DONG THAP UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE
Tạp chí Khoa học Đại học Đồng Tháp
Social Sciences and Humanities Issue
ISSN 0866-7675 | e-ISSN 2815-567X

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52714/dthu.15.3.2026.1787

EVALUATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC BOREDOM AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Vo Van Viet*, Phan Thi Lan Anh, Nguyen Lien Huong, and Ngo Phan Lan Dung

Nong Lam University Ho Chi Minh City, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam

**Corresponding author, Email: vvviet@hcmuaf.edu.vn*

Article history

Received: 10/9/2025; Received in revised form: 25/9/2025; Accepted: 22/12/2025

Abstract

This study explores the correlation between student academic boredom and learning outcomes among undergraduates at Nong Lam University. It is to investigate how those five dimensions of state boredom—Disengagement, Agitated Affect, Inattention, Dysphoric Affect and Time Perception—relate to students' GPA. Quantitative technique was applied to collect data from 2,587 students through validated structured questionnaires and later analyzed by SPSS version 22.0. Participants were a sample of 2,587 undergraduate students enrolled at Nong Lam University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The findings revealed a moderate level of boredom among participants, and highlights a strong interrelationship among emotional states (agitation, dysphoria, and disengagement) and cognitive factors (inattention and time perception). The strong positive correlations suggest that the higher levels of agitation and emotional distress participants experience, the more likely they feel disengaged, inattentive and distorted in their perception of time. However weak the negative correlations between each boredom dimension and GPA are, they indicate that while these emotional and cognitive challenges themselves do not significantly impact GPA, they collectively act as a barrier to the students' academic performance.

Keywords: *Boredom, cognitive aspects, GPA, learning outcomes, state boredom dimensions, student emotions.*

Cite: Vo, V. V., Phan Thi, L. A., Nguyen, L. H., & Ngo Phan, L. D. (2026). Evaluating the relationship between academic boredom and learning outcomes. *Dong Thap University Journal of Science, 15*(3), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.52714/dthu.15.3.2026.1787

ĐÁNH GIÁ MỐI QUAN HỆ GIỮA SỰ BUỒN CHÁN VÀ KẾT QUẢ HỌC TẬP

Võ Văn Việt*, Phan Thị Lan Anh, Nguyễn Liên Hương và Ngô Phan Lan Dung

Khoa Ngoại Ngữ - Sư phạm, Trườn Đại học Nông Lâm Tp. Hồ Chí Minh, Việt Nam

**Tác giả liên hệ, Email: vvviet@hcmuaf.edu.vn*

Lịch sử bài báo

Ngày nhận: 10/9/2025; Ngày nhận chỉnh sửa: 25/9/2025; Ngày duyệt đăng: 22/12/2025

Tóm tắt

Nghiên cứu này tìm hiểu mối tương quan giữa sự buồn chán của sinh viên và kết quả học tập ở bậc đại học tại Trường Đại học Nông Lâm TP.HCM. Cụ thể, nghiên cứu xem xét cách năm thành tố của trạng thái buồn chán- sự mất/thiếu kết nối (Disengagement), hưng cảm/ trạng thái kích động (agitated effect/ high arousal), trầm cảm (dysphoric affect/low arousal), mất tập trung (Inattention) và Ý niệm về thời gian (Time Perception)- liên hệ với nhau và ảnh hưởng đến điểm trung bình tích lũy (GPA) của sinh viên. Thông qua phương pháp định lượng, dữ liệu được thu thập từ 2.587 sinh viên bằng bảng hỏi có cấu trúc và được phân tích bằng phần mềm SPSS phiên bản 22.0. Kết quả cho thấy mức độ buồn chán tổng thể ở mức trung bình trong nhóm đối tượng nghiên cứu. Nghiên cứu phát hiện mối liên hệ đáng kể giữa các yếu tố cảm xúc (hưng cảm, trầm cảm và sự mất/thiếu kết nối) và các yếu tố nhận thức (mất tập trung và Ý niệm về thời gian). Điều này cho thấy khi trạng thái cảm xúc tiêu cực gia tăng, sinh viên có xu hướng giảm mức độ tập trung và gặp khó khăn trong việc nhận định thời gian một cách chính xác. Mặc dù tất cả các thành tố của trạng thái buồn chán đều có mối tương quan âm yếu với GPA, song các mối liên hệ này không có ý nghĩa thống kê rõ rệt, cho thấy ảnh hưởng trực tiếp của sự buồn chán đến thành tích học tập là không đáng kể. Những phát hiện này mang lại hàm ý quan trọng cho các nhà hoạch định chính sách giáo dục và giảng viên trong việc thiết kế các biện pháp can thiệp phù hợp nhằm giảm thiểu sự buồn chán và nâng cao hiệu quả học tập của sinh viên.

