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels” (Winardy & Septiana, 2023, p. 7). Furthermore, the utilisation of multimedia resources enhances the teaching process by offering visual aids and auditory components that cater to diverse learner preferences (Brett, 1995). Students, especially younger ones, can benefit greatly from an engaging classroom environment that incorporates games, enjoyment, and effective communication. This approach can greatly increase motivation and enhance the learning experience (Oga-Baldwin, 2019; Oga-Baldwin et al., 2017; Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2018).

Second, to facilitate engagement among language learners, it is of critical importance to present content that is relevant and meaningful (Brookfield, 1991; Oxford & Cuéllar, 2014). One effective strategy is to connect language learning with real-life situations and the students' specific interests (Shao et al., 2020) as this provides learners with "personal relevance and significance that give purpose to life" (Oxford, 2016, p. 18). As Ellis (1990) puts it "control over linguistic knowledge is achieved by means of performing under real operating conditions in meaning-focused language activities." (p. 195). By "increasing the value of educational topics—that is, the personal relevance and utility of school material-to student's lives", educators can motivate learners to actively participate in their studies (Hulleman & Barron, 2015, p. 166). Through actively participating in language activities, learners can obtain a sense of accomplishment and enter a state of uninterrupted focus known as "flow" (Csikszentmihályi, 1990) which can be specified as "a state of positive well-being and optimal performance in which learners function with their full potential" (Zare, 2023, p. 12). This leads them to view their engagement as meaningful and more likely to exhibit motivated behaviours (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2022) as "flow and engagement are inextricably linked to each other" (Zare, 2023, p. 12). This approach encourages students by displaying how what they are learning directly relates to their everyday lives outside of the classroom. Ultimately, offering relevant and meaningful content (Kinchin & O'Sullivan, 2003; Moore, 1987; White, 2007) has merit in promoting increased student engagement in language learning, as "meaningfulness is at the very heart of their existence" (Gregersen, 2019, p. 628).

Third, to promote active engagement, it is of great significance to encourage student participation through various means. One effective approach is to involve students in discussions, debates, and group activities. By creating an inclusive learning environment that encourages interaction, students can improve their language skills while developing ideas and opinions of their own, underscoring the significant value of engaging in communicative tasks and interacting with peers (Mackey, 2020; Pishghadam et al., 2023) as "in language classrooms, the need for students to communicate and interact with one another is greater than in other subjects due to the communicative demands of language acquisition" (Shao & Parkinson, 2021, p. 5). To fully benefit from these opportunities, educators should emphasise the use of the target language creatively during such activities that involve "genuine communication on personally meaningful topics" (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020

p. 61). This not only improves language learning outcomes, but also enables learners to explore different perspectives and articulate their individual viewpoints effectively. By promoting active participation in this manner, teachers facilitate meaningful exchanges among students, which enhance both understanding and overall progress (Rivers, 1987).

Fourth, to optimise the language learning process it is crucial to set up clear language learning goals (Dörnyei, 2008) and monitor students' progress closely. Obviously, "by helping students set mastery goals and making attributions focused on the learning process, helping them feel safe to risk making mistakes, and providing them with constructive feedback to improve" (Lou & Noels, 2019, p. 9), educators can provide a roadmap for both themselves and their students, ensuring that these objectives are accompanied by a set of concrete action plans, as "future self-guides are only effective if they are accompanied by a set of concrete action plans." (Dörnyei, 2008, p. 4). In the meantime, tracking student progress allows educators to understand how well individual learners are performing and identify areas that require additional support. Reinforcing this notion, it is also of great importance to recognize and celebrate students' achievements (Jiang & Dewaele, 2019), which fosters a healthy learning environment and motivates them to continue improving, emphasising the critical importance of "the positive teacher-student relationship" (Mohammadi et al., 2023, p. 12). As claimed by Wang et al. (2021b):

"When students were in an English language class characterized by academic and emotional support from teachers, mutual respect from classmates, and engaging activities, they were inclined to enjoy the class and feel pride at being a member of such an English class. On the other hand, if students do not feel supported or respected in class, they might feel anxious or bored within the classroom." (p. 8).

Moreover, offering formative and facilitative feedback that includes "comments and suggestions to help guide students in their own revision and conceptualization" (Shute, 2008, p. 157) is also crucial in guiding students towards further development by highlighting their strengths and providing useful guidance on areas that require improvement. As hinted earlier, providing regular, positive and sufficient feedback, which "functions best as an interactive process in which teachers and learners communicate together about learning and teaching" (Mercer & Dörnyei,

2020, p. 62) has been demonstrated to enhance students' positive emotions such as hope and enjoyment (Yang et al., 2021) as well as their self-perceptions and encourage them to seek out opportunities to overcome this challenging situation (Goetz et al., 2010; Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2014), as it “communicates to learners that they are actively involved in their learning progress and processes – that is, it makes them agents rather than merely passive recipients” of their education (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 62). By implementing these practices, one can create an environment that equips students with a lens of “growth mindset” (Yeager & Dweck, 2012) which, as noted, plays a pivotal and distinctive role since a “fixed mindset may impede learning, but a growth mindset can function as a powerful resource, influencing learner motivation, the setting of goals, and how learners respond to setbacks and ‘failures’ that are an essential part of language learning” (Williams et al., 2015, p. 71) and empowers learners to establish a sense of ownership of their language learning experience, thus “fostering proactive, strategic learners who are capable of utilizing self-regulated learning strategies - a crucial goal of learning.” (Feng & Chen, 2023, p. 1).

Fifth, to enhance the learning experience for students, offering them choices and autonomy, which refers to “the learners’ sense that they are in charge, that is, that they can affect their own learning and hold a degree of responsibility for its outcomes” (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 30) throughout their educational process is an effective approach, fostering active, self-regulated, and autonomous learning (Boekaerts et al., 2000). Students tend to prefer taking charge of their own learning process, which can result in increased feelings of competence and motivation when they are given the autonomy to make their own choices (Cotterall, 1995; Lepper, 1985). By allowing students to “take control over their own learning, including their individual choices, decisions and needs, may be a good opportunity for them to cope with boredom in the L2 classroom in a searching and thus constructive way” (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018, p. 189), educators can tap into their “intrinsic motivation” (Carreira, 2011; Lim & Yeo, 2021; Risueño Martínez et al., 2016) and foster a sense of ownership over their learning process. Teachers should provide options for projects or topics that align with each student’s individual interests, strengths, and preferences. This encourages engagement and empowers learners as active participants in shaping their own education. Students will feel more motivated when given the opportunity to pursue subjects they are genuinely interested in.

Incorporating choice and autonomy into the curriculum enables teachers to foster self-directed learning “in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help from others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating goals, identifying human and material resources, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes” (Knowles, 1975, p. 18). They develop “critical thinking skills” (Enciso et al., 2017) that involve “purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference” (Facione, 2013, p. 26) while honing personal agency - essential attributes needed not only for successful academic outcomes but also for “lifelong learning” (Allwright, 1990; Little, 1991).

Sixth, to cultivate an environment that promotes student support and inclusivity, it is crucial to establish a positive classroom culture (Dörnyei, 2008; Kim, 2015). This can be achieved by fostering an atmosphere in which students feel at ease taking risks and embracing their mistakes as part of the language learning process (Aida, 1994). To promote risk-taking, educators should emphasise the idea that acquiring fluency involves perpetual learning from “errors”, “[a] linguistic form or a combination of forms, which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers’ native speaker counterparts” (Lennon, 1991, p. 182). By eliminating fear of judgement or criticism, teachers can empower learners to step out of their comfort zones and explore new linguistic territories. It is important for students to recognize that language acquisition involves trial-and-error methodology where “corrections” (Swain, 1985) are pivotal stepping stones towards progress. Moreover, by endorsing resilience in language education, along with other positive characteristics (Danesh & Shahnazari, 2020; Hiver et al., 2021b; MacIntyre et al., 2019a), instructors nurture “self-confidence” (Clément, 1980; Clément & Gardner, 2001) within individuals while emphasising collective growth through collaboration and mutual assistance, in line with the spirit that “teachers are the key to setting the emotional tone for the class” (Li et al., 2021, p. 9).

Seventh, to yield beneficial language learning outcomes educators should incorporate interactive language apps, online resources, and language learning platforms that cater to the diverse learning styles of students. By integrating technology into the classroom, teachers can engage students in a more interactive way and promote active participation in their language studies. In fact, research

suggests that “most learners could improve their ability in speaking, listening, writing, vocabulary, and learning motivation through technology-enhanced interactions with their peers and teachers” (Zhang & Zou, 2020, p. 23). Innovative technological tools such as mobile applications and online platforms specifically designed for language learners allow instructors to provide engaging materials and encourage independent exploration of the target language. Importantly, these digital resources enable students to practise reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills at their own pace while receiving immediate feedback on their progress, as this is “a crucial part of the learning process” (Harmer, 2007, p. 137). Furthermore, leveraging technology fosters autonomy “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning” (Holec, 1981, p. 3) among learners by offering them greater control over their own education journey. Students can opt to use a variety of multimedia formats that best suit their individual preferences and use self-directed strategies through these tech-based resources. The use of multimedia in language learning has been proven to exert profound effects, such as fostering greater learner engagement and autonomous learning, motivating learners and shaping interactive and experiencing learner styles. Additionally, it can enhance technical proficiency and research skills (Hong, 2010). Relatedly, previous research has shown that using technology for language learning in a self-directed manner, outside of a traditional classroom setting, significantly contributes to language acquisition and enhances the learning process (Brevik, 2019; Peters & Webb, 2018). Simply put, integrating effective technologies can be a potential game-changer in the student motivation toward foreign or second-language acquisition while providing an opportunity for “real communication” (authenticity through a genuine purpose) exchange (Guariento & Morley, 2001).

Eighth, to enhance the language learning experience and make it more enriching, educators must cultivate students’ cultural awareness by introducing various cultural elements related to the target language as it holds “a pedagogical usefulness” (Byram & Wagner, 2018, p. 142). This not only deepens their understanding but also enhances their motivation towards language acquisition. By incorporating cultural components into language lessons (Dörnyei, 2008), educators, often referred to as “cultural workers” (Giroux, 2005, p. 71) weave a tapestry of a more holistic learning environment that goes beyond grammar rules and vocabulary memorization. Through cultural immersion activities such as watching movies or

documentaries in the target language (Dörnyei, 2008), participating in traditional celebrations or rituals, engaging in classroom projects or assignments which “can vary in form and scope, from interviewing someone local to study abroad trips, tandem e-learning partnerships, study villages (e.g. camps within a country creating a language community of use for a short time) or other projects designed to foster contact with L2 speakers” (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 16) and virtual exchange, also referred to as telecollaboration or online cross-cultural exchange (Luo & Yang, 2018; O’Dowd, 2021), learners glean insight into the customs, traditions, literature, art forms, and societal norms associated with the target language community. In this connection:

“The institution can communicate explicitly and indirectly to students, parents and the local community that languages are taken seriously and linguistic diversity is respected and embraced; it can support excursions, exchanges and language-related projects; it can provide time and resources to support activities such as students performing a play in the L2; it can hold events where members of various L2 communities are welcomed into the school or university to share aspects of their languages and cultures in a ‘languages day’; and it can stock the library with sufficient L2 books and films” (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 20).

This exposure promotes cultural appreciation, broadened horizons, and respect for the uniqueness of diverse cultures (Hsieh et al., 2022).

Ninth, in order to create a more engaging and stimulating learning environment in the foreign language classroom, it is of central importance to use task variation as “the same thing all the time, teachers going on and on, and lack of variety” (Robinson, 1975, p. 142) might be one of the reasons for this feeling. According to the control value theory of educational psychology put forward by Pekrun (2006), one of the most prominent frameworks for understanding boredom, individuals who feel in control of a task that they find interesting or important will likely experience positive emotions such as enjoyment. On the other hand, if an important task is perceived as uncontrollable, it can lead to negative emotions like anxiety which has been introduced as an “over-dominated negative emotion” (Lan et al., 2023, p. 2). Additionally, if a task is deemed unimportant or uninteresting and is

either too easy or too difficult, it can result in negative emotions such as boredom (Pekrun, 2006). Within this framework, by incorporating a diverse range of “communication-based tasks” (Pawlak, 2014, p. 92), both unfocused tasks that “predispose learners to choose from a range of forms but they are not designed with the use of a specific form in mind” and focused tasks that “aim to induce learners to process, receptively or productively, some particular linguistic feature, for example, a grammatical structure” (Ellis, 2003, p. 16), boredom can be effectively avoided. Teachers should strive to alternate between listening, speaking, reading, and writing activities in order to induce and sustain students’ interest and facilitate their active engagement while avoiding “the repetitiveness and monotony of activities used” (Kruk et al., 2022, p. 2). By providing varied, challenging tasks that include novel elements, related to the learners’ natural interest and target different language skills (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011), teachers can address the issue of potential boredom among L2 students, as “the more willing, engaged and interested the students are in performing a language task the less boredom they might experience” (Kruk, 2016b, p. 35). These diverse activities not only prevent repetition but also cater to varying interests and preferences within the class. For instance, integrating “some student centered instructional methods such as interactive teaching through discussion” (Mohammadi et al., 2023, p. 12) or debates alongside individual exercises allows for dynamic interaction while simultaneously developing linguistic proficiency. Incorporating task variation brings excitement by introducing new challenges and opportunities for meaningful communication in English classrooms specifically. As indicated by Sulis (2022):

“the provision of short and varied tasks during the lesson can sustain learners’ emotional, behavioural, and cognitive engagement, as they provide them with short-term objectives or proximal goals to achieve. Crucially, the accomplishment of each individual task can contribute to substantiating a learner’s sense of efficacy, while giving them immediate feedback on their progress.” (p. 11).

Additionally, using multiple teaching methods (Gläser-Zikuda et al., 2005; Hwang et al., 2017; Shao et al., 2019; Sulis, 2022) helps fight the boredom that causes students’ disengagement as “a positive attitude to the students’ work, a kind of energy and teaching very useful stuff seemed to instigate them to willingly

participate, whereas conducting the classes in the same way and doing the same type of tasks invited them to resort to avoidance behaviors.” (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018, p. 187). By regularly incorporating this approach throughout lessons, teachers can create a fun and motivating learning environment where students feel interested and involved, mitigating the likelihood of boredom, which often arises from the presence of “unstimulating and non-arousing environments” (Lewinski, 2015, p. 4).

Lastly, to improve language learning, it is helpful to encourage “peer interaction” (Philp et al., 2010) and collaboration among students as sometimes “students among themselves always understand one another better than when the teacher explains it” (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2021, p. 10). By promoting activities such as group work and language exchanges, learners are presented with valuable chances to practise the target language in a supportive setting. Taking part in these types of interactions can have positive effects on their linguistic development (Long, 1991). A practical approach is to incorporate collaborative “school projects” (Dörnyei et al., 2016) or “tasks” (Skehan, 1998, 2001; Willis, 1996) into classroom activities. For example, assigning group tasks where students need to communicate and collaborate actively not only promotes teamwork but also encourages language production, ultimately contributing to the enhancement of students’ FL performance or achievement through group work (Slavin, 1995). By engaging in language exchanges that “stimulate spontaneous language use” (Chen, 2016, p. 4) with peers, learners can share ideas, negotiate meaning, and participate in “close-to-life topics” in real-life situations (Lan et al., 2023, p. 11). These interactions provide an immersive experience for both parties involved and allow students to practise language while receiving formative feedback. Promoting peer interaction has multiple benefits for language learners (Mellanby, 2000; Murphey & Arao, 2001), as it creates a dynamic learning environment conducive to skill improvement.

Of note the strategies outlined above are just a few of the many potential options available. In this sense, the most effective approach may depend on several factors, including the unique needs and abilities of each student and the specific educational setting. However, educators can improve language learning outcomes and foster enthusiasm by incorporating measures that reduce the detrimental influence of boredom which “may have no less detrimental effects than anxiety on L2 learning”, promote motivation, and encourage engagement (Shao et al., 2023, p.

5). Without a shadow of a doubt, “with sufficient guidance, students can be taught to apply a repertoire of intervention strategies and different study techniques (e.g. technology-based learning, role play, fictional talk, movies, or TV shows; see Shao, Nicholson, et al., 2020) to enhance pleasant and reduce unpleasant emotions in L2 learning” (Shao et al., 2023, p. 23). By doing so, students are likely to experience more productive and enjoyable learning experiences as they acquire new knowledge.

To sum up, feeling bored during language learning can have negative effects on outcomes (Macklem, 2015; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Pekrun et al., 2010), due to multiple factors like reduced motivation, decreased attention, and disengagement. This finding empirically support the theoretical claims grounded in Broaden and Build theory (Fredrickson, 2003), yet on a speculative level, and adds empirical evidence, regarding the debilitating effect of boredom based on “control value theory” (Pekrun et al., 2006), and extend these theories in English language learning in the Turkish context. In order to avoid these negative effects, it is crucial for educators to implement strategies that lead to active participation and cultivate a “positive classroom environment” (Fraser et al., 1986; Shao & Parkinson, 2021) in order to “set the stage to engage” (King & King, 2018, p. 15), neatly summarised by Wang et al. (2021b) as follows: “classes with a positive climate can promote student engagement and learning motivation and improve students’ academic performance” (p. 3). To that end, this can open up rich learning opportunities and help make language learning meaningful and enjoyable for students, keeping them motivated and engaged as they climb the ladder of language proficiency and in turn improve students’ overall language performance. In particular, by adopting dynamic and engaging approaches, instructors can help learners achieve an in-depth and nuanced understanding accompanied by appreciation for the target language.

5.2.2. Discussion of the Second Research Question

Do students with different boredom levels have different coping strategies?

The analysis conducted using a one-way ANOVA revealed notable disparities in the cognitive avoidance and behavioural approach coping mechanisms employed by students across different boredom groups. These findings suggest that individuals adapt their approaches based on the severity or intensity of their feelings of boredom. Further research could explore how these coping strategies impact academic

performance and overall “well-being” (Hascher, 2003; MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012b), as generating an in-depth understanding of effective ways to manage boredom could shed some original insights into L2 boredom for educators and psychologists alike.

One of the intriguing findings is that there were no significant differences in coping strategies used by students to deal with feelings of boredom, regardless of their individual levels of boredom. However, it is important to note that there were disparities observed in cognitive avoidance and behavioural approach coping strategies among students with different levels of boredom. It can logically be assumed that individuals with varying degrees of boredom tend to adopt different cognitive and behavioural approaches when facing feelings of boredom.

These findings could also reflect the fact that students who experience moderate levels of boredom are more likely to use cognitive coping strategies compared to those with high levels of boredom. In other words, this finding indicates that individuals in the mid-level range may be more inclined to avoid confronting and elucidating the underlying causes of their boredom than those experiencing higher levels of boredom. Avoidance mechanisms include mental distractions or efforts to shift attention away from sources of this intriguing notion. Students who use such coping strategies may orient themselves to passing time without being authentically engaged, which can be easily observed through visible manifestations such as daydreaming, staring into space, doodling, inattention, use of cell phones, non-attentiveness, looking at the clock, placing their head on their desks and sleeping, scribbling on a piece of paper, surreptitious conversations and passing notes to temporarily escape the boring situation. In contrast, students with higher levels of boredom are less likely to use these avoidance approaches, which perhaps indicates the fact that they recognize the need for greater engagement and active participation when faced with boredom-inducing situations.

On the other hand, individuals who experience low levels of boredom are more likely to use proactive coping strategies to deal with boredom compared to those who experience high levels of boredom. It is reasonable, therefore, to infer that those with lower levels of boredom are more likely to actively address the causes of their boredom and seek more rewarding alternatives (Bench & Lench, 2013) to overcome this problematic condition, particularly within the context of L2.

The pattern of the profile found in our study was consistent with Nett et al.'s (2010) "Criticizers" profile as this profile focuses on "behavioural-approach strategies and thus [try] to change the situation by disapproving or suggesting changes to the teacher" (p. 632). The relationship between low boredom levels and higher scores in behavioural approach coping strategies among students is intriguing as "beyond how often boredom is encountered, there is another issue related to how strong boredom is experienced, its intensity" (Tempelaar & Niculescu, 2021, p. 84). This pattern in how individuals respond to boredom, which is a "multifaceted phenomenon" (Pekrun, 2006, p. 316), could be influenced by a combination of factors in a language class as the experience of boredom encompasses various components "unpleasant, aversive feelings (affective components), as well as an altered perception of time (cognitive components), reduced arousal (physiological components), facial, vocal, and postural expressions of boredom (expressive components), and the motivation to change the activity, or to leave the situation (motivational components)" (Nett et al., 2010, p. 627).

Students who have low levels of boredom may be more inclined to actively engage with the learning material or classroom activities. This can be achieved through behavioural approaches that involve taking proactive steps to address and change the source of boredom. Such students may be more likely to "make the most of resources, take the initiative, seek out opportunities for action and are usually more willing to make changes to their environments in order to create better working or study conditions" (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 36).

Furthermore, people who experience lower levels of boredom may be more intrinsically motivated to participate in classroom activities, empirically supporting the control value theory in educational psychology (Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2010; Tulis & Fulmer, 2013), "which states that boredom occurs when students perceive the task at hand as being of little value and when their perceived control over it is low" (Kruk et al., 2022, p. 1). They may find inherent interest or value in the subject matter, which makes them more likely to approach learning tasks with enthusiasm as "appraisals of intrinsic values refer to the value of an activity or outcome per se. Such an appraisal can imply to value academic studying and the learning material for its own sake, irrespective of the grade one may get in return" (Pekrun & Perry, 2014, p. 319). In contrast, students who experience high levels of boredom may lack intrinsic motivation, resulting in a lower inclination to actively

engage with the material inclined instead they “focus on threats, which will limit the cognitive resources that are necessary to learning activities” (Zhen et al., 2017, p. 211).

Additionally, students with low levels of boredom may perceive a greater sense of control over their learning environment. These individuals may be more likely to take action to change their situation, as behavioural coping often involves “taking action to alter boring situations thereby increasing control/value” (Daniels et al., 2015, p. 256), which benefits their learning. Conversely, students experiencing high levels of boredom may feel a lack of control, leading to passive responses or disengagement “defined as a complete lack of engagement, effort, interest, enthusiasm and/or prosocial conduct, which entails an individual’s total non-commitment and withdrawal from what others do with involvement and/or enjoyment.” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 2). This ties in well with the control value theory of achievement emotions (Pekrun, 2006; Pekrun et al., 2010), as it “seeks sources of boredom in learners not being able to have control over or find value in the task at hand” and the theory grounds this in “the learners’ perception of the learning situation; if their perception is that of low value and little or no control, unpleasant emotions, such as boredom, will ensue.” (Derakhshan et al., 2021a, p. 3).

Moreover, the teaching methods, referred to as “the most salient being” by Perry et al. (2005), utilised in the classroom can impact students’ boredom levels and coping mechanisms. Pekrun and Stephens (2012) note that “quality dimensions of classroom instruction, exemplified by teacher enthusiasm inducing intrinsic values through emotional contagion”, “autonomy support versus control of students’ learning”, “achievement expectancies and values conveyed to the student by significant others, by educational goal structures, and by classroom interaction structures (e.g., competition vs. cooperation)”, “feedback and consequences of achievement (such as educational and occupational career outcomes)” and “social relatedness and support in academic interactions (e.g., affiliation within the classroom; teachers’ and parents’ support after failure)” can be presumed to contribute to students’ sense of control (p. 101). If the teaching strategies are captivating, dynamic, and cater to a variety of learning styles, students might be less prone to experiencing high levels of boredom as “by providing optimal learning materials and instruction (i.e., neither far beyond and below students’ capabilities to learn), academic boredom may be ameliorated, which in turn may help to improve

students' learning" (Tze et al., 2016, p. 140). Consequently, those with lower boredom levels may actively participate in activities that match their preferences and learning styles.

Furthermore, students vary naturally in terms of their personalities, preferences, and learning styles and "the experience does not apply in equal measure to all students, which may be related to their perceptions of specific classes, resources, activities or tasks but also to IDs (e.g., personality, learning styles, learning strategies, motivation, anxiety but also working memory)." (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 85). Those who have low levels of boredom may exhibit traits like curiosity, a willingness to try new things, or a positive attitude toward learning, which can result in their inclination to adopt behavioural coping strategies. On the other hand, students with high boredom levels may have different personality traits or preferences that cause them to rely more on avoidance strategies as "boredom is a multidimensional construct which is an outcome of a constellation of influences" (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 89).

Additionally, the way students perceive the learning tasks may influence their behaviour, echoing to some extent the conclusion drawn by Pawlak et al. (2020b, p. 94) who write: "not only did boredom levels alter substantially from one class to the next, but also that they were subject to change within a single class or the tasks and activities it included". Those who find the tasks enjoyable or interesting and "challenging and closely matched to their needs" are more likely to approach them with enthusiasm (Philp & Duchesne, 2016, p. 50). Meanwhile, students who experience low levels of boredom may derive satisfaction from learning activities, making them more likely to use behavioural coping strategies to engage with the material as "through active involvement in a particular language activity (such as classroom tasks), learners may obtain a sense of accomplishment, experience flow, and therefore regard this engagement as meaningful, thereby leading to motivated behaviours" (Li & Liu, 2023, p. 3).

In conclusion, the reasons for the diverse coping strategies used by students can provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers when developing interventions to tackle boredom in the classroom successfully and "designing aesthetically appealing environments, and providing cognitive and metacognitive scaffolding to support the learning process" (Loderer et al., 2020, p. 12). Adapting teaching methods and resources to match students' interests and fostering intrinsic

motivation are potential approaches to lessen this “mild, silent, and unpleasant affective state or psychological experience” and promote active engagement (Zhao & Yang, 2022, p. 4).

Within an educational setting, given these findings, it is essential for educators working with EFL students to understand the significance of addressing boredom. In effect, by comprehending the diverse coping mechanisms employed by students in response to boredom, educators can develop tailored strategies that cater to individual needs based on their levels of boredom as “the knowledge of the mechanisms fostering boredom can help to develop prevention and intervention programmes with respect to reducing boredom at school” (Daschmann et al., 2011, p. 438). Shao et al. (2023) noted similar expressions in intervention programs suggesting that “L2 teachers might need to tailor intervention programs to different components of students’ emotions” (p. 22). That would encourage an active approach, particularly for students experiencing moderate boredom, towards casting lights on the underlying causes of their boredom. Conversely, those displaying low levels of boredom may benefit from interventions that aim to provoke deep, meaningful engagement through encouraging exploration of alternative courses of action that maintain motivation which as Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) noted, “provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long, often tedious learning process; indeed, all the other factors involved in SLA presuppose motivation to some extent” (p. 72). Therefore following the conclusions made by Daschmann et al.’s (2011), language educators “may reduce boredom more by integrating individualised instruction methods in order to give each pupil the opportunity to work efficiently on their level of achievement” instead of just “recogniz[ing] the problem of diversity in students’ achievement levels and try[ing] to compensate by adjusting the level of their class demands in order to not over challenge the weak students or under challenge the stronger ones” (p. 435).

5.2.3. Discussion of the Third Research Question

Is there a relationship between EFL students’ boredom levels and their English success?

Clearly the most conspicuous finding is the lack of a strong positive correlation between students’ boredom levels and their end-of-year scores (EOYs),

suggesting that there may not be a significant connection between boredom and English proficiency in EFL students. This finding is rather unexpected, given that boredom has long been recognized as an influential factor impacting students' motivation and involvement (Li et al., 2023a; Macklem, 2015; Wang, 1987) and their achievement within the domain of L2 acquisition (Alrabai, 2022a; Zhao & Wang, 2023). Such ambivalence may be related to several potential justifications: As Pawlak and Csizér (2022, p. 2) have made clear, "study abroad contexts stand out as important learning and research environments", which as Mitchell and Tyne (2021, p. 4) further have highlighted, "participants' motivations for study abroad may be quite instrumental, aiming to improve longer-term career prospects and chances of mobility, but may also be more experiential and concerned with personal development". Given the significance attached to study abroad contexts and career aspirations, the participants in this research may have study abroad motives or career-oriented motives to learn English, rather than simply avoiding boredom. On a different note, it is worth highlighting that the students might have employed effective coping mechanisms to manage and flush out lingering effects of boredom during lessons; examples include collaborating with peers or taking regular breaks when needed. Thirdly, fluctuations in student levels of boredom could be exacerbated by factors external to the learner in the present study. The main reasons for such fluctuations could be personal issues or heightened stress levels which contribute to succumbing to feelings of boredom. It should also be remarked that this finding challenges the assumption that high levels of boredom can directly affect language learning outcomes (Dewaele & Li, 2021; Li, 2021; Pawlak et al., 2020a; Pekrun et al., 2014; Shao et al., 2020; Tze et al., 2016; Xie, 2021). What should be stressed here is that although it is important to consider constellations of factors that influence English proficiency, such as teaching methods (Mann & Robinson, 2009), learner motivation and individual differences (Dörnyei, 2005; Ehrman, 2008; Gardner, 1985; Skehan, 1991; Wakamoto, 2009) among students, this study suggests that addressing boredom alone may not necessarily lead to immediate improvements in language abilities due to the complex interplay of these factors. Future investigations in the EFL context should explore additional variables beyond boredom "such as, for example, different facets of motivation, willingness to communicate or beliefs about effective instruction" to provide a fuller understanding of student boredom and its relationship with academic achievement (Pawlak et al.,

2020a, p. 8). Moreover, whether the relationship between boredom and academic achievement holds true a larger sample size or in diverse language contexts needs further validation. This interpretation appears to find support in the fact that albeit there is a small positive connection between boredom levels and EOYs ($r = 0.126$), this relationship did not achieve statistical significance at the commonly accepted p-value threshold of $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.062$). Even more importantly, what is missing in the present study is a conceptualization of different factors, such as motivation, engagement and study habits, which might pose a more substantial influence on the English proficiency of EFL students than boredom alone. It should be noted, nevertheless, despite the absence of a significant correlation between boredom levels and EOYs, it must be borne in mind that this lack of correlation might be attributed to the limitations inherent in measurement instruments used to measure boredom. These scales may not adequately capture the dynamic and complex nature of boredom and detrimental effects of being bored. For instance, in the current study, items are all positively keyed in the scales deployed. It should be mentioned that a “scale with all positively keyed items is vulnerable to acquiescence bias” (Fahlman et al., 2013, p. 81).

In light of the debilitating effect of boredom in L2 learning (Pekrun et al., 2010, 2014), more research is needed that documents evidence of a link between boredom and English language proficiency in EFL learners. Future studies should adopt longitudinal designs with multiple measurement points to fully clarify, untangle and understand the interplay between these factors and their impact on language learning outcomes to observe the dynamics of boredom over time (Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021).

5.2.4. Discussion of the Fourth Research Question

Do students in different proficiency levels, namely A1, A2 and B1 differ in their boredom levels and implementation of boredom coping strategies?

Regarding the fourth research question, the one-way between-groups ANOVA results suggest that there is a significant disparity in boredom levels among EFL learners with different proficiency levels. As regards proficiency levels, students at lower proficiency levels (A1) showed notably decreased levels of boredom compared to those at higher proficiency levels (A2 and B1). This finding

contradicted the study by Pawlak et al. (2020a) where low achievers have a higher level of proneness to boredom than high achievers but echoed the results by Nett et al. (2010), Nett et al. (2011), Tze, et al. (2013a), Daniels (2010), indicating that not all strategies to cope with boredom are the same, and some students handle boredom more effectively than their counterparts.

This is likely due to the fact that advanced learners may perceive language learning as monotonous due to their extensive familiarity with the language, potentially dampening enthusiasm for further language absorption in the learning process. This situation may be attributed to the fact that the advanced English learners' may not perceive as many benefits as beginners. These findings may hold some notable implications for teachers and researchers in the L2 domain, as it suggests that higher-proficiency students may be more likely to experience heightened boredom.

Yet another thing worth mentioning is that there is no significant correlation in coping mechanisms (including cognitive, behavioural, and avoidance strategies) among learners with varying levels of language proficiency. This indicates that the selection of coping strategies is not hinged on language proficiency but rather a universal response to remedy lingering effects of the experience of boredom in the language learning process as “more transitory situation-based factors shape people’s choices of coping responses” (Holahan et al., 1996, p. 25).

The findings bear great importance in encouraging learners to seek opportunities for combating boredom in language learning classrooms, especially for more advanced learners. Language instructors should consider incorporating diverse activities and approaches that promote attentive and active involvement, encourage students’ engagement and motivation to counter the effects of the experience of boredom and push students towards excellence and provide direction for progress in the learning process, taking into account “complex, multifaceted and thus opaque the concepts of engagement and disengagement are, and how intricately the latter is related to boredom” (Pawlak et al., 2020a, p. 7).

5.3. Summary

This chapter analyses the quantitative findings of the study presented in the previous section in light of the research questions. The findings are subsequently

compared to previous studies conducted in a similar field, and an examination of both similarities and differences is presented. Drawing upon these data-supported interpretations, informed conclusions can be drawn regarding the boredom.



CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Presentation

In this chapter, a summary of research findings is provided, the results are discussed by addressing the methodological and pedagogical implications and limitations, suggesting the potential gaps that future research may aim to bridge and proposing recommendations.

6.2. Summary of the Study

The primary objective of this research study was to examine the incidence of boredom among EFL students enrolled in a Turkish university, in particular with respect to the School of Foreign Languages. Furthermore, this investigation sought to analyse potential differences in coping strategies employed by students, based on the boredom level they experienced.

To analyse the correlation between boredom and language learning outcomes, a quantitative research methodology was applied in this investigation. A survey was carried out among 219 EFL students enrolled at the School of Foreign Languages in a university located in Turkey. The survey elucidated various questions related to the extent of students' boredom levels during their language learning process, as well as strategies they implemented to cope with the adverse impact of boredom. Additionally, participants were asked about their overall performance in language learning activities.

The research results revealed that the average boredom level among EFL students enrolled at a Turkish university was 23.76 (SD = 5.23). Furthermore, the study revealed disparities in coping mechanisms employed by students who encountered different degrees of boredom. More precisely, individuals who reported higher boredom levels tended to employ cognitive avoidance coping strategies as a means of dealing with their boredom. In contrast, those with lower boredom levels were more inclined to utilise behavioural approach coping strategies for managing their emotions.

The results of this investigation suggest that many EFL students at a university in Turkey frequently experience boredom, which could negatively impact their motivation and involvement in language learning activities. To gain thorough understanding of the mechanisms underlying structure of classroom boredom, future research could zoom in more squarely on the relationship between boredom and language acquisition outcomes, as well as identify effective methods to alleviate boredom. By implementing strategies that aim to reduce feelings of boredom, it is possible to boost student engagement and foster increased motivation within the language learning process.

This study also reveals that students with varying degrees of boredom utilise different strategies to cope, particularly in terms of cognitive avoidance and behavioural approach. Students who experience higher boredom levels often employ cognitive avoidance techniques as a means to cope, whereas those with lower levels are more inclined to adopt behavioural approach strategies.

The findings of this investigation carry important implications for educators. Educators have a central role to play in helping students cope with boredom (Pawlak et al., 2021b) by presenting stimulating and engaging activities. Furthermore, they can also teach students techniques for managing boredom.

6.3. Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of this investigation suggest that boredom is a common issue among EFL students at the School of Foreign Languages in Turkey. The high levels of reported boredom may negatively impact their motivation and engagement in language learning. Further research can be conducted to explore the

connection between boredom levels and language learning outcomes, as well as to identify ways to reduce boredom and enhance student motivation and engagement.

The study's findings also indicate that students who encounter diverse levels of boredom exhibit distinct coping strategies, particularly in terms of cognitive avoidance and behavioural approach. Students who feel more bored are inclined to rely on cognitive avoidance mechanisms to deal with their boredom, while those who experience less boredom are more likely to employ behavioural approach coping strategies.

Not only is the teacher a key part of the facilitation of emotions of learners in the classroom, but also parental support is important. Educators and parents can benefit from the outcomes of this investigation. Teachers can aid students in overcoming boredom by presenting engaging and thought-provoking tasks (Ellis, 2003) and teaching them effective coping strategies (Nett et al., 2010). Meanwhile, parents can support their children by providing opportunities for exploring individual interests and passions, and demonstrating understanding and encouragement.

The current study fills an important niche, exhibiting a variety of academic merits in respect to the existing corpus of knowledge on boredom and language acquisition by probing into the relationship between boredom levels and language learning outcomes in a Turkish context. The findings from this research provide illuminating insight into the factors that facilitate or undermine boredom during language learning and offer practical strategies to prevent or mitigate its arousal and brings forward the importance of enhancing and sustaining motivation what drives “a person to make certain choices, to engage in action, to expend effort and persist in action” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 3) and engagement as “student engagement drives learning; it requires energy and effort; is affected by multiple contextual influences; and can be achieved for all learners” in the language learning process (Christenson et al., 2012, p. 817).