Từ khóa: *Buồn chán, cảm xúc sinh viên, điểm trung bình tích lũy (GPA), kết quả học tập, thành tố trạng thái buồn chán, yếu tố nhận thức*.

1. Introduction

In higher education, student academic success is not only determined by cognitive and pedagogical factors but also influenced by affective dimensions that contribute to engagement and persistence. Among these, perhaps the most ubiquitous and yet ignored emotion is academic boredom, which is characterized by feelings of social detachment, lack of attentiveness, or emotional distress, and distorted perceptions of time (Fahlman et al., 2013; Goetz et al., 2006; Pekrun, 2006). Unlike overt emotions such as anger or frustration, boredom operates quietly but persistently, with the potential to demotivate classroom participation and hinder academic achievement.

Previous literature has shown that boredom negatively relates with student academic performance in several ways. It has been associated with reduced motivation, reliance on surface-level learning strategies, diminished self-regulation, absenteeism, and even dropout (Amiri et al., 2021; Sharp et al., 2020; Tze et al., 2016). Finally, boredom is not a unitary phenomenon, but is rather multidimensional incorporating emotional (e.g., agitation, dysphoria, disengagement) and cognitive (e.g., inattention, distorted time perception) features. These dimensions often interact, reinforcing one another to intensify students' academic difficulties.

This study intends to examine how academic boredom is associated with learning outcomes in a sample of 2,587 undergraduates from Nong Lam University- Ho Chi Minh City. Accordingly, it seeks to provide a more complete view of the relationship between boredom and academic performance by considering boredom's five dimensions: agitated affect, disengagement, dysphoric affect, inattention, and time perception.

This study offers two contributions. Theoretically, it continues to develop the emerging literature by framing boredom specifically in a Vietnamese higher education context, adding to the cross-cultural understandings of this emotional phenomenon. In terms of practical implications, these results suggest that boredom should be understood by teachers, school administrators, and other educational stakeholders as a complex obstacle to school achievement that can be addressed through the development of a student's engaging learning experiences and support for educational success.

2. Literature review

2.1. Definition of academic boredom

The literature on boredom in educational settings is extensive, offering various definitions, measurement approaches, and insights into its impact on learning outcomes. Raffaelli et al. (2018) defined boredom as a state of mind characterized by a lack of interest, stimulation, or challenge. This individualized sensation manifests in forms of restlessness, indifference, or disinterest, stemming from both internal factors (e.g., lack of motivation or purpose) and external factors (e.g., insufficient stimulation). Goetz et al. (2006) depicted this emotional state as "feelings of monotony, apathy, and disinterest, resulting from a perceived lack of challenge, relevance, or meaningfulness in learning activities". It was further considered as "frustration, disinterest, and disengagement during educational pursuits" (Klassen et al., 2008). These definitions all emphasize that boredom is a negative emotion that can adversely influence students' academic achievement.

Academic boredom is a complicated and context-bound phenomenon, influenced by both the learning environment and individual student traits. According to Preckel et al. (2010), boredom is more prevalent among students with poor ability or achievement who struggle to recognize and overcome barriers to success. Even high-achieving students, such as talented

learners, may become bored when assignments lack appropriate challenge, resulting in disengagement, absenteeism, or decreased interest. Furlong et al. (2021) have classified classroom boredom into four types: neutral boredom, which reflects a state of calm seclusion; creative boredom, which can lead to imaginative problem-solving; negative boredom, which students actively avoid; and detrimental boredom, which fosters irritation and disengagement. These contrasts highlight that boredom can have both positive and negative implications, depending on its form and context.

2.2. Nature of boredom

Boredom is typically assessed using a variety of approaches such as observation, self-report questionnaires, and physiological or neurological sensors, reflecting its multifaceted nature (Raffaelli et al., 2018). In educational contexts, boredom often arises from repetitive tasks, unengaging activities, or a lack of novelty, all of which can hinder student engagement and learning. Russell (1980) circumflex model of emotions provides a foundational framework for understanding boredom, categorizing it into a two-dimensional space of arousal (low to high) and valence (pleasant to unpleasant). Boredom is depicted as a low-arousal, unpleasant emotion. This is a categorization supported by Vogel-Walcutt et al. (2012), who examined boredom in educational settings and confirmed its association with low arousal and negative affect.