As the findings revealed that the students' boredom level and coping strategies had an indirect impact on their language achievement, given its strong correlation with motivation (Pawlak et al., 2020a), L2 educators are suggestive of finding pedagogical strategies to boost both language mindset and motivation of the L2 students when aiming to dissipate the lingering effects of language boredom. Motivated by these findings, boredom can be conceptualised as “a combination of dissatisfaction, disappointment, annoyance, inattention, lack of motivation to pursue

previously set goals and impaired vitality” (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018, p. 177) that can negatively impact both learning and motivation. With the above points in mind, educators are strongly encouraged to provide engaging activities and teach students effective coping strategies to manage boredom as these efforts further result in better EFL learning outcomes.

6.4. Implications of the Study

This study’s findings bear several practical implications for language educators seeking to establish an engaging and stimulating learning environment. It is essential for teachers to understand that students’ proficiency in the target language affects their perception of boredom during lessons. To illuminate this issue, instructors should implement a range of intellectually challenging (e.g., Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Shernoff, 2013), and captivating activities suitable for each student’s linguistic abilities (e.g., Loderer et al., 2020). Furthermore, teachers play a crucial role in keeping student motivation high by emphasising the benefits of bilingualism. To foster active engagement with the target language, educators should emphasise the practical benefits and “real-world” applications of proficiency highlighting the power of “authenticity through real world targets” in multiple languages (Guariento & Morley, 2001, p. 350), underscoring that “human beings simply do not pursue competence in every area open to them” (Miller & Brickman, 2004, p. 19). This perspective emphasises that individual priorities and goals serve as the “driving force” behind language acquisition, accentuating its pivotal role in shaping and fueling personal aspirations (Miller & Brickman, 2004). Additionally, it is widely established that individuals who set and pursue mastery goals are less likely to abandon their pursuits in difficult situations and are more motivated to seek self-improvement through their tasks (Ames, 1992; Furner & Gonzalez-DeHass, 2011; Mattern, 2005; Pekrun, 2006; Turner & Husman, 2008). This, in turn, provides learners with “a considerable boost that helps them to see the real world relevance of the language and to make its use personally relevant” (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020, p. 15).

Teachers play a vital role in aiding students in managing their boredom. By providing engaging, well-designed tasks and activities (Dewaele et al., 2019b), as well as teaching them effective methods for coping with this emotion, educators and

can significantly improve students' learning outcomes while also inducing enjoyment, which is described as "good feelings coming from breaking through homeostatic limits and stretching beyond oneself to accomplish something new or even unexpected, especially in the face of some difficult tasks," during the learning process (Li et al., 2018, p. 184). In that regard, as students' enjoyment rises, they will be more likely to communicate, utilising more self-regulated strategies and showing increased engagement in English (Lee, 2022; Shen et al., 2023).

What is also of note is that while there are many options available, teachers must be cognizant of the fact that these recommended strategies may not be the most suitable for each student and learning environment. Nevertheless, by implementing measures to diminish boredom while boosting motivation and engagement, L2 teachers should strive to increase students' learning efficiency and overall enjoyment. This is crucial because "enjoyment and boredom are critically important for self-regulation of learning, adoption of learning strategies, motivation, and academic achievement." (Putwain et al., 2018b, p. 1342). It should be noted, nevertheless, to complement "educators' efforts, students should use strategies to better manage this negative and unsettling emotion, which may subsequently help them to improve their learning. For instance, the use of cognitive-appraisal strategies such as identifying meaning in a boring class" has been demonstrated to be as an effective approach to cope with academic boredom (Tze et al., 2016, p. 140).

6.5. Suggestions for Further Studies

The results of this investigation are of great relevance for researchers, and further studies should be carried out to examine the correlation between boredom and language proficiency in greater depth and help paint a fuller picture of this issue. Additionally, researchers should examine other factors that could potentially evoke the feeling of boredom during language learning, such as the type of learning tasks, teaching methods, and individual learner characteristics.

Firstly, considering the use of quantitative methods (McKinley & Rose, 2020; Renck Jalongo & Saracho, 2016) in this study, it is of paramount importance to take into account several limitations when it comes to deep understanding and scrutinising the key factors that instigate boredom. The quantitative approach, which highlights the use of numbers and statistics, may not capture all of the subtle nuances that

explain variations in levels of boredom, coping strategies, and language learning achievements. To overcome these potential limitations and enhance our grasp of the subject under scrutiny, future research should consider employing a variety of methodologies. These may include qualitative interviews and longitudinal studies such as the latent growth curve model, to assess changes in questionnaire responses over two or three time points (Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021) as “the experience of boredom is an outcome of a complex interaction of internal and external variables that may be subject to change over [time]” allowing the potential for in-depth and nuanced understanding (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 94).

In addition, it is worth noting that the primary data collection method employed in this research predominantly involved self-report questionnaires. Correspondingly, it should be acknowledged that this approach may introduce biases due to social desirability and limitations in building a sophisticated understanding of the level of boredom experienced by EFL learners, their coping efforts and its impact on their English proficiency. That is to say:

“Obviously, one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that the participants might have been reluctant to openly admit that the things they were asked to do in class were boredom-inducing in front of the teacher who acted in the capacity of a researcher (i.e., one of the present authors). Therefore, their self-ratings could have been affected by the Hawthorne effect, a danger that always has to be reckoned with when conducting research in real classrooms and, to some extent inevitably, the price to be paid for ensuring high ecological validity that cannot be achieved in laboratory conditions.” (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 84).

The study can develop a deeper and fuller understanding of the topic in question by employing supplementary qualitative research methods such as learner diaries (Pekrun et al., 2002; Zawodniak et al., 2017), classroom observations (Vogel-Walcutt et al., 2012), interviews with learners (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018), and focus groups (Nakamura et al., 2021). This approach may provide L2 researchers with a more granular understanding of the relationship between boredom experienced by EFL learners, their coping efforts and its impact on their English proficiency.

Moreover, the study's utilisation of a convenience sample of students (Ary et al., 2019; Rose et al., 2020) weakens the generalisation of the findings. It is important to emphasise that convenience sampling involves “the convenience of the researcher [as] crucial criterion: participation depends on practical criteria like geographical proximity, availability, accessibility and willingness to volunteer” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 99). Consequently, the conclusions drawn from this specific group of students may not easily extend to broader populations or diverse educational contexts. To ascertain the generalizability of the findings, it would be advantageous to incorporate more diverse samples, encompassing individuals from various backgrounds and proficiency levels. By involving a larger sample size, researchers can develop a fine-grained understanding of the relationship between these variables across various learner populations. Moreover, employing random sampling techniques can heighten the probability of obtaining representative data that can be extrapolated beyond specific groups or settings as it “is a sampling which permits every single item from the universe to have an equal chance of presence in the sample” (Etikan & Bala, 2017, p. 216).

Another limitation is the use of cross-sectional data (Fraenkel et al., 2022). Consequently, researchers should approach the analysis with caution, as the study's limited time frame prevented the ability to track how boredom levels evolve over time. The research assessed both boredom and coping strategies at a single juncture, which restricts the researcher's ability to draw conclusions about potential fluctuations in boredom levels. To paint a much finer-grained picture of the intricate connection between learning and boredom over an extended duration, future investigations need to adopt longitudinal designs and experience sampling methods (e.g., Goetz et al., 2014; Nett et al., 2011; Pekrun et al., 2014). Such designs permit multiple assessments of boredom at various points throughout the learning process as well as “allow for tests of generalizability across different age groups while controlling for potential method biases.” (Goetz et al., 2014, p. 405).

Moreover, the study's limitations include the uneven gender representation, with female university students in a Foreign Language School primarily providing responses. The gender distribution was not balanced with 129 females (58.9%) versus 85 males (38.8%). Future research should benefit from a more symmetrical distribution of participants in terms of gender while also obtaining additional demographic data. Although it is acceptable, the study is limited by its small sample

size for practical reasons (Dörnyei, 2007; Mackey, 2016). Including wider sample size would garner a more accurate and comprehensive picture as it “should be sufficiently large to eliminate subject variance as a significant concern” (DeVellis, 2016, p. 130). Because a small sample size of participants in a study can hinder the ability to generalise its findings (Creswell, 2018). Including more participants would allow for painting a much finer-grained, representative and reliable picture. Additionally, the study’s scope was limited to one foreign language school, which reduces its generalizability to other schools or language learning settings. Therefore, to address some of these shortcomings, future research can further explore and employ participants from different cultural contexts as the results differ among participants and contexts.

Likewise, one drawback of this particular study on the subject of boredom and strategies for coping with it is that the survey employed to gather data as participants are “presented with forced choices that are simplifications of their rich and complex experience” (Dewaele & Pavelescu, 2019, p. 12). Consequently, there is a possibility that respondents’ genuine coping mechanisms for addressing boredom were not entirely captured in full detail, potentially resulting in an omission of valuable insights into their methods for dealing with this state.

In like manner, this study did not take into account certain factors that could contribute to the occurrence of boredom, such as student motivation (Gardner, 1985) and personality (Ehrman, 2008) as well as enjoyment (Fredrickson, 2004) which are known to exert a substantial impact on students’ engagement and overall educational experience. Failing to consider these elements could potentially limit our understanding of how boredom relates to other important variables. As a way of reaching a better understanding of boredom, future research should incorporate “a range of ID factors, such as motivation, willingness to communicate, personality, learning style or the use of language learning strategies” (Pawlak et al., 2020b, p. 96) allowing for a deeper exploration of how individual differences (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Larsen-Freeman, 2018; Pawlak, 2017, 2020a) influence susceptibility to boredom during academic activities.

One drawback of the study is the lack of sub-divisions in evaluating language proficiency. The examination does not include specific elements like listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. By incorporating these sub-domains into the assessment process, a more extensive and precise understanding of

participants' language skills could have been attained. This would have enabled a more detailed and accurate investigation into their levels of language proficiency. However, due to this omission, the depth of insights that can be derived from the findings may be limited.

Lastly, our study on the connection between emotion and achievement was constrained to boredom. However, students often experience a wide range of emotions, including but not limited to pride, hope, hopelessness (Pekrun et al., 2002) and epistemic emotions such as surprise, curiosity, and confusion during cognitive activities related to knowledge and learning (Pekrun et al., 2016). Up to now, beyond the well-researched phenomenon of anxiety, enjoyment (Boudreau et al., 2018; Dewaele & Li, 2020; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Imai, 2010; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Liu, 2006; MacIntyre, 2017; Piniel & Albert, 2018; Saito et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2020), which are metaphorically conceptualised as “the right and left feet of the language language learner” (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016, p. 215), there has been growing interest in foreign language learning boredom (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017, 2018; Kruk, 2016a, 2016b; Pawlak et al., 2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2021a; Zawodniak & Kruk, 2018; Zawodniak et al., 2017, 2023), however above mentioned emotions have been an under-researched issue that still require further investigation. It is essential for future research to broaden its scope to encompass these underrepresented emotional dimensions.

What should also be emphasised at this juncture is that despite all the aforementioned limitations, this study offers a wealth of insights into the connection between boredom and language proficiency, albeit with some limitations. To gain a richer and more nuanced understanding of this phenomenon, it is advisable for future research to build upon these rich and invaluable findings.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, E. E., & Stinson, S. G. (1977). Boredom and eating in obese and non-obese individuals. *Addictive Behaviors*, 2(4), 181–185. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603\(77\)90015-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603(77)90015-6)
- Acee, T. W., Kim, H., Kim, H. J., Kim, J.-I., Chu, H.-N. R., Kim, M., Cho, Y., & Wicker, F. W. (2010). Academic boredom in under- and over-challenging situations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 35(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2009.08.002>
- Ahmed, S. M. S. (1990). Psychometric properties of the boredom proneness scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 71(3), 963–966. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1990.71.3.963>
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02026.x>
- Aldridge, M., & DeLucia, R. (1989). Boredom: The Academic Plague of First Year Students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition*, 1(2), 43–56
- Allwright, D. (1990). *Autonomy in language pedagogy*, CRILE Working Paper 6. Centre for Research in Education, University of Lancaster.
- Alrabai, F. (2022a). Modeling the relationship between classroom emotions, motivation, and learner willingness to communicate in EFL: Applying a holistic approach of positive psychology in SLA Research. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2053138>
- Alrabai, F. (2022b). The role of mixed emotions in language learning and teaching: A positive psychology teacher intervention. *System*, 107, 102821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102821>
- Altunel, İ. (2019). Bridging the Gap: A Study on the Relationship Between Mindset and Foreign Language Anxiety. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 6(3), 690–705

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 369–386. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303>
- Aragão, R. (2011). Beliefs and emotions in foreign language learning. *System*, 39(3), 302–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.003>
- Ariani, D. W. (2021). How achievement goals affect students' well-being and the relationship model between achievement goals, academic self-efficacy and affect at school. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(1), 111–134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jarhe-08-2020-0273>
- Arnold, J. (2011). Attention to affect in language learning. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies*, 22((1)), 11–22
- Artino, A. R. (2009). Think, feel, act: Motivational and emotional influences on military students' online academic success. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 21(2), 146–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-009-9020-9>
- Artino, A. R., & Jones, K. D. (2012). Exploring the complex relations between achievement emotions and self-regulated learning behaviors in online learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(3), 170–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.01.006>
- Artino, A. R., & Stephens, J. M. (2009). Beyond grades in online learning: Adaptive Profiles of academic self-regulation among Naval Academy undergraduates. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 20(4), 568–601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202x0902000402>
- Artino, A. R., Holmboe, E. S., & Durning, S. J. (2012). Control-value theory: Using achievement emotions to improve understanding of motivation, learning, and performance in Medical Education: Amee Guide no. 64. *Medical Teacher*, 34(3). <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159x.2012.651515>

- Artino, A. R., La Rochelle, J. S., & Durning, S. J. (2010). Second-year medical students' motivational beliefs, emotions, and achievement. *Medical Education*, 44(12), 1203–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03712.x>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. A. (2019). *Introduction to research in Education*. Cengage.
- Ashley, M., & Shaughnessy, K. (2021). Predicting insufficient effort responding: The relation between negative thoughts, emotions, and online survey responses. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000308>
- Axelson, R. D., & Flick, A. (2010). Defining student engagement. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 43(1), 38–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.533096>
- Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2021). Motivation and self-regulated strategy use: Relationships to primary school students' English writing in Hong Kong. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(3), 378–399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819859921>
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2020). The role of growth mindset, self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(1), 207–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820933190>
- Bai, J., & Ng, S. (2005). Tests for skewness, kurtosis, and normality for time series data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 23(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1198/073500104000000271>
- Bailey, J. P., Thackray, R. I., Pearl, J., & Parish, T. S. (1976). Boredom and arousal: Comparison of tasks differing in visual complexity. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 43(1), 141–142. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1976.43.1.141>
- Baker, R. S. J., D'Mello, S. K., Rodrigo, Ma. M. T., & Graesser, A. C. (2010). Better to be frustrated than bored: The incidence, persistence, and impact of learners' cognitive–affective states during interactions with three different computer-based learning environments. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 68(4), 223–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2009.12.003>

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action a social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117–148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Baratta, P. L., & Spence, J. R. (2018). Capturing the noonday demon: Development and validation of the State Boredom Inventory. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(4), 477–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2018.1481830>
- Baratta, P. L., & Spence, J. R. (2015). A riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma . . . or just multidimensional? Testing the multidimensional structure of boredom. In C. E. J. Härtel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.), *Research on emotion in organizations: New ways of studying emotions in organizations*. (Vol. 11, pp. 139–172). Chapter, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Barbalet, J. M. (1999). Boredom and social meaning. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50(4), 631–646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.1999.00631.x>
- Bargdill, R. (2000). The study of life boredom. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 31(2), 188–219. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15691620051090979>.
- Barmack, J. E. (1937). Boredom and Other Factors in the Physiology of Mental Efforts: An Exploratory Study. *Archives of Psychology*, 218, 6–81
- Barmack, J. E. (1938). The Effect of Benzidrine Sulphate (Benzl-Methyl-Carbinamide) upon the Report of Boredom and Other Factors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 5(1), 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1938.9917557>
- Barnett, L. A. (2005). Measuring the abcs of leisure experience: Awareness, boredom, challenge, distress. *Leisure Sciences*, 27(2), 131–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400590912051>
- Barnett, L. A., & Klitzing, S. W. (2006). Boredom in free time: Relationships with personality, affect, and motivation for different gender, racial and ethnic

- student groups. *Leisure Sciences*, 28(3), 223–244.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400600598053>
- Bauer-Marschallinger, S., Dalton-Puffer, C., Heaney, H., Katzinger, L., & Smit, U. (2021). Clil for all? An exploratory study of reported pedagogical practices in Austrian Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1996533>
- Bench, S., & Lench, H. (2013). On the function of boredom. *Behavioral Sciences*, 3(3), 459–472. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs3030459>
- Berweger, B., Born, S., & Dietrich, J. (2022). Expectancy-value appraisals and achievement emotions in an online learning environment: Within- and between-person relationships. *Learning and Instruction*, 77, 101546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101546>
- Bieg, M., Goetz, T., Sticca, F., Brunner, E., Becker, E., Morger, V., & Hubbard, K. (2017). Teaching methods and their impact on students' emotions in mathematics: An experience-sampling approach. *Int. J. Math. Educ.* 49(3), 411–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-017-0840-1>
- Bieg, S., Grassinger, R., & Dresel, M. (2019). Teacher humor: Longitudinal effects on students' emotions. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 34(3), 517–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-018-0402-0>
- Bieleke, M., Gogol, K., Goetz, T., Daniels, L., & Pekrun, R. (2021). The AEQ-S: A short version of the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 65, 101940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101940>
- Binnema, D. (2004). Interrelations of psychiatric patient experiences of boredom and mental health. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 25(8), 833–842. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840490506400>
- Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R., & Zeidner, M. (2000). *Handbook of self-regulation*. Academic Press.
- Bong, M. (2002). Predictive utility of subject-, task-, and problem-specific self-efficacy judgments for immediate and delayed academic performances. *The*

- Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(2), 133–162.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970209599503>
- Boniwell, I., & Tunariu, A. D. (2019). *Positive psychology: theory, research and applications* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
- Botes, E., Dewaele, J.-M., Greiff, S. (2021). *Taking Stock: A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Foreign Language Enjoyment*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/guaj5>
- Boudreau, C., MacIntyre, P. D., & Dewaele, J. M. (2018). Enjoyment and anxiety in Second language communication: An idiodynamic approach. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 149–170.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.7>
- Breidenstein, G. (2007). The meaning of boredom in school lessons. Participant observation in the seventh and eighth form. *Ethnography and Education*, 2(1), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820601159133>
- Brett, P. (1995). Multimedia for listening comprehension: The design of a multimedia-based resource for developing listening skills. *System*, 23(1), 77–85.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(94\)00054-a](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(94)00054-a)
- Brevik, L. M. (2019). Gamers, surfers, social media users: Unpacking the role of interest in English. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 35(5), 595–606.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12362>
- Brissett, D., & Snow, R. P. (1993). Boredom: Where the future isn't. *Symbolic Interaction*, 16(3), 237–256. <https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1993.16.3.237>
- Brookfield, S. (1991). *The skillful teacher: On techniques, trusts, and responsiveness in the classroom*. Jossey-Bass.
- Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E. H., VanEpps, E. M., Pollack, J. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Mind-sets matter: A meta-analytic review of implicit theories and self-regulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(3), 655–701.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029531>
- Byram, M., & Wagner, M. (2018). Making a difference: Language teaching for intercultural and international dialogue. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12319>

- Cacali, E. R. (2019). The Effects of Growth Mindsets on University EFL Motivation in Japan. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review*, 23, 125–132
- Caldwell, L. L., Darling, N., Payne, L. L., & Dowdy, B. (1999). “Why are you bored?”: An examination of psychological and social control causes of boredom among adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(2), 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1999.11949853>
- Carreira, J. M. (2011). Relationship between motivation for learning EFL and intrinsic motivation for learning in general among Japanese elementary school students. *System*, 39(1), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.01.009>
- Carriere, J. S. A., Cheyne, J. A., & Smilek, D. (2008). Everyday attention lapses and memory failures: The affective consequences of mindlessness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 17(3), 835–847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2007.04.008>
- Carroll, J. B. (1981). Twenty-Five Years of Research on Foreign Language Aptitude. In K. Diller (Ed.), *Individual Differences and Universals in Language Learning Aptitude* (pp. 83–118). Chapter, Newbury House
- Carver, C. S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol’ too long: Consider the brief cope. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 4 (1), 92–100. doi: 10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(2), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267>
- Chan, C. S., van Tilburg, W. A., Igou, E. R., Poon, C. Y., Tam, K. Y., Wong, V. U., & Cheung, S. K. (2018). Situational meaninglessness and state boredom: Cross-sectional and experience-sampling findings. *Motivation and Emotion*, 42(4), 555–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9693-3>
- Chapman, K. E. (2013). *Boredom in the German foreign language classroom* (dissertation).

- Chen, J. C. (2016). EFL learners' strategy use during task-based interaction in Second life. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2306>
- Cheng, Y. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(6), 647–656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb01903.x>
- Cheyne, J. A., Carriere, J. S. A., & Smilek, D. (2006). Absent-mindedness: Lapses of conscious awareness and everyday cognitive failures. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 15(3), 578–592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2005.11.009>
- Chin, A., Markey, A., Bhargava, S., Kassam, K. S., & Loewenstein, G. (2017). Bored in the USA: Experience sampling and boredom in everyday life. *Emotion*, 17(2), 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000232>
- Ching, C. L., & Chan, V. L. (2020). Positive emotions, positive feelings and Health: A Life Philosophy. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 4(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v4n1.16>
- Christenson, S., Reschly, A., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of Research on Student engagement*. Springer.
- Cinkara, E. (2016). Reflective practice and foreign language classroom anxiety: Video-stimulated recall at work. *Reflective Practice*, 17(6), 694–707. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2016.1206880>
- Cinkara, E., & Cabaroglu, N. (2015). Parallel functioning hypothesis to explain pronoun resolution and processing load: Evidence from eye-tracking. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 22(2), 119–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09296174.2014.1001635>
- Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 147–154). Chapter, Pergamon.
- Clément, R., & Gardner, R. C. (2001). Second language mastery. In H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 489–504). Chapter, Wiley.

- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23(2), 195–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(95\)00008-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(95)00008-8)
- Coughlan, G., Igou, E. R., van Tilburg, W. A., Kinsella, E. L., & Ritchie, T. D. (2017). On boredom and perceptions of heroes: A meaning-regulation approach to heroism. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 59(4), 455–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167817705281>
- Craparo, G., Faraci, P., Fasciano, S., Carrubba, S., & Gori, A. (2013). A factor analytic study of the Boredom Proneness Scale (BPS). *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, 10((3–4)), 164–170.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (Vol. 5th ed.). Sage.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*. Jossey-Bass.
- Csikszentmihályi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper Collins.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2004). Pleasure vs. enjoyment. *Across the Board*, 41(2), 9–9.
- Damrad-Frye, R., & Laird, J. D. (1989). The experience of boredom: The role of the self-perception of attention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2), 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.315>
- Danckert, J. (2019). Boredom: Managing the delicate balance between exploration and exploitation. *Boredom Is in Your Mind*, 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26395-9_3
- Danckert, J., Hammerschmidt, T., Marty-Dugas, J., & Smilek, D. (2018). Boredom: Under-aroused and restless. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 61, 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2018.03.014>
- Danesh, J., & Shahnazari, M. (2020). A structural relationship model for resilience, L2 learning motivation, and L2 proficiency at different proficiency levels. *Learning and Motivation*, 72, 101636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2020.101636>

- Daniels, L. M. (2010). *Data summary on boredom*. Wordpress. https://emotionandmotivation.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/boredom-data-summary_oct-18.pdf.
- Daniels, L. M., Haynes, T. L., Stupnisky, R. H., Perry, R. P., Newall, N. E., & Pekrun, R. (2008). Individual differences in achievement goals: A longitudinal study of cognitive, emotional, and achievement outcomes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 584–608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.08.002>
- Daniels, L. M., Stupnisky, R. H., Pekrun, R., Haynes, T. L., Perry, R. P., & Newall, N. E. (2009). A longitudinal analysis of achievement goals: From affective antecedents to emotional effects and achievement outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 948–963. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016096>
- Daniels, L. M., Tze, V. M. C., & Goetz, T. (2015). Examining boredom: Different causes for different coping profiles. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 37, 255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.11.004>
- Darden, D. K. (1999). Boredom: A socially disvalued emotion. *Sociological Spectrum*, 19(1), 13–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/027321799280280>
- Daschmann, E. C., Goetz, T., & Stupnisky, R. H. (2011). Testing the predictors of boredom at school: Development and validation of the precursors to boredom scales. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 421–440. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709910x526038>
- Davies, J., & Fortney, M. (2012). The Menton theory of engagement and boredom. In *Poster presented at the First Annual Conference on Advances in Cognitive Systems* (pp. 131–143). Chapter, Palo Alto, CA.
- De Chenne, T. K. (1988). Boredom as a clinical issue. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 25(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0085325>
- Dehghanzadeh, H., Fardanesh, H., Hatami, J., Talaei, E., & Noroozi, O. (2019). Using gamification to support learning English as a Second language: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(7), 934–957. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1648298>
- Derakhshan, A., Fathi, J., & Pawlak, M., & Kruk, M. (2022). Classroom social climate, growth language mindset, and student engagement: The mediating role

- of boredom in learning English as a foreign language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2099407>
- Derakhshan, A., Kruk, M., Mehdizadeh, M., & Pawlak, M. (2021a). Boredom in online classes in the Iranian EFL context: Sources and solutions. *System*, 101, 102556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102556>
- Derakhshan, A., Kruk, M., Mehdizadeh, M., & Pawlak, M. (2021b). Activity-induced boredom in online EFL classes. *ELT Journal*, 76(1), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab072>
- Derakhshan, N., Smyth, S., & Eysenck, M. W. (2009). Effects of state anxiety on performance using a task-switching paradigm: An investigation of attentional control theory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16(6), 1112–1117. <https://doi.org/10.3758/pbr.16.6.1112>
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2009). Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia TK (Eds.), *In The new Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 623–646). Chapter, Emerald Group Publishing.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2015). On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The Language Teacher*, 39, 13–15.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2016). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2017). Are perfectionists more anxious foreign language learners and users? In C. Gkonou, M. Daubney, & J. M. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications*. (pp. 70–91). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Alfawzan, M. (2018). Does the effect of enjoyment outweigh that of anxiety in foreign language performance? *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 21–45. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.2>
- Dewaele, J. M., & Dewaele, L. (2017). The Dynamic Interactions in foreign language classroom anxiety and foreign language enjoyment of pupils aged 12 to 18. A

- pseudo-longitudinal investigation. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 1(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.6>
- Dewaele, J. M., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Learner-internal and learner-external predictors of willingness to communicate in the FL classroom. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 2(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.37>
- Dewaele, J. M., & Li, C. (2018). Editorial: Special Issue Emotions in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 15–20.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Li, C. (2020). Emotions in second language acquisition: A critical review and research agenda. *Foreign Language World*, 196(1), 34–49.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Li, C. (2021). Teacher enthusiasm and students' social-behavioral learning engagement: The mediating role of student enjoyment and boredom in Chinese efl classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(6), 922–945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211014538>
- Dewaele, J. M., & MacIntyre, P. (2022). “you can’t start a fire without a spark”. enjoyment, anxiety, and the emergence of flow in foreign language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0123>
- Dewaele, J. M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The Two Faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 237–274. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5>
- Dewaele, J. M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2016). Foreign Language Enjoyment and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety: The right and left feet of the language learner. In P. D. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Positive Psychology in SLA* (pp. 215–234). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Dewaele, J. M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2019). The predictive power of multicultural personality traits, learner and teacher variables on foreign language enjoyment and anxiety. In M. Sato & S. Loewen (Eds.), *Evidence-based second language pedagogy: A collection of instructed second language acquisition studies* (pp. 263–286). Chapter, Routledge.

- Dewaele, J. M., & Pavelescu, L. M. (2019). The relationship between incommensurable emotions and willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language: A multiple case study. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1675667>
- Dewaele, J. M., Chen, X., Padilla, A. M., & Lake, J. (2019a). The flowering of positive psychology in Foreign Language Teaching and Acquisition Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02128>
- Dewaele, J. M., MacIntyre, P. D., Boudreau, C., & Dewaele, L. (2016). *Do Girls Have All the Fun? Anxiety and Enjoyment in the Foreign Language Classroom.*, 2(1), 41–63.
- Dewaele, J. M., Magdalena, A. F., & Saito, K. (2019b). The effect of perception of teacher characteristics on Spanish efl learners' anxiety and enjoyment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2), 412–427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12555>
- Dewaele, J. M., Witney, J., Saito, K., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Foreign language enjoyment and anxiety: The effect of teacher and learner variables. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(6), 676–697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817692161>
- Diehl, V. A., & Wyrick, M. (2015). The relationships between need for cognition, boredom proneness, task engagement, and test performance. *SAGE Open*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015585606>
- Diseth, Å. (2011). Self-efficacy, goal orientations and learning strategies as mediators between preceding and subsequent academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(2), 191–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.01.003>
- Dorman, J. P., Fisher, D. L., & Waldrip, B. G. (2006). Classroom environment, students' perceptions of assessment, academic efficacy and attitude to science: A LISREL analysis. In F. Darrell & K. M. Swe (Eds.), *Contemporary approaches to research on learning environments: Worldviews* (pp. 1–28). Chapter, World Scientific.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2008). New ways of motivating foreign language learners: Generating vision. *Links*, 38, 3–4.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2013). *The Psychology of Second Language Acquisition-Oxford Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 motivational self system. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group Dynamics in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the second language learner revisited*. Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 589–630). Chapter, Blackwell Publishing.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & MacIntyre, P. D. (Eds.). (2014). *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (Vol. 81). Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Drory, A. (1982). Individual differences in boredom proneness and task effectiveness at work. *Personnel Psychology*, 35(1), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1982.tb02190.x>
- Dumančić, D. (2018). Investigating boredom among EFL teachers. *ExELL*, 6(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.2478/exell-2019-0006>

- Dursun, P., & Tezer, E. (2013). Turkish adaptation of the boredom proneness scale short-form. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1550–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.786>
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Dweck, C. S. (2017). The journey to children's mindsets-and beyond. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(2), 139–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12225>
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.95.2.256>
- Eastwood, J. D., Cavaliere, C., Fahlman, S. A., & Eastwood, A. E. (2007). A desire for desires: Boredom and its relation to alexithymia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(6), 1035–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.08.027>
- Eastwood, J. D., Frischen, A., Fenske, M. J., & Smilek, D. (2012). The unengaged mind. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 482–495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612456044>
- Ehrman, M. (2008). Personality and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 61–72). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adult Language Learning Strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/327261>
- Elahi Shirvan, M., & Taherian, T. (2021). Longitudinal Examination of university students' foreign language enjoyment and foreign language classroom anxiety in the course of general English: Latent growth curve modeling. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1441804>
- Elahi Shirvan, M., Yazdanmehr, E., Taherian, T., Kruk, M., & Pawlak, M. (2021). Boredom in practical English language classes: A longitudinal confirmatory factor analysis-curve of factors model. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0073>

- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second language acquisition learning in the classroom*. Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2004). Individual Differences in Second Language Learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 525–551). Chapter, Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263109990544>
- Elpidorou, A. (2018). The good of boredom. *Philosophical Psychology*, 31(3), 323–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2017.1346240>
- Enciso, O. L. U., Enciso, D. S. U., & Daza, M. D. P. V. (2017). Critical thinking and its importance in education: Some reflections. *Rastros Rostros*, 19(34), 78–88
- Eren, A. (2013). Prospective teachers' perceptions of instrumentality, boredom coping strategies, and four aspects of engagement. *Teaching Education*, 24(3), 302–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.724053>
- Eren, A. (2016). Unidirectional cycles of boredom, boredom coping strategies, and engagement among prospective teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(4), 895–924. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9348-8>
- Eren, A., & Coskun, H. (2016). Students' level of boredom, boredom coping strategies, epistemic curiosity, and graded performance. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(6), 574–588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.999364>
- Eren, A., & Yeşilbursa, A. (2017). Exploring the Relationships between Prospective Turkish Teachers' Hopes, Motivations and Professional Plans. In H. Watt, P. Richardson, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Global Perspectives on Teacher Motivation* (pp. 220–247). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Eren, A., & Yeşilbursa, A. (2019). Pre-service teachers' teaching-specific hopes and their motivational forces: The roles of efficacy beliefs and possible selves.

- Teaching and Teacher Education*, 82, 140–152.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.016>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6).
<https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149>
- Facione, P. (2013). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts*. Insight Assessment.
http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf_files/what&why2006.pdf.
- Fahlman, S. A. (2009). *Development and validation of the Multidimensional State Boredom Scale* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). York University.
- Fahlman, S. A., Mercer, K. B., Gaskovski, P., Eastwood, A. E., & Eastwood, J. D. (2009). Does a lack of life meaning cause boredom? Results from psychometric, longitudinal, and experimental analyses. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(3), 307–340.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2009.28.3.307>
- Fahlman, S. A., Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Flora, D. B., & Eastwood, J. D. (2013). Development and validation of the Multidimensional State Boredom scale. *Assessment*, 20(1), 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111421303>
- Farmer, R., & Sundberg, N. D. (1986). Boredom proneness-the development and correlates of a new scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 50(1), 4–17.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5001_2
- Feldman, C., & Kuyken, W. (2019). *Mindfulness: Ancient wisdom meets modern psychology*. The Guilford Press.
- Feng, Y., & Chen, J. (2023). Book review. *System*, 112, 102969.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102969>
- Fenichel, O. (1951). On the psychology of boredom. In D. Rapaport (Ed.), *Organization and Pathology of Thought* (pp. 349–361). Chapter, Columbia University Press.
- Ferrell, J. (2004). Boredom, crime and criminology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 8(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480604044610>

- Fierro-Suero, S., Almagro, B. J., & Sáenz-López, P. (2020). Validation of the achievement emotions questionnaire for physical education (AEQ-PE). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(12), 4560. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124560>
- Finch, D., Peacock, M., Lazdowski, D., & Hwang, M. (2015). Managing emotions: A case study exploring the relationship between experiential learning, emotions, and student performance. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 13(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.12.001>
- Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 97–131). Chapter, Springer.
- Fisherl, C. D. (1993). Boredom at work: A neglected concept. *Human Relations*, 46(3), 395–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600305>
- Fiske, D. W., & Maddi, S. R. (1961). *Functions of varied experience*. Dorsey.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in Education*. McGraw-Hill.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2022). *How to design and evaluate research in Education*. McGraw Hill.
- Fraser, B. J., Treagust, D. F., & Dennis, N. C. (1986). Development of an instrument for assessing classroom psychosocial environment at universities and Colleges. *Studies in Higher Education*, 11(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075078612331378451>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The Broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.3.218>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). The Value of Positive Emotions: The emerging science of positive psychology is coming to understand why it's good to feel good.

- American Scientist*, 91(4), 330–335.
<https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/27858244>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden–and–build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359(1449), 1367–1377.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1512>
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2018). Reflections on positive emotions and upward spirals. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), 194–199.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617692106>
- Frenzel, A. C., Becker-Kurz, B., Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Lüdtke, O. (2018). Emotion transmission in the classroom revisited: A reciprocal effects model of teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(5), 628–639.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000228>
- Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Sutton, R. E. (2009). Emotional transmission in the classroom: Exploring the relationship between teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 705–716.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014695>
- Frenzel, A. C., Pekrun, R., & Goetz, T. (2007). Perceived learning environment and students' emotional experiences: A multilevel analysis of mathematics classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(5), 478–493.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.09.001>
- Furner, J. M., & Gonzalez-DeHass, A. (2011). How do students' mastery and performance goals relate to math anxiety? *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 7(4).
<https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/75209>
- Gan, Z., Leung, C., He, J., & Nang, H. (2018). Classroom assessment practices and learning motivation: A case study of Chinese EFL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(2), 514–529. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.476>
- Gana, K., & Akremi, M. (1998). L'échelle de disposition à l'ennui (EDE) : Adaptation Française et validation du boredom proneness scale (bp). The scale of tendency towards boredom (EDE). Trans: French adaptation and validation of the

- boredom proneness scale (bp). *L'année Psychologique*, 98(3), 429–450.
<https://doi.org/10.3406/psy.1998.28576>
- Ganley, R. M. (1989). Emotion and eating in obesity: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 8(3), 343–361.
[https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108X\(198905\)8:3<343::AID-EAT2260080310>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108X(198905)8:3<343::AID-EAT2260080310>3.0.CO;2-C)
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Garn, A. C., Simonton, K., Dasingert, T., & Simonton, A. (2017). Predicting changes in student engagement in University Physical Education: Application of Control-value theory of Achievement Emotions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 29, 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.12.005>
- Gee, J. P. (2007). *Good video games and good learning: Collected essays on video games*. Peter Lang.
- Geiwitz, P. J. (1966). Structure of boredom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), 592–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023202>
- Ghaith, G. M., Shaaban, K. A., & Harkous, S. A. (2007). An investigation of the relationship between forms of positive interdependence, social support, and selected aspects of classroom climate. *System*, 35(2), 229–240.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.11.003>
- Giladi, A., Koslowsky, M., & Davidovitch, N. (2022). Effort as a mediator of the relationship between English learning self-efficacy and reading comprehension performance in the EFL Field: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 11(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v11n1p114>
- Giroux, H. A. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of Education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Gkonou, C., Daubney, M., & Dewaele, J. M. (Eds.). (2017). *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications*. Multilingual Matters.