Similarly, Pekrun (2006)'s control-value theory of achievement emotions highlights how boredom in academic settings can reduce students' perceived control over tasks and diminish the value they assign to learning activities, ultimately impacting their performance. Accordingly, students feel bored when they have a low control over classroom activities and when they fail to recognize the value of the task they are engage in. Control is defined as to the learner's ability to influence learning outcomes, while value is the importance or the interestingness of the learning content in students' mind. For non-majored English students, many consider English as peripheral to their core academic or career goals, thus reducing its value. At the same time, they perceive a low control, or feel disengaged due to limited language proficiency or negative past experiences with English. As a consequence, these students become prime candidates for experiencing boredom in the English classroom.

2.3. Previous studies on boredom

Historical research, such as Kooker (1959)'s study, identified behavioral consequences of boredom, noting that bored students often exhibited tardiness, which could negatively affect academic performance due to reduced class attendance. More recent studies have established a negative correlation between boredom and key learning variables, including effort, course grades, and self-efficacy for self-regulated learning (Apridayani & Waluyo, 2022; Bekker et al., 2023; Furlong et al., 2021; Xie, 2021). These findings highlight the detrimental impact of boredom on academic outcomes, emphasizing the need to address its root causes.

Contemporary research has increasingly focused on identifying these causes. Chansaengsee (2023) and Finkelstein (2003) point to factors such as under-stimulation from monotonous or unchallenging tasks, overly rigid teaching styles, or students' inability to sustain attention. Ficino (2022) adds that difficulties in recognizing, reflecting on, or articulating the experience of boredom can exacerbate its effects, particularly when students lack strategies to cope with this emotion. In language learning contexts, Pawlak et al. (2020) conducted a mixed-methods study with English majors, finding that English speaking activities elicited less boredom compared to grammar, writing, or reading tasks. Similarly, Kruk (2021) identified factors contributing to boredom among English majors, including

language-related tasks, teacher behavior, classroom structure, and curriculum design, based on qualitative analyses.

Mousavian Rad et al. (2022) further explored boredom in English language classrooms, identifying classroom-related factors (e.g., uninspiring instructional materials and unwelcoming environments), teaching styles, students' personality traits, and curriculum design as primary contributors. These findings align with broader research on classroom dynamics, such as that by Mercer-Lynn et al. (2014), who emphasize the role of teacher-student rapport and task variety in mitigating boredom. Additionally, Tze et al. (2016) highlight the interplay between boredom and academic motivation, noting that students with low intrinsic motivation are more susceptible to boredom, which in turn undermines their engagement and achievement.

Research findings largely indicate a negative relationship between academic boredom and learning outcomes, although some sources explore alternative interpretations. Academic boredom is widely recognized as a negative emotional state associated with poor academic performance and frequent cognitive failures (Amiri et al., 2021; Sharp et al., 2020). Feldges and Pieczenko (2020) emphasized a clear link between boredom and low academic achievement, noting that bored students often struggle to maintain attention, which leads to poor test performance.

Boredom has also been identified as a contributing factor to reduced motivation, lower academic achievement, diminished perceived value of learning tasks, decreased student engagement, and weakened concentration. It can negatively affect the quality of students' work as well as their cognitive and motivational processes. Studies have found negative correlations between boredom and academic grades at both school and university levels. For example, Amiri et al. (2021) found that students with higher boredom proneness tended to have lower final-year grades and that boredom proneness predicted lower GPAs among undergraduates, particularly those with poor academic performance.

Moreover, academic boredom has been linked to several adverse educational outcomes, including low achievement, high school dropout, truancy, and even juvenile delinquency (Coşkun & Yüksel, 2021; Nkwogu & Ubah, 2019). The relationship between boredom and academic performance may be reciprocal—poor performance can increase boredom, while higher boredom can further impair performance. Boredom can also exert indirect effects, such as reducing students' self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, which in turn negatively influences academic success. Additionally, bored students tend to rely more on surface learning strategies rather than deep or strategic learning approaches. Notably, boredom experienced during class may have a stronger negative impact than boredom encountered during individual study (Amiri et al., 2021).

However, some studies report that boredom proneness and character strengths do not significantly predict GPA among high school students. Despite such exceptions, meta-analyses generally show a low to moderate negative correlation between academic boredom and learning outcomes (Amiri et al., 2021). Overall, academic boredom is widely regarded as a factor that undermines learning motivation and thereby, it appears to hinder academic achievement.

While educational boredom has gained global attention in educational contexts, there remains a research gap in Vietnam. Large-scale empirical studies that investigate the experience of boredom among undergraduates and the relationship between the various dimensions of boredom and objective measures of performance, such as grade point average

(GPA), are quite rare. This needs to be addressed as boredom not only hinders immediate learning but can also accumulate over time, shaping long-term academic trajectories.