- Gläser-Zikuda, M., Fuß, S., Laukenmann, M., Metz, K., & Randler, C. (2005). Promoting students' emotions and achievement – instructional design and evaluation of the Ecole-approach. *Learning and Instruction*, 15(5), 481–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2005.07.013>
- Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2006). Phänomenologie Schulischer Langeweile [Phenomenology of boredom at school]. *Zeitschrift Für Entwicklungspsychologie Und Pädagogische Psychologie*, 38(4), 149–153. <https://doi.org/10.1026/0049-8637.38.4.149>
- Goetz, T., & Hall, N. C. (2014). Academic boredom. In L. Linnenbrink-Garcia & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 311–330). Chapter, Routledge.
- Goetz, T., & Nett, U. E. (2008). *Codebook of the coping with boredom scales. Math related version*. Empirical Educational Research, University of Konstanz, Germany/Thurgau University of Teacher Education, Switzerland.
- Goetz, T., Cronjaeger, H., Frenzel, A. C., Lüdtke, O., & Hall, N. C. (2010). Academic self-concept and emotion relations: Domain specificity and age effects. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 35(1), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2009.10.001>
- Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Hall, N. C., Nett, U. E., Pekrun, R., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2014). Types of boredom: An experience sampling approach. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(3), 401–419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9385-y>
- Goetz, T., Keller, M. M., Lüdtke, O., Nett, U. E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2020). The dynamics of real-time classroom emotions: Appraisals mediate the relation between students' perceptions of teaching and their emotions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(6), 1243–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000415>
- Goldberg, Y. K., Eastwood, J. D., LaGuardia, J., & Danckert, J. (2011). Boredom: An emotional experience distinct from apathy, anhedonia, or depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 30(6), 647–666. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2011.30.6.647>

- Gordon, A., Wilkinson, R., McGown, A., & Jovanoska, S. (1997). The psychometric properties of the Boredom Proneness Scale: An examination of its validity. *Psychological Studies*, 42((2-3)), 85–97.
- Govaerts, S., & Grégoire, J. (2008). Development and construct validation of an academic emotions scale. *International Journal of Testing*, 8(1), 34–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305050701808649>
- Green, J. L., Manski, S. E., Hansen, T. A., & Broatch, J. E. (2023). Descriptive statistics. *International Encyclopedia of Education (Fourth Edition)*, 723–733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-818630-5.10083-1>
- Green-Demers, I., Pelletier, L. G., Stewart, D. G., & Gushue, N. R. (1998). Coping with the less interesting aspects of training: Toward a model of interest and motivation enhancement in individual sports. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 20(4), 251–261. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2004_2.
- Greenson, R. (1953). On boredom. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 1(1), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000306515300100102>
- Gregersen, T. (2019). Aligning positive psychology with language learning motivation. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 621–640). Chapter, Springer International Publishing.
- Gregory, A., Allen, J. P., Mikami, A. Y., Hafen, C. A., & Pianta, R. C. (2014). Effects of a professional development program on behavioral engagement of students in middle and high school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51(2), 143–163. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21741>.
- Grubb, E. A. (1975). Assembly line boredom and individual differences in recreation participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 7(4), 256–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1975.11970242>
- Guariento, W., & Morley, J. (2001). Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 347–353. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.4.347>
- Gudivada, V. N. (2017). Data Analytics: Fundamentals. In M. Chowdhury, A. Apon, & K. Dey (Eds.), *Data Analytics for Intelligent Transportation Systems* (pp. 31–67). Chapter, Elsevier.

- Guilloteaux, M. J. (2016). Student Engagement During EFL High School Lessons in Korea. *An Experience-Sampling Study*, 23(1), 21–46.
- Guo, W., Bai, B., Zang, F., Wang, T., & Song, H. (2023). Influences of motivation and grit on students' self-regulated learning and English learning achievement: A comparison between male and female students. *System*, 114, 103018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103018>
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional Contexts for Engagement and Achievement in Reading. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 601–634). Chapter, Springer.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2014). In *Multivariate Data Analysis*. (7th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Haladyn, J. J. (2015). *Boredom and art: Passions of the will to boredom*. Zero Books.
- Hall, N. C., Sampasivam, L., Muis, K. R., & Ranellucci, J. (2016). Achievement goals and emotions: The mediational roles of perceived progress, control, and value. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(2), 313–330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12108>
- Hamilton, J. A., Haier, R. J., & Buchsbaum, M. S. (1984). Intrinsic enjoyment and boredom coping scales: Validation with personality, evoked potential and attention measures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5(2), 183–193. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(84\)90050-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(84)90050-3)
- Hangen, E. J., Elliot, A. J., & Jamieson, J. P. (2018). Highlighting the difference between approach and avoidance motivation enhances the predictive validity of performance-avoidance goal reports. *Motivation and Emotion*, 43(3), 387–399. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9744-9>
- Harasymchuk, C., & Fehr, B. (2013). A prototype analysis of Relational boredom. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(5), 627–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512464483>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson Education.

- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2009). Beyond sameness, with engagement and outcomes for all: An introduction. . In S. Harper & J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations* (pp. 1–15). Chapter, Routledge.
- Harris, M. B. (2000). Correlates and characteristics of boredom proneness and boredom. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(3), 576–598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02497.x>
- Hascher, T. (2003). Well-being in school – why students need social support. In Ph. Mayring & Ch. v. Rhöneck (Eds.), *Learning emotions. The influence of affective factors on classroom learning* (pp. 127–142). Chapter, Lang.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Hayat, A. A., Shateri, K., Amini, M., & Shokrpour, N. (2020). Relationships between academic self-efficacy, learning-related emotions, and metacognitive learning strategies with academic performance in medical students: A structural equation model. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-01995-9>
- Healy, S. D. (1984). *Boredom, self, and culture*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Heckel, C., & Ringeisen, T. (2017). Enjoyment and Boredom in Academic Online-Learning: Relations with Appraisals and Learning Outcomes. In K. A. Moore & P. Buchwald (Eds.), *Stress and Anxiety: Coping and Resilience* (pp. 27–136). Chapter, Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH.
- Henry, A., & Thorsen, C. (2018). Disaffection and agentic engagement: ‘redesigning’ activities to enable authentic self-expression. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 456–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818795976>
- Heron, W. (1957). The pathology of boredom. *Scientific American*, 196(1), 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0157-52>
- Hill, A. B. (1975). Extraversion and variety-seeking in a monotonous task. *British Journal of Psychology*, 66(1), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1975.tb01434.x>

- Hill, A. B., & Perkins, R. E. (1985). Towards a model of boredom. *British Journal of Psychology*, 76(2), 235–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1985.tb01947.x>
- Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., Vitta, J. P., & Wu, J. (2021b). Engagement in language learning: A systematic review of 20 years of research methods and definitions. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882110012. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211001289>
- Hiver, P., Mercer, S., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (Eds.) (2021a). *Student Engagement in the Language Classroom*. Multilingual Matters.
- Holahan, C. J., Moos, R. H., & Schaefer, J. A. (1996). Coping, stress resistance, and growth: Conceptualizing adaptive functioning. In M. Zeidner & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Handbook of coping: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 24–43). Chapter, John Wiley & Sons.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Pergamon.
- Hong, J., Nie, Y., Heddy, B., Monobe, G., Ruan, J., You, S., & Kambara, H. (2016). Revising and validating achievement emotions questionnaire – teachers (AEQ-T). *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 5(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijep.2016.1395>
- Hong, X. (2010). Review of effects of glosses on incidental vocabulary learning and reading comprehension. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguists*, 33, 56–73.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2010). Foreign and Second language anxiety. *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s026144480999036x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (2017). On the misreading of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) and the need to balance anxiety research and the experiences of anxious language learners. In C. Gkonou, M. Daubney, & J. M. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications* (pp. 31–47). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/327317>

- Hsieh, M. H., Chuang, H. H., & Albanese, D. (2022). Investigating student agency and affordances during online virtual exchange projects in an ELF context from an ecological call perspective. *System*, 109, 102888. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102888>
- Hsieh, P. P. H., & Kang, H. S. (2010). Attribution and self-efficacy and their interrelationship in the Korean EFL Context. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 606–627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00570.x>
- Hulleman, C. S., & Barron, K. E. (2015). Motivation interventions in education: Bridging theory, research, and practice. In L. Corno & E. M. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 174–185). Chapter, Routledge.
- Hunter, J. A., & Eastwood, J. D. (2021). Understanding the relation between boredom and academic performance in postsecondary students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(3), 499–515. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000479>
- Hunter, J. A., Dyer, K. J., Cribbie, R. A., & Eastwood, J. D. (2016). Exploring the utility of the Multidimensional State Boredom scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 32(3), 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000251>
- Hwang, G. J., Hsu, T. C., Lai, C. L., & Hsueh, C. J. (2017). Interaction of problem-based gaming and learning anxiety in language students' English listening performance and Progressive Behavioral Patterns. *Computers & Education*, 106, 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.11.010>
- Imai, Y. (2010). Emotions in SLA: New Insights from Collaborative Learning for an EFL classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 278–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01021.x>
- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Weissinger, E. (1987). Leisure and boredom. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 5(3), 356–364. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1987.5.3.356>
- Jacobs, E. (2003). Mixed methods and moving to opportunity. *The Educational Exchange*, IX Retrieved from [Http://Www.Hfrp.Org/Evaluation/ the-Evaluation-Exchange/Issue-Archive/](http://www.hfrp.org/Evaluation/the-Evaluation-Exchange/Issue-Archive/), 3, 14–15.

- Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2012). Longitudinal test of self-determination theory's motivation mediation model in a naturally occurring classroom context. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1175–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028089>
- Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2016). Why students become more engaged or more disengaged during the semester: A self-determination theory dual-process model. *Learning and Instruction*, 43, 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.01.002>
- Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It is not autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 588–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019682>
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: Necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 467–494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01143.x>
- Jegaden, D., Menaheze, M., Lucas, D., Loddé, B., & Dewitte, J.-D. (2019). Don't forget about seafarer's boredom. *International Maritime Health*, 70(2), 82–87. <https://doi.org/10.5603/imh.2019.0013>
- Jiang, Y., & Dewaele, J. M. (2019). How unique is the foreign language classroom enjoyment and anxiety of Chinese EFL learners? *System*, 82, 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.02.017>
- Joe, H. K., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Classroom social climate, self-determined motivation, willingness to communicate, and achievement: A study of structural relationships in instructed Second language settings. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 53, 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.11.005>
- Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. (1986). Why do the nation's students use drugs and alcohol? Self-reported reasons from nine national surveys. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 16(1), 29–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002204268601600103>
- Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Barabadi, E. (2018). Role of the emotions and classroom environment in willingness to communicate. *Studies in Second*

Language Acquisition, 40(3), 605–624.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263117000304>

- Kim, T. Y. (2015). Enhancing English learning motivation and creating English self through languaging activities in Korean Elementary and secondary schools : A methods approach.”. *The Journal of Modern British and American Language and Literature*, 33(2), 147. <https://doi.org/10.21084/jmball.2015.05.33.2.147>
- Kinchin, G. D., & O’Sullivan, M. (2003). Incidences of student support for and resistance to a curricular innovation in high school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(3), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.22.3.245>
- King, H., & King, W. (2018). *The wild card: 7 steps to an educator’s creative breakthrough*. San Dave Burgess Consulting, Inc.
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., Ganotice, F. A., & Villarosa, J. B. (2015). Positive affect catalyzes academic engagement: Cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental evidence. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 39, 64–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.03.005>
- Klassen, R. M. (2004). Optimism and realism: A review of self-efficacy from a cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(3), 205–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590344000330>
- Klassen, R. M. (2006). Too much confidence? The self-efficacy of adolescents with learning disabilities. In F. Parajes & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 181–200). Chapter, Information Age.
- Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. Association Press.
- Kohn, A. (2015). The perils of ‘Growth Mindset’ education: why we’re trying to fix our kids when we should be fixing the system. *Salon Magazine*.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 275–299. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.129>

- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Lored Publishing.
- Krebt, D. M. (2017). The effectiveness of role play techniques in teaching speaking for EFL college students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(5), 863–870. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0805.04>
- Kruk, M. (2016a). Investigating the changing nature of boredom in the English language classroom: Results of a study. *Nowy wymiar filologii*, 252-263.
- Kruk, M. (2016b). Variations in motivation, anxiety and boredom in learning English in second life. *The EuroCALL Review*, 24(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.4995/eurocall.2016.5693>
- Kruk, M. (2021). *Investigating dynamic relationships among individual difference variables in learning English as a Foreign Language in a virtual world*. Springer.
- Kruk, M. (2022). Dynamicity of perceived willingness to communicate, motivation, boredom and anxiety in second life: The case of two advanced learners of English. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(1–2), 190–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1677722>
- Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2017). Nuda a praktyczna Nauka Języka Angielskiego. *Neofilolog*, (49/1), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2017.49.1.07>
- Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2018). Boredom in practical English language classes: Insights from interview data. In L. Szymański, J. Zawodniak, A. Łobodziec, & M. Smoluk (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary views on the English language, literature and culture* (pp. 177–191). Chapter, Uniwersytet Zielonogórski.
- Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2020). A comparative study of the experience of boredom in the L2 and L3 classroom. *English Teaching & Learning*, 44(4), 417–437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-020-00056-0>
- Kruk, M., Pawlak, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2021). Another look at boredom in language instruction: The role of the predictable and the unexpected. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 15–40. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.1.2>

- Kruk, M., Pawlak, M., Elahi Shirvan, M., & Shahnama, M. (2022). The emergence of boredom in an online language class: An ecological perspective. *System*, 107, 102803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102803>
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 683–706. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0099>
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature. In Commissioned Report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success*. National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
- Lam, S. F., Wong, B. P. H., Yang, H., & Liu, Y. (2012). Understanding Student Engagement with a Contextual Model. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 403–419). Chapter, Springer.
- Lan, G., Zhao, X., & Gong, M. (2023). Motivational intensity and willingness to communicate in L2 learning: A moderated mediation model of enjoyment, boredom, and shyness. *System*, 117, 103116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103116>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Looking ahead: Future directions in, and future research into, Second language acquisition. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 55–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12314>
- Larson, R. W., & Richards, M. H. (1991). Boredom in the middle school years: Blaming schools versus blaming students. *American Journal of Education*, 99(4), 418–443. <https://doi.org/10.1086/443992>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
- Leary, M. R., Rogers, P. A., Canfield, R. W., & Coe, C. (1986). Boredom in interpersonal encounters: Antecedents and social implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(5), 968–975. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.5.968>

- Lee, J. S. (2022). The role of grit and classroom enjoyment in EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(5), 452–468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1746319>
- Lee, T. W. (1986). Towards the Development and Validation of a Measure of Job Boredom. *Manhattan College Journal of Business*, 15(1), 22–28.
- Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition, identification, and distinction. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 180–196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.2.180>
- LePera, N. (2011). Relationships between boredom proneness, mindfulness, anxiety, depression, and substance use. *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, 8(2), 15–25.
- Lepper, M. R. (1985). Microcomputers in education: Motivational and social issues. *American Psychologist*, 40(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.40.1.1>
- Lewinski, P. (2015). Effects of classrooms' architecture on academic performance in view of telic versus paratelic motivation: A review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 746. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00746>
- Lewinsky, H. (1943). Boredom. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 13(3), 147–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1943.tb02734.x>
- Li, C. (2021). A control–value theory approach to boredom in English classes among university students in China. *The Modern Language Journal*, 105(1), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12693>
- Li, C., & Dewaele, J. M. (2020). The predictive effects of trait emotional intelligence and online learning achievement perceptions on foreign language class boredom among Chinese university students. *Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching*, 5, 33–44.
- Li, C., Dewaele, J. M., & Jiang, G. (2020). The complex relationship between classroom emotions and EFL achievement in China. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(3), 485–510. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0043>
- Li, C., Dewaele, J.-M., & Hu, Y. (2023a). Foreign language learning boredom: Conceptualization and measurement. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(2), 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0124>

- Li, C., Huang, J., & Li, B. (2021). The predictive effects of classroom environment and trait emotional intelligence on foreign language enjoyment and anxiety. *System*, 96, 102393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102393>
- Li, C., Jiang, G., & Dewaele, J. M. (2018). Understanding Chinese high school students' foreign language enjoyment: Validation of the Chinese version of the foreign language enjoyment scale. *System*, 76, 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.06.004>
- Li, C., Wei, L., & Lu, X. (2023b). Contributions of foreign language writing emotions to writing achievement. *System*, 116, 103074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103074>
- Li, J., King, R. B., & Wang, C. (2022). Profiles of motivation and engagement in Foreign Language Learning: Associations with emotional factors, academic achievement, and demographic features. *System*, 108, 102820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102820>
- Li, S. (2016). The construct validity of Language Aptitude. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38(4), 801–842. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s027226311500042x>
- Li, Z., & Liu, Y. (2023). Theorising language learning experience in L2 motivation with perma: A positive psychology perspective. *System*, 112, 102975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102975>
- Liang, L., Li, C., Meng, C., Guo, X., Lv, J., Fei, J., & Mei, S. (2022). Psychological distress and internet addiction following the covid-19 outbreak: Fear of missing out and boredom proneness as mediators. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 40, 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2022.03.007>
- Lichtenfeld, S., Pekrun, R., Stupnisky, R. H., Reiss, K., & Murayama, K. (2012). Measuring students' emotions in the early years: The achievement emotions questionnaire-elementary school (AEQ-ES). *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(2), 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.04.009>
- Liem, A. D., Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer

- relationship, and achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 486–512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.08.001>
- Lim, S. L., & Yeo, K. J. (2021). A systematic review of the relationship between motivational constructs and self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10(1), 330. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.21006>
- Linnenbrink, E. A. (2006). Emotion research in education: Theoretical and methodological perspectives on the integration of affect, motivation, and cognition. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(4), 307–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9028-x>
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Achievement goal theory and affect: An asymmetrical bidirectional model. *Educational Psychologist*, 37(2), 69–78. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3702_2
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs instudent engagement and learning inthe classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 119–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308223>
- Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & Barger, M. M. (2014). Achievement goals and emotions. In R. Pekrun & L. Linnenbrink-Garcia (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 142–161). Chapter, Routledge.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy I: Definitions, Issues, and Problems*. Authentik.
- Little, D., Devitt, S., & Singleton, D. (1994). *Learning foreign languages from authentic texts: Theory and practice*. Authentik Language Learning.
- Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System*, 34(3), 301–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.04.004>
- Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00687.x>
- Loderer, K., Pekrun, R., & Lester, J. C. (2020). Beyond cold technology: A systematic review and meta-analysis on emotions in technology-based learning

- environments. *Learning and Instruction*, 70, 101162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.08.002>
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x>
- London, H., Schubert, D. S., & Washburn, D. (1972). Increase of autonomic arousal by boredom. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 80(1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033311>
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Chapter, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2019). Promoting growth in foreign and Second language education: A research agenda for mindsets in Language learning and teaching. *System*, 86, 102126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102126>
- Luo, H., & Yang, C. (2018). Twenty Years of telecollaborative practice: Implications for teaching Chinese as a foreign language. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5–6), 546–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1420083>
- MacDonald, D. A., & Holland, D. (2002). Spirituality and boredom proneness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(6), 1113–1119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(01\)00114-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(01)00114-3)
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in Foreign Language and second language teaching: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24–41). Chapter, McGraw-Hill.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45–68). Chapter, John Benjamins Publishing.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2016). So Far So Good: An Overview of Positive Psychology and Its Contributions to SLA. In D. Gabryś-Barker & D. Gałajda (Eds.), *Positive*

- Psychology Perspectives on Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. Second Language Learning and Teaching.* (pp. 3–20). Chapter, Springer, Cham.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2017). An overview of language anxiety research and trends in its development. In C. Gkonou, M. Daubney, & J. M. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications.* (pp. 11–30). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the Second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gregersen, T. (2012a). Affect: The Role of Language Anxiety and Other Emotions in Language Learning. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for Language Learning.* (pp. 103–118). Chapter, Palgrave Macmillan.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gregersen, T. (2012b). Emotions that facilitate language learning: The positive-broadening power of the imagination. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(2), 193. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2012.2.2.4>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Vincze, L. (2017). Positive and negative emotions underlie motivation for L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 61–88. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2017.7.1.4>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Clement, R. (2016). Individual differences. In G. Hall (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 310–323). Routledge.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2020). Language teachers' coping strategies during the COVID-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations

- with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions. *System*, 94, 102352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102352>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dewaele, J. M., Macmillan, N., & Li, C. (2019b). The emotional underpinnings of Gardner's Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery. In P. D. MacIntyre & A. Al-Hoorie (Eds.), *Contemporary language motivation theory: 60 years since Gardner and Lambert (1959)* (pp. 57–79). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2019a). Setting an agenda for positive psychology in SLA: Theory, practice, and research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(1), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12544>
- Mackey, A. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Routledge.
- Mackey, A. (2020). *Interaction, feedback and task research in Second language learning methods and design*. Cambridge University Press.
- Macklem, G. L. (2015). *Boredom in the classroom: Addressing student motivation, self-regulation, and engagement in learning*. Springer.
- Mahatmya, D., Lohman, B. J., Matjasko, J. L., & Farb, A. F. (2012). Engagement Across Developmental Periods. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 45–63). Chapter, Springer.
- Mak, B. (2011). An exploration of speaking-in-class anxiety with Chinese ESL learners. *System*, 39(2), 202–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.002>
- Malkovsky, E., Merrifield, C., Goldberg, Y., & Danckert, J. (2012). Exploring the relationship between boredom and sustained attention. *Experimental Brain Research*, 221(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-012-3147-z>
- Mann, S. (2016a). *The science of boredom: Why boredom is good*. Hachette UK.
- Mann, S. (2016b). *The Upside of Downtime: Why Boredom Is Good*. Robinson.
- Mann, S., & Robinson, A. (2009). Boredom in the Lecture Theatre: An investigation into the contributors, moderators and outcomes of boredom amongst university students. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(2), 243–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920802042911>

- Maroldo, G. K. (1986). Shyness, boredom, and grade point average among college students. *Psychological Reports*, 59(2), 395–398. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1986.59.2.395>
- Martin, A. J., Anderson, J., Bobis, J., Way, J., & Vellar, R. (2012). Switching on and switching off in Mathematics: An ecological study of future intent and disengagement among middle school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025988>
- Martin, M., Sadlo, G., & Stew, G. (2006). The phenomenon of boredom. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(3), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qrp066oa>
- Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and Second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 123–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00212>
- Mattern, R. (2005). College students' goal orientations and achievement. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17, 27–32.
- McCue, C. (2007). Basics. *Data Mining and Predictive Analysis*, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-075067796-7/50023-4>
- McDowall, R. J., & Wells, H. M. (1927). The Physiology of Monotony. *BMJ*, 1(3452), 414–415. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.1.3452.414>
- McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367824471>
- Mega, C., Ronconi, L., & De Beni, R. (2014). What makes a good student? how emotions, self-regulated learning, and motivation contribute to academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(1), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033546>
- Meguro, Y. (2020). The effects of individual differences in field dependence/independence and analogical reasoning for L2 instruction. *System*, 94, 102296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102296>

- Mellanby, A. R. (2000). Peer-led and adult-led School Health Education: A critical review of available comparative research. *Health Education Research*, 15(5), 533–545. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/15.5.533>
- Melton, A. M., & Schulenberg, S. E. (2009). A confirmatory factor analysis of the boredom proneness scale. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(5), 493–508. <https://doi.org/10.3200/jrl.143.5.493-508>
- Méndez López, M. G., & Fabela Cárdenas, M. A. (2014). Emotions and their effects in a language learning Mexican context. *System*, 42, 298–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.006>
- Méndez López, M. G., & Peña Aguilar, A. (2013). Emotions as learning enhancers of foreign language learning motivation. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 15(1), 109–124.
- Mercer, S. (2020). The wellbeing of language teachers in the private sector: An ecological perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882097351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820973510>
- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mercer, S., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). Introducing positive psychology to sla. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 153–172. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.2>
- Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Bar, R. J., & Eastwood, J. D. (2014). Causes of boredom: The person, the situation, or both? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 122–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.034>
- Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Flora, D. B., Fahlman, S. A., & Eastwood, J. D. (2011). The measurement of boredom. *Assessment*, 20(5), 585–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111408229>
- Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Hunter, J. A., & Eastwood, J. D. (2013). Is trait boredom redundant? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 32(8), 897–916. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2013.32.8.897>

- Miller, R. B., & Brickman, S. J. (2004). A model of future-oriented motivation and self-regulation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(1), 9–33. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:edpr.0000012343.96370.39>
- Miller, Z. F., & Godfroid, A. (2020). Emotions in incidental language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42(1), 115–141. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s027226311900041x>
- Mitchell, R., & Tyne, H. (Eds.). (2021). *Language, mobility and study abroad in the contemporary European context*. Routledge.
- Mohammadi, R. R., Saeidi, M., & Abdollahi, A. (2023). Modelling the interrelationships among self-regulated learning components, critical thinking and reading comprehension by PLS-SEM: A mixed methods study. *System*, 117, 103120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103120>
- Mohammadi, S., & Aliakbari, M. (2018). Students' Perceived Classroom Climate and Their Achievement Goal Orientations in an Iranian EFL Context. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 6(23), 129–145.
- Molden, D. C., & Dweck, C. S. (2006). Finding “meaning” in psychology: A lay theories approach to self-regulation, social perception, and social development. *American Psychologist*, 61(3), 192–203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.61.3.192>
- Moody, G. D., Galletta, D. F., & Dunn, B. K. (2017). Which phish get caught? An exploratory study of individuals' susceptibility to phishing. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 26(6), 564–584. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41303-017-0058-x>
- Moore, G. E. (1987). Down with boredom! *Vocational Education Journal*, 62(5), 38–39.
- Moreira, P., Cunha, D., & Inman, R. A. (2018). Achievement emotions questionnaire-mathematics (AEQ-M) in adolescents: Factorial structure, measurement invariance and convergent validity with personality. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 16(6), 750–762. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2018.1548349>

- Mugon, J., Struk, A., & Danckert, J. (2018). A failure to launch: Regulatory modes and boredom proneness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01126>
- Murphey, T., & Arao, H. (2001). Reported belief changes through near peer role modeling. *TESL-EJ*, 5(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/http://tesl-ej.org/ej19/a1.html>
- Nakamura, S. (2018). How I see it: An exploratory study on attributions and emotions in L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 553–574. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.3.2>
- Nakamura, S., Darasawang, P., & Reinders, H. (2021). The antecedents of boredom in L2 classroom learning. *System*, 98, 102469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102469>
- Nett, U. E., Goetz, T., & Daniels, L. M. (2010). What to do when feeling bored? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(6), 626–638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.09.004>
- Nett, U. E., Goetz, T., & Hall, N. C. (2011). Coping with boredom in school: An experience sampling perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.10.003>
- Nicholls, J. G. (1978). The development of the concepts of effort and ability, perception of academic attainment, and the understanding that difficult tasks require more ability. *Child Development*, 49(3), 800. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1128250>
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91(3), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.91.3.328>
- Noels, K. A., Vargas Lascano, D. I., & Saumure, K. (2019). The development of self-determination across the language course. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(04), 821–851. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263118000189>
- Noteborn, G., Bohle Carbonell, K., Dailey-Hebert, A., & Gijssels, W. (2012). The role of emotions and task significance in virtual education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(3), 176–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.03.002>

- Nussbaum, A. D., & Dweck, C. S. (2008). Defensiveness versus remediation: Self-theories and modes of self-esteem maintenance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(5), 599–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207312960>
- O'Connor, D. (1967). The phenomena of boredom. *Journal of Existentialism*, 7(27), 381–399.
- O'Dowd, R. (2021). Virtual Exchange: Moving forward into the next decade. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(3), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1902201>
- O'Hanlon, J. F. (1981). Boredom: Practical consequences and a theory. *Acta Psychologica*, 49(1), 53–82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918\(81\)90033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(81)90033-0)
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q. (2019). Acting, thinking, feeling, making, collaborating: The Engagement Process in Foreign Language Learning. *System*, 86, 102128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102128>
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Fryer, L. K. (2018). Schools can improve motivational quality: Profile transitions across early foreign language learning experiences. *Motivation and Emotion*, 42(4), 527–545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9681-7>
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., Nakata, Y., Parker, P., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Motivating young language learners: A longitudinal model of self-determined motivation in elementary school foreign language classes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 49, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.01.010>
- Oga-Baldwin, W. Q., & Fryer, L. K. (2021). Engagement growth in language learning classrooms: A latent growth analysis of engagement in Japanese elementary schools. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 224–240). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Orcutt, J. D. (1984). Contrasting effects of two kinds of boredom on alcohol use. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 14(1), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002204268401400112>
- Oxford, R. (2017). Anxious language learners can change their minds: Ideas and strategies from traditional psychology and positive psychology. In C. Gkonou,

- M. Daubney, & J. M. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications* (pp. 179–199). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Oxford, R. L. (2016). Toward a psychology of well-being for language learners: The EMPATHICS vision. In P.D. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Positive psychology in SLA* (pp. 10–90). Chapter, Multilingual Matters.
- Oxford, R. L., & Cuéllar, L. (2014). Positive psychology in cross-cultural narratives: Mexican students discover themselves while learning Chinese. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 173–203. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2014.4.2.10>
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543–578. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066004543>
- Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 10(149), 1–49.
- Pajares, F. (2009). Motivational role of self-efficacy beliefs in self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 111–139). Chapter, Routledge.
- Papathanasiou, I. V., Fradelos, E. C., Nikolaou, E., Tsaras, K., Kontopoulou, L., & Malli, F. (2021). Emotional intelligence and professional boredom among nursing personnel in Greece. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, 11(8), 750. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm11080750>
- Passik, S. D., Inman, A., Kirsh, K., Theobald, D., & Dickerson, P. (2003). Initial validation of a scale to measure purposelessness, understimulation, and boredom in cancer patients: Toward a redefinition of depression in advanced disease. *Palliative and Supportive Care*, 1(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1478951503030062>
- Patall, E. A. (2013). Constructing motivation through choice, interest, and interestingness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(2), 522–534. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030307>

- Patrick, H., & Ryan, A. M. (2005). Identifying Adaptive Classrooms: Dimensions of the Classroom Social Environment. In K. A. Moore & L. H. Lippman (Eds.), *What do Children Need to Flourish: Conceptualizing and Measuring Indicators of Positive Development* (pp. 271–287). Chapter, Springer Science + Business Media.
- Patrick, H., Ryan, A. M., & Kaplan, A. (2007). Early adolescents' perceptions of the classroom social environment, motivational beliefs, and engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(1), 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.83>
- Pavelescu, L. M., & Petrić, B. (2018). Love and enjoyment in context: Four case studies of adolescent EFL learners. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 73–101. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.4>
- Pawlak, M. (2014). Pedagogical Choices in Error Correction. In *Error Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom. Second Language Learning and Teaching*. (pp. 89–158). Chapter, Springer.
- Pawlak, M. (2017). Overview of Learner Individual Differences and Their Mediating Effects on the Process and Outcome of Interaction. In L. Gurzynski-Weiss (Ed.), *Expanding Individual Difference Research in the Interaction Approach: Investigating Learners, Instructors, and Other Interlocutors* (pp. 19–40). Chapter, John Benjamins.
- Pawlak, M. (2020a). Review of directed motivational currents and language education: Exploring implications for pedagogy; author: Christine Muir; publisher: Multilingual matters, 2020; ISBN: 978-1-78892-884-7; pages: 252. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(4), 807–811. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.4.7>
- Pawlak, M. (2020b). Individual differences and good language teachers. In C. Griffiths & Z. Tajeddin (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 121–132). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Pawlak, M., & Csizér, K. (2022). The impact of self-regulatory strategy use on self-efficacy beliefs and motivated learning behavior in study abroad contexts: The

- case of university students in Italy, Poland and Turkey. *System*, 105, 102735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102735>
- Pawlak, M., Derakhshan, A., Mehdizadeh, M., & Kruk, M. (2021b). Boredom in online English language classes: Mediating variables and coping strategies. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882110649. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211064944>
- Pawlak, M., Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2020c). Investigating individual trajectories in experiencing boredom in the language classroom: The case of 11 polish students of English. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(4), 598–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820914004>
- Pawlak, M., Kruk, M., Zawodniak, J., & Pasikowski, S. (2020a). Investigating factors responsible for boredom in English classes: The case of advanced learners. *System*, 91, 102259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102259>
- Pawlak, M., Kruk, M., Zawodniak, J., & Pasikowski, S. (2022). Examining the underlying structure of after-class boredom experienced by English majors. *System*, 106, 102769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102769>
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020b). *Boredom in the foreign language classroom: A micro-perspective*. Springer Nature.
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020d). The neglected emotion of boredom in teaching English to advanced learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 497–509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12302>
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2021a). Individual trajectories of boredom in learning English as a foreign language at the university level: Insights from three students' self-reported experience. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(3), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1767108>
- Peixoto, F., Mata, L., Monteiro, V., Sanches, C., & Pekrun, R. (2015). The Achievement Emotions Questionnaire: Validation for Pre-Adolescent Students. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12(4), 472–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2015.1040757>

- Pekrun, R. (1984). An expectancy-value model of anxiety. In H. M. van der Ploeg, R. Schwarzer, & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in Test Anxiety Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 53–72). Chapter, Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Pekrun, R. (1992a). The impact of emotions on learning and achievement: Towards a theory of cognitive/motivational mediators. *Applied Psychology*, 41(4), 359–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1992.tb00712.x>
- Pekrun, R. (1992b). The expectancy-value theory of anxiety: Overview and implications. In D. G. Forgays, T. Sosnowski, & K. Wrzesniewski (Eds.), *Anxiety: Recent developments in self-appraisal, psychophysiological and health research* (pp. 23–41). Chapter, Hemisphere.
- Pekrun, R. (2000). A social-cognitive, control-value theory of Achievement Emotions. *Motivational Psychology of Human Development - Developing Motivation and Motivating Development*, 143–163. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115\(00\)80010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115(00)80010-2)
- Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of Achievement Emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and Implications for Educational Research and Practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(4), 315–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9>
- Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2012). Academic Emotions and Student Engagement. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 259–282). Chapter, Springer.
- Pekrun, R., & Stephens, E. J. (2010). Achievement emotions: A control-value approach. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(4), 238–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00259.x>
- Pekrun, R., & Stephens, E. J. (2012). Academic emotions. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, S. Graham, J. M. Royer, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook, Vol. 2. Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors* (pp. 3–31). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13274-001>

- Pekrun, R., & Perry, R. P. (2014). Control–value theory of achievement emotions. In R. Pekrun & L. Linnenbrink–Garcia (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 120–142). Routledge.
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2006). Achievement goals and discrete achievement emotions: A theoretical model and prospective test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(3), 583–597. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.3.583>
- Pekrun, R., Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2007). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: An integrative approach to emotions in education. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (pp. 13–36). Chapter, Elsevier Academic Press.
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2005). *Academic emotions questionnaire-mathematics (AEQ-M) user's manual User's Manual*. Department of Psychology, University of Munich.
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Daniels, L. M., Stupnisky, R. H., & Perry, R. P. (2010). Boredom in achievement settings: Exploring control–value antecedents and performance outcomes of a neglected emotion. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 531–549. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019243>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Barchfeld, P., & Perry, R. P. (2011). Measuring emotions in students' learning and Performance: The achievement emotions questionnaire (AEQ). *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.10.002>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Perry, R. P., Kramer, K., Hochstadt, M., & Molfenter, S. (2004). Beyond test anxiety: Development and validation of the Test Emotions Questionnaire (TEQ). *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 17(3), 287–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800412331303847>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational Psychologist*, 37(2), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3702_4