The current study was conducted at Nong Lam University, Ho Chi Minh City, using a structured questionnaire to capture students' actual experiences. It aims to provide valuable insights into the relationship between boredom and academic performance. By focusing on a relatively understudied population and context, the study contributes to the literature on language education and highlights practical implications for reducing boredom and improving student engagement and learning outcomes in Vietnamese higher education.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative research design to examine the relationship between academic boredom and learning outcomes among students at Nong Lam University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The quantitative approach is selected to facilitate the statistical analysis of the association between students' experiences of academic boredom and their academic performance.

3.2. Participants

They comprise 2,587 undergraduate students enrolled at Nong Lam University-Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. A convenience sampling technique is employed to select participants. The sample includes students from eight different academic cohorts, spanning from the 2015 to 2022 intakes, thereby ensuring representation across a broad temporal range of student experiences at the institution.

3.3. Instruments

The present study used the Multidimensional State Boredom Scale developed by (Fahlman et al., 2013b) to collect primary data. The Multidimensional State Boredom Scale (MSBS) is a psychological tool designed to assess various facets of boredom with three sections. The MSBS is a validated psychological instrument designed to assess multiple dimensions of academic boredom. The version used in this study consists of three main sections.

Section 1: Demographic Information – This section gathers basic background data, including participants' gender and academic year.

Section 2: Academic Boredom Scale – This section is adapted from established subscales, namely Agitated Affect (AAF), Disengagement (DIS), Dysphoric Affect (DAF), Inattention (INA), and Time Perception (TPE). These subscales collectively measure different affective and cognitive manifestations of academic boredom.

Section 3: Antecedent Factors – This section aims to explore potential contributing factors to academic boredom. It included sub-dimensions such as Attitude (ATT), University Environment (UEN), Teaching Content (TEC), Lecturers' Teaching Methods (TME), and Pedagogical Style (PES).

All items are rated using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 7 ("Strongly Agree"). Higher total scores on the MSBS indicate a greater level of academic boredom experienced by the respondent.

The MSBS was translated into Vietnamese using a standard adaptation process. This included forward translation, back translation, expert review, and a pilot test with students to

ensure linguistic clarity and cultural relevance. The final version was then used in the main study to examine its reliability and validity.

The reliability of the MSBS-Vietnamese version was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The results showed high internal consistency across all subscales, with values ranging from .920 to .949 (Time Perception α = .925, Disengagement α = .949, Dysphoric Affect α = .933, Inattention α = .920, Agitated Affect α = .932). These results suggest that the questionnaire is reliable and provide a solid basis for further analysis.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data are analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0. Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and percentages, are employed to summarize participants' demographic characteristics and their reported levels of academic boredom. To examine the relationship between academic boredom and academic performance, Pearson correlation analysis is conducted. Specifically, the analysis focused on the association between five dimensions of boredom—Agitated Affect (AAF), Disengagement (DIS), Dysphoric Affect (DAF), Inattention (INA), and Time Perception (TPE)—and students' academic achievement scores.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Profile of participants

Among 2587 participants, the majority are female (59.6%), the remaining 40.4 % male. The participants range from batch 2015 to 2022. Batches 2020 - 2022 account for the majority of the participants (84.8%), which is followed by batch 2019, taking up 9.8% (n= 254). The students from batch 2018 constitute 3.1% (n= 79), batch 2017 1.6% (n= 41), batch 2016 0.5percent (n= 14), and batch 2015 0.2% (n= 6) of the whole sample of participants.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants

		Frequency	Percent
Batches	2015	6	.2
	2016	14	.5
	2017	41	1.6
	2018	79	3.1
	2019	254	9.8
	2020	755	29.2
	2021	880	34.0
	2022	558	21.6
Gender	Male	1045	40.4
	Female	1542	59.6
Grades	Below Average	87	3.4
	Average	581	22.5
	Fair	1432	55.4
	Good	469	18.1
	Very good	18	.7
	Total	2587	100.0

4.2. Descriptive of boredom in classroom

Section 1 of the MSBS has 29 items categorized into five dimensions indicating students' experience of boredom: *Disengagement* (Items 2, 7, 9, 1 0, 13, 17, 19, 22, 24, 28),

Agitated Affect (Items 5, 12, 14, 21, 27), *Inattention* (Items 3, 16, 20, 23), *Dysphoric affect* (Items 4, 8, 15, 25, 29), and *Time Perception* (Items 1, 6, 11, 18, 26). These dimensions provide insights into different aspects of boredom experienced by respondents.