- Pekrun, R., Hall, N. C., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2014). Boredom and academic achievement: Testing a model of reciprocal causation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(3), 696–710. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036006>
- Pekrun, R., Vogl, E., Muis, K. R., & Sinatra, G. M. (2016). Measuring emotions during epistemic activities: The epistemically-related emotion scales. *Cognition and Emotion, 31*(6), 1268–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1204989>
- Perkins, R. E., & Hill, A. B. (1985). Cognitive and affective aspects of boredom. *British Journal of Psychology, 76*(2), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1985.tb01946.x>
- Perry, R. P. (1991). Perceived control in college students: Implications for instruction in higher education. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 7, pp. 1–56). Chapter, Agathon.
- Perry, R. P., Hall, N., & Ruthig, J. (2005). “Perceived (Academic) control and scholastic attainment in higher education,” in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 22, ed J. Smart (Dordrecht; Heidelberg; New York, NY; London: Springer), 363–436.
- Peters, E., & Webb, S. (2018). Incidental vocabulary acquisition through viewing L2 television and factors that affect learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 40*(3), 551–577. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263117000407>
- Peterson, C., Maier, S. F., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1993). *Learned helplessness: A theory for the age of personal control*. Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, A. (1993). *On kissing, tickling, and being bored: Psychoanalytic essays on the unexamined life*. Harvard University Press.
- Phillips, L. (2015). Ten Ways for Cultivating Language and Literacy Learning Through Engagement with Families and Communities. *Practically Primary, 20*, 40–41.
- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*, 50–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190515000094>

- Philp, J., Walter, S., & Basturkmen, H. (2010). Peer interaction in the foreign language classroom: What factors foster a focus on form? *Language Awareness, 19*(4), 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2010.516831>
- Piniel, K., & Albert, Á. (2018). Advanced learners' foreign language-related emotions across the four skills. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(1), 127–147. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.6>
- Piotrowski, C. (2013). Boredom Research: An Analysis of Topical Domain and Historical Trends. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 40*((2)), 50–52.
- Pishghadam, R., Derakhshan, A., & Zhaleh, K. (2023). The interplay of teacher success, credibility, and stroke with respect to EFL students' willingness to attend classes. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 50*(4), 284–292. <https://doi.org/10.24425/ppb.2019.131001>
- Pomerantz, A., & Bell, N. D. (2011). Humor as safe house in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 148–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01274.x>
- Preckel, F., Götz, T., & Frenzel, A. (2010). Ability grouping of gifted students: Effects on academic self-concept and boredom. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 451–472. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709909x480716>
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>
- Prior, M. T. (2019). Elephants in the room: An “affective turn,” or just feeling our way? *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(2), 516–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12573>
- Putwain, D. W., Becker, S., Symes, W., & Pekrun, R. (2018a). Reciprocal relations between students' academic enjoyment, boredom, and achievement over time. *Learning and Instruction, 54*, 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.08.004>
- Putwain, D. W., Pekrun, R., Nicholson, L. J., Symes, W., Becker, S., & Marsh, H. W. (2018b). Control-value appraisals, enjoyment, and boredom in mathematics: A

- longitudinal latent interaction analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(6), 1339–1368. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218786689>
- Putwain, D. W., Sander, P., & Larkin, D. (2013). Academic self-efficacy in study-related skills and behaviours: Relations with learning-related emotions and academic success. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(4), 633–650. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02084.x>
- Putwain, D. W., Woods, K. A., & Symes, W. (2010). Personal and situational predictors of test anxiety of students in post-compulsory education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(1), 137–160. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709909x466082>
- Ragheb, M. G., & Merydith, S. P. (2001). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale measuring free time boredom. *Leisure Studies*, 20(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360122569>
- Raker, J. R., Gibbons, R. E., & Cruz-Ramírez de Arellano, D. (2019). Development and evaluation of the Organic Chemistry-Specific Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ-OCHEM). *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 56(2), 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21474>
- Ranellucci, J., Hall, N. C., & Goetz, T. (2015). Achievement goals, emotions, learning, and performance: A Process Model. *Motivation Science*, 1(2), 98–120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000014>
- Raoofi, S., Hoon Tan, B., & Heng Chan, S. (2012). Self-efficacy in second/foreign language learning contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60>
- Ratliff, K. G., & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Sex differences in motivations for and effects of drinking among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 45(1), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1984.45.26>
- Raz, H. (1985). Role-play in foreign language learning. *System*, 13(3), 225–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(85\)90037-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(85)90037-5)
- Reeve, J. (2012). A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Student Engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 149–172). Chapter, Springer.

- Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 579–595. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032690>
- Reeve, J., & Lee, W. (2014). Students' classroom engagement produces longitudinal changes in classroom motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034934>
- Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*(4), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002>
- Reijseger, G., Schaufeli, W. B., Peeters, M. C. W., Taris, T. W., van Beek, I., & Ouwenel, E. (2013). Watching the paint dry at work: Psychometric Examination of the Dutch boredom scale. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 26*(5), 508–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2012.720676>
- Reinhardt, J., & Thorne, S. L. (2020). Digital games as language-learning environment. In J. Plass, R. Mayer, & B. Homer (Eds.), *Handbook of game-based learning* (pp. 409–435). Chapter, MIT Press.
- Renck Jalongo, M., & Saracho, O. N. (2016). Writing for publication. *Springer Texts in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31650-5>
- Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, Jangle, and Conceptual Haziness: Evolution and Future Directions of the Engagement Construct. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 3–19). Chapter, Springer.
- Resnik, P., & Dewaele, J. M. (2020). Trait Emotional Intelligence, positive and negative emotions in first and foreign language classes: A mixed-methods approach. *System, 94*, 102324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102324>
- Respondek, L., Seufert, T., Stupnisky, R., & Nett, U. E. (2017). Perceived academic control and academic emotions predict undergraduate university student success: Examining effects on dropout intention and achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00243>
- Reynolds, B. L. (2014). Evidence for the task-induced involvement construct in incidental vocabulary acquisition through Digital Gaming. *The Language*

- Learning Journal*, 45(4), 466–484.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.938243>
- Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 353–387.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026838>
- Risueño Martínez, J. J., Vázquez Pérez, M. L., Hidalgo Navarrete, J., & De la Blanca de la Paz, S. (2016). Language learning strategy use by Spanish EFL students: The effect of proficiency level, gender, and motivation. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 34(1), 133. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.34.1.232981>
- Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, S. B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R., & Carlstrom, A. (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(2), 261–288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.2.261>
- Robinson, W. P. (1975). Boredom at school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 45(2), 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1975.tb03239.x>
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Baffoe-Djan, J. B. (2020). *Data Collection Research Methods in applied linguistics*. Bloomsbury academic.
- Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(6), 1161–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0077714>
- Russell, V. J., Ainley, M., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). *Schooling issues digest: Student motivation and engagement*. Department of Education, Science and Training, Australian Government.
- Ruthig, J. C., Perry, R. P., Hladkyj, S., Hall, N. C., Pekrun, R., & Chipperfield, J. G. (2008). Perceived control and emotions: Interactive effects on performance in Achievement Settings. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11(2), 161–180.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-007-9040-0>

- Ryan, S. (2020). Motivation and individual differences. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 163–182). Chapter, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Saito, K., Dewaele, J.-M., Abe, M., & In'nami, Y. (2018). Motivation, emotion, learning experience, and second language comprehensibility development in classroom settings: A cross-sectional and longitudinal study. *Language Learning*, 68(3), 709–743. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12297>
- Sampson, R. J. (2020). The feeling classroom: Diversity of feelings in instructed L2 learning. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(3), 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1553178>
- Scherer, K. R. (2000). Emotions as episodes of subsystem synchronization driven by nonlinear appraisal processes. In M. D. Lewis & I. Granic (Eds.), *Emotion, Development, and Self-organization: Dynamic Systems Approaches to Emotional Development* (pp. 70–79). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? and how can they be measured? *Social Science Information*, 44(4), 695–729. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018405058216>
- Scherer, K. R. (2009). The dynamic architecture of emotion: Evidence for the component process model. *Cognition & Emotion*, 23(7), 1307–1351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902928969>
- Schonwetter, D. J., Perry, R. P., & Struthers, C. W. (1993). Students' perceptions of control and success in the college classroom: Affects and achievement in different instructional conditions. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 61(3), 227–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1993.9943863>
- Schreck, M. K. (2011). *You've got to reach them to teach them: Hard facts about the soft skills of student engagement*. Solution Tree Press.
- Schubert, D. S. P. (1977). Boredom as an antagonist of creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 11(4), 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.1977.tb00631.x>
- Schubert, D. S. P. (1978). Creativity and coping with boredom. *Psychiatric Annals*, 8(3), 46–54. <https://doi.org/10.3928/0048-5713-19780301-06>

- Seligman, M. (2018). Perma and the building blocks of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 13(4), 333–335.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1437466>
- Şen, M., & Oz, H. (2021). Vocabulary Size as a Predictor of Willingness to Communicate Inside the Classroom. In: Zarrinabadi, N., Pawlak, M. (eds) *New Perspectives on Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language. Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Springer, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67634-6_12
- Shao, K., & Parkinson, B. (2021). Social Psychological accounts of Peer Emotion Transfer in EFL classrooms: A doubly latent multilevel analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882110115.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211011513>
- Shao, K., Pekrun, R., & Nicholson, L. J. (2019). Emotions in classroom language learning: What can we learn from achievement emotion research? *System*, 86, 102121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102121>
- Shao, K., Pekrun, R., Marsh, H. W., & Loderer, K. (2020). Control-value appraisals, achievement emotions, and foreign language performance: A latent interaction analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 69, 101356.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101356>
- Shao, K., Stockinger, K., Marsh, H. W., & Pekrun, R. (2023). Applying control-value theory for examining multiple emotions in L2 classrooms: Validating the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire – Second Language Learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882211444.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221144497>
- Sharp, J. G., Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2016). Towards a model for the assessment of student boredom and boredom proneness in the UK higher education context. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 40(5), 649–681.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2014.1000282>
- Sharp, J. G., Hemmings, B., Kay, R., Murphy, B., & Elliott, S. (2017). Academic boredom among students in higher education: A mixed-methods exploration of

- characteristics, contributors and consequences. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 41(5), 657–677. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2016.1159292>
- Sharp, J. G., Sharp, J. C., & Young, E. (2018). Academic boredom, engagement and the achievement of undergraduate students at university: A review and synthesis of relevant literature. *Research Papers in Education*, 35(2), 144–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1536891>
- Sharp, J. G., Zhu, X., Matos, M., & Sharp, J. C. (2021). The Academic Boredom Survey Instrument (ABSI): A measure of trait, state and other characteristic attributes for the exploratory study of student engagement. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(9), 1253–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2021.1947998>
- Shen, B., Wang, Y., Yang, Y., & Yu, X. (2023). Relationships between Chinese University EFL Learners' academic emotions and self-regulated learning strategies: A structural equation model. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882211448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221144832>
- Shermoff, D. J. (2013). *Optimal learning environments to promote student engagement*. Springer.
- Shih, S. S., & Alexander, J. M. (2000). Interacting effects of goal setting and self- or other-referenced feedback on children's development of self-efficacy and cognitive skill within the Taiwanese classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(3), 536–543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.3.536>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Simonton, K. L., & Garn, A. C. (2020). Control–Value Theory of Achievement Emotions: A closer look at student value appraisals and enjoyment. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 81, 101910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101910>
- Sinatra, G. M., & Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.1002924>

- Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in Second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(2), 275–298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100009979>
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 183–205). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, E. A. (2016). Engagement and disaffection as central to processes of motivational resilience and development. In K. R. Wentzel & D. B. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 145–168). Chapter, Routledge.
- Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). *Developmental Dynamics of Student Engagement, Coping, and Everyday Resilience*. Springer.
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009a). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69(3), 493–525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164408323233>
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (2009b). Engagement and disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In K. R. Wenzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223–245). Chapter, Routledge.
- Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 765–781. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012840>
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, C. V., & Cardaciotto, L. (2011). Is active learning like broccoli? Student perceptions of active learning in large lecture classes. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11(1), 53–61.

- Smith, K. A., Sheppard, S. D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). Pedagogies of engagement: Classroom-based practices. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00831.x>
- Smith, R. P. (1981). Boredom: A Review. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 23(3), 329–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872088102300308>
- Spacks, P. M. (1995). *Boredom: Literary history of a state of mind*. University of Chicago Press.
- Stephan, M., Markus, S., & Gläser-Zikuda, M. (2019). Students' achievement emotions and online learning in teacher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00109>
- Struk, A. A., Carriere, J. S., Cheyne, J. A., & Danckert, J. (2016). A short boredom proneness scale. *Assessment*, 24(3), 346–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191115609996>
- Sulis, G. (2022). Engagement in the Foreign Language Classroom: Micro and Macro Perspectives. *System*, 110, 102902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102902>
- Sun, T., Wang, C., Lambert, R. G., & Liu, L. (2021). Relationship between Second Language English writing self-efficacy and achievement: A meta-regression analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53, 100817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100817>
- Suzuki, M., & Tonegawa, A. (2022). Development of the Japanese version of the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire – Elementary School (aeq-es-j). *Japanese Psychological Research*, 64(1), 40–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12303>
- Svalberg, A. M. L. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct. *Language Awareness*, 18(3–4), 242–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197264>
- Svendsen, L. (2005). *A Philosophy of Boredom*. Reaktion Books.

- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Chapter, Newbury House.
- Swinkels, A., & Giuliano, T. A. (1995). The measurement and conceptualization of mood awareness: Monitoring and labeling one's mood states. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(9), 934–949.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295219008>
- Tam, K. Y., Chan, C. S., van Tilburg, W. A., Lavi, I., & Lau, J. Y. (2022). Boredom belief moderates the mental health impact of boredom among young people: Correlational and multi-wave longitudinal evidence gathered during the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Personality*, 91(3), 638–652.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12764>
- Tam, K. Y., van Tilburg, W. A., & Chan, C. S. (2021). What is boredom proneness? A comparison of three characterizations. *Journal of Personality*, 89(4), 831–846.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12618>
- Tanaka, A., & Murayama, K. (2014). Within-person analyses of situational interest and boredom: Interactions between task-specific perceptions and achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(4), 1122–1134.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036659>
- Tassone, A., Liu, J. J., Reed, M. J., & Vickers, K. (2017). Multitasking in the classroom: Testing an educational intervention as a method of reducing multitasking. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 21(2), 128–141.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417740772>
- Taylor, G. R., & Trumbull, M. (2005). *Developing a multi faced research design/paradigm. Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in research* (2nd ed.). University Press of America.
- Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(4), 681–709.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263116000243>

- Teimouri, Y. (2018). Differential roles of shame and guilt in L2 learning: How bad is bad? *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(4), 632–652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12511>
- Tempelaar, D., & Niculescu, A. C. (2021). Types of boredom and other learning activity emotions: A person-centred investigation of inter-individual data. *Motivation and Emotion*, 46(1), 84–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09909-y>
- Thackray, R. I. (1981). The stress of boredom and monotony: A consideration of the evidence. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 43(2), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-198104000-00008>
- Thackray, R. I., Jones, K. N., & Touchstone, R. M. (1974). Personality and physiological correlates of performance decrement on a monotonous task requiring sustained attention. *British Journal of Psychology*, 65(3), 351–358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1974.tb01409.x>
- Tilfarlıoğlu, F. Y., & Cinkara, E. (2009). Self-Efficacy in EFL: Difference among Proficiency Groups and Relationship with Success. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 3(2), 129–142.
- Titley, R. W., & Titley, B. S. (1982). Academic advising: The neglected dimension in designs for undergraduate education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 9(1), 45–49. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top0901_12
- Todman, M. (2013). The Dimensions of State Boredom: Frequency, Duration, Unpleasantness, Consequences and Causal Attributions. *Educational Research International*, 1(1), 32–40.
- Tolor, A. (1989). Boredom as related to alienation, assertiveness, internal-external expectancy, and sleep patterns. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45(2), 260–265. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(198903\)45:2<260::aid-jclp2270450213>3.0.co;2-g](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198903)45:2<260::aid-jclp2270450213>3.0.co;2-g)
- Tompkins, P. K. (2001). The Role Playing. Simulation. *TESL*, IV(8).
- Toohy, P. (2011). *Boredom: A lively history*. Yale University Press.