4.2.1. Agitated affect

Table 2 summaries the measurement of agitated affect across five distinct indicators namely *moodiness, agitation, impatience, social annoyance* and *irritability*. The mean scores are calculated from the average scores to measure variables to test the respondent's degree of agreement. A mean of 3.5 is chosen as the lowest acceptable mean score on the 7-point Likert scale, indicating that any item with a mean value above 3.5 agreed that respondents agree with the given statement in the questionnaire. The result indicates that the participants agree to all items in the boredom measurement questionnaire and that they generally have moderate to high levels of agitated affect. However, the item that has the highest rating was *impatience* (M = 4.13), which is followed by *irritability* (M= 3.97). *Moodiness* comes next with the mean of 3.95. The lowest scores are reported for *social annoyance* (M=3.67, SD/Standard Deviation =1.69). It means that most respondents surveyed get bored during the class because of internal factors like impatience or moodiness rather than external factors.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for agitated affect items

	Mean	**SD**
I am more moody than usual	3.95	1.68
I feel agitated	3.83	1.69
I am impatient right now	4.13	1.68
I am annoyed with the people around me	3.67	1.69
Everything seems to be irritating me right now	3.97	1.72

4.2.2. Disengagement

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of participants' responses regarding *disengagement*. Ten items related to the level of disengagement revolves around feelings of *boredom*, *indecision*, *repetition* and *lack of value in activities*. The mean scores range from 3.77 to 4.43, suggesting a moderate to high level of disengagement among respondents. However, the item that has the highest rating is the *desire for more exciting activities* while the lowest mean score is associated with perceptions of *being forced into activities which lack personal value*. The results also highlight the prevalence of dissatisfaction and monotony. Standard deviations range from 1.66 to 1.73, implying relatively consistent experiences of disengagement across respondents.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for disengagement items

	Mean	**SD**
I am stuck in a situation that I feel is irrelevant	4.04	1.66
I feel bored	4.04	1.73
I am indecisive or unsure of what to do next	4.24	1.69
I want to do something fun, but nothing appeals to me	4.24	1.68
I wish I was doing something more exciting	4.43	1.68
I am wasting time that would be better spent on something else	4.27	1.71
I want something to happen but I'm not sure what	4.20	1.69
I feel like I'm sitting around waiting for something to happen	4.01	1.69
Everything seems repetitive and routine to me	4.24	1.66
I seem to be forced to do things that have no value to me	3.77	1.72

4.2.3. Dysphoric effect

Regarding *dysphoric effect* which consists of 5 items related to *emptiness*, *loneliness*, *isolation*, *distress* and *the perception of having no one to talk to*, the results in Table 4 indicate that most respondents generally display moderate levels of boredom with the means ranging from 3.69 to 4.06. That is, they feel sometimes bored. Nevertheless, *feeling empty* shows the highest mean score (M= 4.06, SD = 1.72), suggesting that it is the most intensely experienced aspect. Another factor that receives most agreement among student participants belongs to loneliness with a rather high mean (M= 4.03, SD = 1.78). This is closely followed by *feeling down* with a mean of 4.02 (SD = 1.72), indicating frequent experience of sadness and distress. The feeling of isolation or *being cut off from the world* shows a slightly lower mean (M=3.85, SD=1.71), while the perception of *having no one to talk to* registers the lowest mean (M=3.69, SD=1.73). The slightly lower scores for social disconnection compared to internal emotional states (emptiness, loneliness) suggest that the primary issue might be emotional rather than purely social.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for dysphoric affect items

	Mean	**SD**
I feel empty	4.06	1.72
I feel cut-off from the rest of the world	3.85	1.71
It seems like there's no one around for me to talk to	3.69	1.73
I am lonely	4.03	1.78
I feel down	4.02	1.72

4.2.4. Inattention

In terms of *inattention* aspects, Table 5 provides the insights into challenges related to *attention*, *concentration* and *distraction*. All statements reflect high mean values, ranging from 4.18 to 4.47. It means that the respondents are struggling with maintaining focused attention, sustained concentration, and resisting distractions, which could have meaningful impacts on their productivity, and academic performance. Among the statements, *"I am easily distracted*" has the highest mean (4.47) with a standard deviation of 1.65, showing that the boredom that the students respondents bear mostly comes from their distraction. This also explains why they have *short attention span* (M= 4.29, SD = 1.65) and difficulty in *focusing* (M= 4.22, SD= 1.67). Meanwhile, with the lowest mean (4.18) for "*My mind is wandering*," the data implies that the respondents frequently experience their minds drifting away from the task at hand.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for inattention items

	Mean	**SD**
It is difficult to focus my attention	4.22	1.67
My attention span is shorter than usual	4.29	1.65
My mind is wandering.	4.18	1.70
I am easily distracted	4.47	1.65

4.2.5. Time perception

Looking at the data in Table 6, we can see that the participants are having problem with time perception. The high mean scores (ranging from 3.85 to 4.21) across the various items suggest that the respondents feel time is passing more slowly than usual. In particular, the mean score of 4.21 for "Time is passing by slower than usual" implicates that the respondents experience boredom due to slow time passage. Similarly, the mean score of 3.86 for "Time is moving very slowly" further reinforces this distorted time perception. With a mean of 3.97, "I

wish time would go by faster," suggests that the respondents desire for time to pass more quickly. Overall, the data highlights the distortion in perception of time among the student respondents.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics for time perception items

	Mean	SD
Time is passing by slower than usual.	4.21	1.62
Time is dragging on	3.85	1.72
Time is moving very slowly	3.86	1.69
Right now it seems like time is passing slowly	3.86	1.68
I wish time would go by faster	3.97	1.78

4.3. Correlation analysis

The correlation matrix in Table 7 shows how different aspects of boredom are related with each other and with academic achievement (measured by GPA) by using Pearson correlation coefficients. The *Agitated Affect Scale* shows a significant positive correlation with the *Dysphoric Affect* ($r = .923$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that the more the agitation is, the higher the dysphoria becomes.

Similarly, the strong positive correlation with the *Disengagement Scale* ($r = 0.913$, $p < 0.01$) shows that higher levels of agitation are associated with increased feelings of disengagement. In other words, when the student participants experience the feeling of moodiness, impatience or irritation, they are more likely to struggle with engagement in classroom tasks or activities, leading to demotivation and inattention. This close relation can be reinforced in the strong correlation between *Agitated Affect* and the *Inattention* ($r = 0.845$, $p < 0.01$). The finding suggests that the students find it challenging to stay focused on the lessons when they are bored.

Like agitation, *Disengagement Scale* has strong positive correlation *Dysphoric Affect* ($r = 0.906$), positive correlation with *Inattention* ($r = 0.911$) and *Time Perception* ($r = 0.829$). This implies that increased disengagement accompanies higher levels of emotional distress, difficulties in maintaining focus, and distortions in their sense of time.

There is a significant positive correlation between *inattention* scale with *Dysphoric Affect* ($r = 0.826$). This reinforces the idea that *inattention* is closely tied to *emotional distress*. Furthermore, *inattention* and *time perception* are closely linked ($r = 0.745$), suggesting that lack of focus or concentration results in a skewed perception of time.

Similarly*, Dysphoric Affect Scale* bears strong positive correlation with *Agitated Affect* ($r = 0.923$) and *Disengagement* ($r = 0.906$). This indicates that heightened dysphoria is associated with both agitation and disengagement. Besides, dysphoric individuals tend to experience difficulties with attention ($r = 0.826$) and may perceive time in a distorted manner ($r = 0.789$).

The correlation analysis reveals a clear pattern of negative relationships between GPA and various dimensions of boredom among students although they are slightly weak. Specifically, the weak negative correlation between the Agitated Affect Scale and GPA ($r = -0.086$, $p < 0.01$) indicates that as levels of agitation increase, students' GPAs tend to decrease, albeit only slightly. This relationship suggests that students who experience higher agitation may perform somewhat worse academically. However, the correlation is weak, meaning that agitation is not a strong predictor of GPA on its own.

The Dysphoric Affect Scale ($r = -0.082$, $p < 0.01$) and Time Perception Scale ($r = -0.084$, $p < 0.01$) reflect similar negative relationships, although they are slightly weaker. Although the correlations are weak, they suggest that emotional states like dysphoria and perceptions of time management can still impact academic performance.

Similarly, the Disengagement Scale ($r = -0.079$, $p < 0.01$) and Inattention Scale ($r = -0.079$, $p < 0.01$) also show negative correlations with GPA. Despite weak correlations, they still indicate that the lack of engagement in classroom activities and attention to the lessons can influence academic performance.

Table 7. Pearson Correlations Between Dimensions of Academic Boredom and Students' Academic Performance (GPA)

		AAF	DIS	INA	DAF	TPE	GPA
AAF	Pearson Correlation	1	.913**	.845**	.923**	.824**	-.086**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587
DIS	Pearson Correlation	.913**	1	.911**	.906**	.829**	-.079**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587
INA	Pearson Correlation	.845**	.911**	1	.826**	.745**	-.079**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587
DAF	Pearson Correlation	.923**	.906**	.826**	1	.789**	-.082**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587
TPE	Pearson Correlation	.824**	.829**	.745**	.789**	1	-.084**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587
GPA	Pearson Correlation	-.086**	-.079**	-.079**	-.082**	-.084**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587	2587