- Trigueros, R., & Aguilar-Parra, J. M. (2022). Adaptation and testing of the factorial structure of the Achievement Emotional Questionnaire-short to the Spanish context of physical education classes. *European Physical Education Review*, 28(3), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x221082993>
- Trigwell, K., Ellis, R. A., & Han, F. (2012). Relations between students' approaches to learning, experienced emotions and outcomes of learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 811–824. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.549220>
- Tsapelas, I., Aron, A., & Orbuch, T. (2009). Marital boredom now predicts less satisfaction 9 years later. *Psychological Science*, 20(5), 543–545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02332.x>
- Tseng, W. T., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 78–102. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami046>
- Tsui, A. (2001). Classroom interaction. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 120–125). Chapter, Cambridge University Press.
- Tu, X. (2021). The role of classroom culture and psychological safety in EFL students' engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.760903>
- Tulis, M., & Fulmer, S. M. (2013). Students' motivational and emotional experiences and their relationship to persistence during academic challenge in mathematics and reading. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 27, 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.06.003>
- Turner, J. E., & Husman, J. (2008). Emotional and cognitive self-regulation following academic shame. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 20(1), 138–173. <https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2008-864>
- Tyson, D. F., Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & Hill, N. E. (2009). Regulating debilitating emotions in the context of performance: Achievement goal orientations, achievement-elicited emotions, and socialization contexts. *Human Development*, 52(6), 329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000242348>

- Tze, V. M. C., Daniels, L. M., & Klassen, R. M. (2014b). Examining the factor structure and validity of the English precursors to boredom scales. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 32, 254–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.03.018>
- Tze, V. M. C., Daniels, L. M., & Klassen, R. M. (2016). Evaluating the relationship between boredom and academic outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(1), 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9301-y>
- Tze, V. M. C., Daniels, L. M., Klassen, R. M., & Li, J. C. H. (2013a). Canadian and Chinese University Students' approaches to coping with academic boredom. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 23, 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.10.015>
- Tze, V. M. C., Klassen, R. M., & Daniels, L. M. (2014a). Patterns of boredom and its relationship with perceived autonomy support and engagement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 39(3), 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.05.001>
- Tze, V. M. C., Klassen, R. M., Daniels, L. M., Li, J. C. H., & Zhang, X. (2013b). A cross-cultural validation of the learning-related boredom scale (LRBS) with Canadian and Chinese college students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 31(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282912443670>
- Urbanova, D., & Pavelkova, I. (2022). Boredom coping in the context of secondary education. *Pedagogická Orientace*, 30(4). <https://doi.org/10.5817/pedor2020-4-486>
- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., & Igou, E. R. (2011). On boredom and social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(12), 1679–1691. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211418530>
- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., & Igou, E. R. (2012). On boredom: Lack of challenge and meaning as distinct boredom experiences. *Motivation and Emotion*, 36(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-011-9234-9>

- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., & Igou, E. R. (2016). Going to political extremes in response to boredom. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(6), 687–699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2205>
- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., & Igou, E. R. (2017). Can boredom help? Increased prosocial intentions in response to boredom. *Self and Identity*, 16(1), 82–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2016.1218925>
- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., & Igou, E. R. (2019). Dreaming of a brighter future: Anticipating happiness instills meaning in life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(2), 541–559. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-9960-8>
- Van Tilburg, W. A. P., Igou, E. R., Maher, P. J., Moynihan, A. B., & Martin, D. G. (2019). Bored like hell: Religiosity reduces boredom and tempers the quest for meaning. *Emotion*, 19(2), 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000439>
- Veiga, F. H., Reeve, J., Wentzel, K., & Robu, V. (2014). Assessing students' engagement: A review of instruments with psychometric qualities. In F. H. Veiga (Ed.), *Students' engagement in school: International perspectives of psychology and education* (pp. 38–57). Chapter, Instituto de Educação da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Vodanovich, S. J. (2003). Psychometric Measures of boredom: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 137(6), 569–595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980309600636>
- Vodanovich, S. J., & Kass, S. J. (1990). A factor analytic study of the boredom proneness scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55(1–2), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.1990.9674051>
- Vodanovich, S. J., Kass, S. J., Andrasik, F., Gerber, W. D., Niederberger, U., & Breaux, C. (2011). Culture and gender differences in boredom proneness. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 13(2), 221–230.
- Vodanovich, S. J., Wallace, J. C., & Kass, S. J. (2005). A confirmatory approach to the factor structure of the boredom proneness scale: Evidence for a two-factor short form. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 85(3), 295–303. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8503_05

- Vodanovich, S. J., Watt, J., & Piotrowski, C. (1997). Boredom Proneness in African-American College Students: A Factor Analytic Perspective. *Education*, 118(2), 229.
- Vogel-Walcutt, J. J., Fiorella, L., Carper, T., & Schatz, S. (2012). The definition, assessment, and mitigation of state boredom within educational settings: A comprehensive review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24(1), 89–111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9182-7>
- Wagner, I., & Finkielstein, M. (2021). Strategic boredom: The experience and dynamics of boredom in refugee camp. A Mediterranean case. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 50(5), 649–682. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912416211008525>
- Wakamoto, N. (2009). *Extroversion/introversion in foreign language learning: Interactions with learner strategy use*. Peter Lang.
- Wang, C. (1987). Information gap and boredom in classroom teaching. *Modern Foreign Lang.*, 4, 35–45.
- Wang, C., & Bai, B. (2017). Validating the instruments to measure ESL/EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulated learning strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 931–947.
- Wang, H., Peng, A., & Patterson, M. M. (2021b). The roles of class social climate, language mindset, and emotions in predicting willingness to communicate in a foreign language. *System*, 99, 102529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102529>
- Wang, W., & Gan, Z. (2021). Development and validation of the Reading Motivation Questionnaire in an English as a foreign language context. *Psychology in the Schools*, 58(6), 1151–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22494>
- Wang, Y., Shen, B., & Yu, X. (2021a). A latent profile analysis of EFL learners' self-efficacy: Associations with academic emotions and language proficiency. *System*, 103, 102633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102633>
- Watt, J. D., & Blanchard, M. J. (1994). Boredom proneness and the need for cognition. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28(1), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1994.1005>

- Watt, J. D., & Ewing, J. E. (1996). Toward the development and validation of a measure of sexual boredom. *Journal of Sex Research*, 33(1), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499609551815>
- Watt, J. D., & Vodanovich, S. J. (1999). Boredom proneness and psychosocial development. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(3), 303–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989909599743>
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548–573. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.92.4.548>
- Weinerman, J., & Kenner, C. (2016). Boredom: That Which Shall not Be Named. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 40((1)), 18–23.
- Weinstein, L., Xie, X., & Cleanthous, C. C. (1995). Purpose in life, boredom, and volunteerism in a group of retirees. *Psychological Reports*, 76(2), 482–482. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.76.2.482>
- Westborg, J. (2022a). *Learning in praxis.” transformative play initiative*. YouTube. Jul 04.
- Westborg, J. (2022b). *Role-playing games for education.” transformative play initiative*. YouTube. June 30.
- Westgate, E. C., & Wilson, T. D. (2018). Boring thoughts and bored minds: The MAC model of boredom and cognitive engagement. *Psychological Review*, 125(5), 689–713. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000097>
- White, J. (2007). Banishing boredom in the middle school math class. *National Middle School Association*, 10(4), 38–39.
- Williams, C. (2015). Bored? Well Don’t Be. *Scientific American*, 303(6), 37–41.
- Williams, M., Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2015). *Exploring Psychology in Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

- Winardy, G. C., & Septiana, E. (2023). Role, play, and games: Comparison between role-playing games and role-play in Education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 8(1), 100527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100527>
- Wolfgang, M. E., & Dowling, W. D. (1981). Differences in motivation of adult and younger undergraduates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(6), 640. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981772>
- Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. *System*, 39(4), 510–522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.017>
- Woodrow, L. (2014). *Writing about quantitative research in Applied Linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright, L. S., & Moore, R. (1982). Correlates of reported drug abuse problems among college undergraduates. *Journal of Drug Education*, 12(1), 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.2190/7lmd-avr0-aqq3-re93>
- Xie, F., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). A conceptual review of positive teacher interpersonal communication behaviors in the instructional context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.708490>
- Xie, J. (2021). The effects of boredom on Efl learners' engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 10–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.743313>
- Xing, W., Tang, H., & Pei, B. (2019). Beyond positive and negative emotions: Looking into the role of Achievement Emotions in discussion forums of moocs. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 43, 100690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2019.100690>
- Xu, M., Wang, C., Chen, X., Sun, T., & Ma, X. (2022). Improving self-efficacy beliefs and English language proficiency through a summer intensive program. *System*, 107, 102797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102797>
- Xu, Z., Chen, Z., Eutsler, L., Geng, Z., & Kogut, A. (2019). A scoping review of digital game-based technology on English language learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(3), 877–904. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09702-2>

- Yabukoshi, T. (2021). Self-regulation and self-efficacy for the improvement of listening proficiency outside the classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1472626>
- Yamashita, T. (2018). *Grit and Second Language Acquisition: Can Passion and Perseverance Predict Performance in Japanese Language Learning?* Unpublished MA thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- Yang, Y., Gao, Z., & Han, Y. (2021). Exploring Chinese EFL learners' achievement emotions and their antecedents in an online English learning environment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.722622>
- Yazzie-Mintz, E., & McCormick, K. (2012). Finding the Humanity in the Data: Understanding, Measuring, and Strengthening Student Engagement. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. (pp. 743–761). Chapter, Springer.
- Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist*, 47(4), 302–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.722805>
- Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 267–301. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311405999>
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426–437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05378.x>
- Yu, W., Shao, K., & Xiang, Y. (2015). The Relationships among Chinese EFL Learners' Emotional Intelligence, Foreign Language Anxiety and English Proficiency. *Modern Foreign Languages*, 5, 656–666.
- Zakay, D. (2014). Psychological time as information: The case of boredom. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00917>
- Zare, J. (2023). The impact of L2 learners' altruistic teaching on their task engagement in English essay writing. *System*, 118, 103137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103137>

- Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2018). The impact of Second Life on changes in levels of L2 motivation, language anxiety and boredom among students of English philology. *Neofilolog*, 50(1), 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2018.50.1.5>
- Zawodniak, J., Kruk, M., & Chumas, J. (2017). Towards conceptualizing boredom as an emotion in the EFL academic context. *Konin Language Studies*, 5(4), 425–441.
- Zawodniak, J., Kruk, M., & Pawlak, M. (2023). Boredom as an aversive emotion experienced by English majors. *RELC Journal*, 54(1), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220973732>
- Zhang, K., Wu, S., Xu, Y., Cao, W., Goetz, T., & Parks-Stamm, E. J. (2021). Adaptability promotes student engagement under covid-19: The multiple mediating effects of academic emotion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.633265>
- Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2020). Dialogic discussion as a platform for constructing knowledge: Student-teachers' interaction patterns and strategies in learning to teach English. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00101-2>
- Zhang, M. (2021). EFL/ESL teacher's resilience, academic buoyancy, care, and their impact on students' engagement: A theoretical review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731859>
- Zhang, R., & Zou, D. (2020). Types, purposes, and effectiveness of state-of-the-art technologies for second and Foreign Language Learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 696–742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1744666>
- Zhang, T. (2022). Unpacking boredom factors of Chinese foreign language major students in translation classes: A sequential mixed methods study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.895223>
- Zhang, X., Dai, S., & Ardasheva, Y. (2020). Contributions of (de)motivation, engagement, and anxiety to English listening and speaking. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79, 101856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101856>

- Zhao, X., & Wang, D. (2023). Grit, emotions, and their effects on ethnic minority students' English language learning achievements: A structural equation modelling analysis. *System*, 113, 102979. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102979>
- Zhao, Y., & Yang, L. (2022). Examining the relationship between perceived teacher support and students' academic engagement in Foreign Language Learning: Enjoyment and boredom as mediators. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.987554>
- Zhen, R., Liu, R.-D., Ding, Y., Wang, J., Liu, Y., & Xu, L. (2017). The mediating roles of academic self-efficacy and academic emotions in the relation between basic psychological needs satisfaction and learning engagement among Chinese adolescent students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 54, 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.01.017>
- Zhou, L., & Wu, Y. (2021). Validation of the Chinese version of the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire–Elementary School. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 49(5), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.10118>
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation Seeking: Beyond the Optimal Level of Arousal*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zull, J. E. (2006). Key aspects of how the brain learns. In S. Johnson & K. Taylor (Eds.), *The neuroscience of adult learning* (pp. 3–9). Chapter, Jossey-Bass.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Level of Boredom Scale (Turkish) Coping with Boredom Scale (Turkish)

Kısım 1: Demografik Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyet a) Kadın b) Erkek

1. Yaş: _____

2. Öğrenci Numarası: _____

3. Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğreniyorsunuz? _____

Kısım 2: Level of Boredom Scale

Van Tilburg and Igou'nın 2012 tarihli anketinden uyarlanmıştır.

#	Değerli arkadaşlar, bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizce dersinde can sıkıntısıyla nasıl başa çıktığının incelenmesidir. Aşağıdaki ifadelerle katılma derecenizi, görüşünüzü en iyi yansıtan seçeneğe karşılık gelen kutucuklardan <u>bir tanesini</u> "X" ile işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Çalışmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayalı olup, görüşleriniz yalnızca bu çalışmanın amacı doğrultusunda kullanılacaktır. Katkılarınız için teşekkürler.	1 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum	2 = Katılıyorum	3 = Kararsızım	4 = Katılmıyorum	5 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
İngilizce derslerindeki duygularınızı göz önünde bulundurduğunuzda, bu derslerde ne sıklıkla						
1	kaygısız ve zorlanmamış hissedersiniz	1	2	3	4	5
2	dersin önemli bir amacı olmadığını düşünüyorsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5
3	tamamı ile farklı bir şey yapmayı istersiniz?	1	2	3	4	5

4	daha anlamlı bir şey yapmanız gerektiğini düşünürsünüz?	1	2	3	4	5
5	daha anlamlı bir aktivite yapmaya başlarsınız?	1	2	3	4	5
6	daha anlamlı bir şeyler yapmak istersiniz?	1	2	3	4	5
7	biraz daha (akademik olarak) zorlanmak istersiniz?	1	2	3	4	5
8	sıkıldığınızı hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4	5

Kısım 3: Coping with Boredom Scale

Nett et al.'un 2010 tarihli anketinden uyarlanmıştır.

Dersten sıkıldığında,						
9	derse daha fazla dikkatimi vermeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
10	hocamdan başka bir şeyler yapmamızı isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
11	diğer derse hazırlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
12	yanımda oturan kişiyle konuşurum.	1	2	3	4	5
13	kendime tekrar odaklanmam gerektiğini söylerim.	1	2	3	4	5
14	hocamdan daha ilginç etkinlikler isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
15	ödevlerimi yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
16	yanımda oturan arkadaşım ile konuşmaya başlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
17	konunun önemini düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
18	hocamdan derse biraz çeşitlilik katmasını öneririm.	1	2	3	4	5
19	başka bir konu/ders çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
20	arkadaşım ile konuşarak dikkatimi dağıtırım.	1	2	3	4	5
21	dersin önemli olduğunu düşünmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
22	hocamı konu dışına çıkartarak ilgimi çeken konularda konuşturmaya çalışırım	1	2	3	4	5

23	ödevimi ya da çalışmam gereken başka konuları düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
24	dersten sıkılan diğer arkadaşlarımla temas kurmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25	konu önemli olduğu için tekrar odaklanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
26	sınıfın daha fazla ilgileneceğini düşündüğüm başka bir konu açarım.	1	2	3	4	5
27	sonraki dersin ödevini temize çekerim.	1	2	3	4	5
28	yanımda ya da yakınımnda oturanlarla ilgilenerek vakit geçiririm.	1	2	3	4	5



Appendix B: Level of Boredom Scale (English)

Coping with Boredom Scale (English)

Section 1: Demographic Information

4. Gender

a) Female b) Male

5. Age: _____

6. Student number: _____

7. How long have you been learning English? _____

Section 2: Level of Boredom Scale

Adapted from Van Tilburg and Igou (2012)

#	The statements are scaled from 1 to 5. Please circle the number that is closest to you. There is no right or wrong answer for each statement, so please give your answers honestly.	1 = not at all	2 = not really	3 = undecided	4 = somewhat	5 = very much
When you focus on your feelings during the English lessons,						
1	how much does the feeling make you feel restless and unchallenged at the same time?	1	2	3	4	5
2	how much does the feeling make you think that the lesson served no important purpose?	1	2	3	4	5
3	how much does the feeling make you feel like doing something completely different?	1	2	3	4	5
4	how much does the feeling make you feel like doing something more purposeful?	1	2	3	4	5
5	how much does the feeling make you turn to a more meaningful activity?	1	2	3	4	5

6	how much does the feeling make you want to do something more meaningful?	1	2	3	4	5
7	how much does the feeling make you want to be challenged?	1	2	3	4	5
8	how much do you feel bored?	1	2	3	4	5

Section 3: Coping with Boredom Scale

Adapted from Nett et al. (2010)

#	The statements are scaled from 1 to 5. Please circle the number that is closest to you. There is no right or wrong answer for each statement, so please give your answers honestly.	1 = strongly disagree	2 = disagree	3 = undecided	4 = agree	5 = strongly agree
Cognitive-approach						
When I am bored in English class...						
1	...I try to pay attention to the lesson more.	1	2	3	4	5
2	...I tell myself to concentrate again.	1	2	3	4	5
3	...I make myself aware of the importance of the issue.	1	2	3	4	5
4	...I try to make myself aware that this class is important.	1	2	3	4	5
5	...I make myself focus again because the issue is important.	1	2	3	4	5

Behavioral-approach						
When I am bored in English class...						
1	...I ask my instructor if we can do something else.	1	2	3	4	5
2	...I ask my instructor for more interesting tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
3	...I suggest that the instructor add variety to the lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
4	...I try to get the instructor off topic so that we discuss an issue that interests me	1	2	3	4	5
5	...I bring up an issue that I think the class is more interested in.	1	2	3	4	5

Cognitive-avoidance						
When I am bored in English class...						
1	...I prepare for my next class.	1	2	3	4	5
2	...I do my homework.	1	2	3	4	5
3	...I study for another subject.	1	2	3	4	5
4	...I think about my homework or something I have to study.	1	2	3	4	5
5	...I copy the homework for my next class.	1	2	3	4	5

Behavioral-avoidance						
When I am bored in English class...						
1	...I talk to the person sitting next to me.	1	2	3	4	5

2	...I start talking to my classmate sitting next to me.	1	2	3	4	5
3	...I distract myself by interacting with my classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
4	...I try to contact other classmates who are feeling also bored.	1	2	3	4	5
5	...I occupy myself with my classroom neighbor or someone who is sitting close to me.	1	2	3	4	5



Appendix C: Gaziantep University Social and Humanities Ethics Committee Meeting Report (Related Section)

Meeting No: 13

Meeting Date: 06.12.2022

Meeting Time: 11: 00

- 18) Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nün 17.11.2022 tarih, 260427 sayılı ve "Bilimsel ve Eğitim Amaçlı (Hacer YAZGAN)" konulu yazısı incelenmiş olup Üniversitemiz Gaziantep Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi Doç. Dr. Emrah CİNKARA'nın Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nde danışmanlığını yürüttüğü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Hacer YAZGAN'ın "Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizcenin Öğretiminde Can Sıkıntısı ve Can Sıkıntısı İle Baş Etme Stratejilerinin İncelenmesi" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezi çalışmasının Üniversitemiz Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Etik Kurulu'nca değerlendirilmesi istenmektedir. Kurula yapılan başvuru; çalışmanın amacı, yöntemi, veri kaynakları ve veri toplama araçları açısından değerlendirilmiştir. Kurulumuza beyan edilen belgelere dayalı olarak yapılan incelemeler sonucunda başvuruya ilişkin etik aykırılık tespit edilmemiş olup adı geçen öğrencinin söz konusu yüksek lisans tezi çalışmasını yapabilmesinin uygun görülmesine;

CURRICULUM VITAE

Hacer Yazgan graduated from Uludağ University, Department of Foreign Language Education in English Language Teaching in 2011. She has been working as an English Language Teacher in the Ministry of National Education since September, 2012. She has started the MA program at Gaziantep University, Department of English Language Teaching in the fall semester of the 2020-2021 academic years.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Hacer Yazgan, 2011 yılında Uludağ Üniversitesi Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Bölümü İngilizce Öğretmenliği alanından mezun olmuştur. 2012 yılı Eylül ayından itibaren Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı bünyesinde İngilizce Öğretmeni olarak görev yapmaya devam etmektedir. 2020-2021 eğitim öğretim yılı güz döneminde Gaziantep Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda yüksek lisans eğitimine başlamıştır.