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

5. Conclusion

This study investigated the relationship between boredom and learning outcomes among students at Nong Lam University. The findings support the view conceptualized by Fahlman et al. (2013) that academic boredom is not a multidimensional construct rather than a single experience. This negative feeling is attributed to both emotional dimensions—such as agitated affect, disengagement, and dysphoria—and cognitive elements, including inattention and time perception distortions. These dimensions are significantly interrelated, forming a web of

mutually reinforcing experiences that undermine student motivation and engagement. This result also in line with previous findings by Goetz et al. (2006), Tze et al. (2016), Vogel-Walcutt et al. (2012), who identified boredom as a complex and context-sensitive emotional state that can hinder academic success.

According to the control-value theory proposed by (Pekrun, 2006), students are most prone to boredom when they perceive low control over a learning task and minimal value in its outcome. This theory gains particular relevance in the context of the Nong Lam University study, where non-English major students are required to complete compulsory English courses. For many, these courses are seen as peripheral to their core academic and career aspirations, resulting in low perceived value and high disengagement. Such conditions, the study shows, are fertile ground for boredom to take root.

The correlation analysis conducted in the study found a weak but stable negative correlation between aspects of boredom and students' GPA. While the correlations are low in strength, agitated affect (r = -0.086), disengagement (r = -0.079), dysphoric affect (r = -0.082), inattention (r = -0.079), time perception (r = -0.084), it indicated that boredom has negative effect on academic achievement. These results align with earlier studies by Amiri et al. (2021), Sharp et al. (2020); Feldges & Pieczenko (2020) that viewed the construct of boredom as leading to decreased motivation, lack of concentration, and lowered performance outcomes.

Also, the high correlations within dimensions of boredom, like between agitation and dysphoria (r =.923) or disengagement and inattention (r =.911), reflects the interrelatedness of these experiences. It means that students who are moody and agitated are more likely to feel disconnected, inattentive and time-disoriented. Although individually, these emotional and cognitive experiences do not have major impacts on GPA, cumulatively they are, in long run, obstacles to their academic achievement.

Understanding these relationships can raise awareness for the educators to develop a holistic interventions and support strategies to address the challenges faced by the students in Nong Lam University- Ho Chi Minh City. More engaging and varied learning activities should be incorporated into the syllabus to challenge students and reduce feelings of monotony. These could include interactive tasks, project-based learning, and opportunities for creative expression. That is because when interactive tasks are applied across the curriculum, they can transform students from passive listeners into active participants. For instance, instead of providing a long lectures, teachers can organize "Think–Pair–Share" activities where students first reflect individually, then discuss with a peer, and finally share with the class. This can turn the lessons into engaging moments. Another interactive activities can be carried out through "peer teaching" activities where students are assigned to explain a topic or a concept to their peers. This activity not only enhances students' understanding but also build confidence. In terms of project-based learning, teachers can organize short-term projects that require sustained effort, creativity, and teamwork like having students create a short podcast series on topics they care about (e.g., student life at Nong Lam University- Ho Chi Minh City, favorite music, or campus challenges). Such projects integrate real-life skills, promote collaboration, and make students feel motivated and engaged in their learning.

Teachers should also provide students with more opportunities for creative expressions. Instead of a standard essay, students can use multimedia tools to allow students to present ideas through videos, podcasts, or infographics. These creative activities can reduce the sense of routine and allow learners to shine in their own ways. Regarding teaching methodology, teachers should implement diverse teaching strategies, such as collaborative learning and learner-centered approach to stimulate interest and ensure that students actively construct knowledge rather than passively receive it. By doing so, teachers can meet students' varied

learning needs, address different learning styles, and create a more dynamic classroom atmosphere. Group problem-solving competitions where each team tackles real-life math applications (budgeting, statistical surveys, or designing floor plans using geometry). Collaborative learning activities, such as group problem-solving competitions where each team tackles real-life math applications (budgeting, statistical surveys, or designing floor plans using geometry) can encourage teamwork, social interaction, and shared responsibility. A learner-centered approach further enhances engagement by allowing students to choose how they demonstrate understanding—via infographics, models, or coding a small math-related app, so that they feel that what they are doing is relevant and important in their lives and they are appreciated as decision-makers. Another equally important measure that should be taken into consideration is to recognize the emotional states of students. Activities that promote students' awareness of their own emotions, such as reflective journal entries that ask students to comment on which aspects of a lesson they found interesting or boring, help to foster metacognitive development and ownership over the emotions of learning. Finally, teachers should foster a supportive classroom environment where students feel comfortable to discuss their feelings of boredom and disengagement. As recommended by Nett et al. (2011) such discussions between students and teachers related to how to alleviate boredom in the classroom are considered essential parts of learning process. Moreover, the emotion theory also emphasizes the students' need to identify, be aware of and explain their boredom to be able to deal with it successfully; therefore, a transparent classroom environment where instances of boredom experienced by the students can be openly stated should be create (Eastwood et al., 2012).

Limitation

It is essential to acknowledge some limitations of this study. Firstly, although the study involves a large sample of 2587 students, it is limited to a single university, which may affect the generalizability of the findings to other educational contexts or regions. In addition, while the study identifies various dimensions of boredom, it does not thoroughly investigate the underlying causes or contextual factors leading to boredom, which could provide deeper insights into this phenomenon. Another important consideration is that GPA, although commonly used as an indicator of academic success, may be affected by other variables outside of student boredom. To illustrate, factors at the personal level, like motivation to learn, ways of studying, ability to self-regulate and the learner's own language competence, are all very influential in determining how students perform and outcomes generally. In this way boredom is likely not to directly lead to poorer academic outcomes but rather to influence intermediate variables, such as lack of motivation, disengagement in the classroom, and/or escape coping. The link between boredom and GPA might not be as straight forward cause–effect. This limitation indicates that further studies should seek to integrate other constructs –particularly motivation to learn, engagement, and self-regulation– to better understand the mechanisms through which boredom influences academic outcomes. This aims to shed light on the comprehensive pictures regarding the elements that contribute to learners' demotivation and boredom and how to help students overcome such negative feelings to improve their learning outcomes.

References

Amiri, E., Elkarfa, A., Sbaihi, M., & Iannàccaro, G. (2021). Students' experiences and perceptions of boredom in EFL academic context. *International Journal of Languages and Literary Studies*, *3*(3), 1–19.

Apridayani, A., & Waluyo, B. (2022). Antecedents and effects of students' enjoyment and boredom in synchronous online English courses. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16.

Bekker, C. I., Rothmann, S., & Kloppers, M. M. (2023). The happy learner: Effects of academic boredom, burnout, and engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 974486.

Chansaengsee, S. (2023). Boredom in online activity during COVID-19 outbreak causing dysfunctional behaviors of adolescent students: phenomenological study to the creation of virtual reality classroom. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *38*(4), 1749–1770.

Coşkun, A., & Yüksel, Y. (2021). Examining English as a foreign language students' Boredom in terms of different variables. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture*, *7*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v7i2.2539

Eastwood, J. D., Frischen, A., Fenske, M. J., & Smilek, D. (2012). The unengaged mind: Defining boredom in terms of attention. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*(5), 482–495.

Fahlman, S. A., Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Flora, D. B., & Eastwood, J. D. (2013a). Development and validation of the multidimensional state boredom scale. *Assessment*, *20*(1), 68–85.

Fahlman, S. A., Mercer-Lynn, K. B., Flora, D. B., & Eastwood, J. D. (2013b). Development and validation of the multidimensional state boredom scale. *Assessment*, *20*(1), 68–85.

Feldges, T., & Pieczenko, S. (2020). Boredom in educational contexts: A critical review. *Encyclopaideia*, *24*(57), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-8670/11035

Ficino, M. (2022). *On the Christian religion*. University of Toronto Press.

Finkelstein, J. (2003). The taste of boredom: McDonaldization and Australian food culture. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *47*(2), 187–200.

Furlong, M., Smith, D. C., Springer, T., & Dowdy, E. (2021). Bored with school! Bored with life? Well-being characteristics associated with a school boredom mindset. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *5*(1), 42–64.

Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Pekrun, R., & Hall, N. C. (2006). The domain specificity of academic emotional experiences. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *75*(1), 5–29.

Klassen, R. M., Krawchuk, L. L., & Rajani, S. (2008). Academic procrastination of undergraduates: Low self-efficacy to self-regulate predicts higher levels of procrastination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *33*(4), 915–931.

Kooker, E. W. (1959). An investigation of security-insecurity and achievement-boredom in elementary school children. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *27*(4), 333–340.

Kruk, M. (2021). *Investigating dynamic relationships among individual difference variables in learning English as a foreign language in a virtual world*. Springer Nature.

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*(1), 122–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.034

Mousavian Rad, S. E., Roohani, A., & Mirzaei, A. (2022). Developing and validating precursors of students' boredom in EFL classes: An exploratory sequential mixed-methods study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–18.

Nkwogu, F. U., & Ubah, J. N. (2019). Teacher related causes of boredom. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *10*(3), 32–35. https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/10-3-03

Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020). Boredom in the foreign language classroom: A micro-perspective. *Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *June*, 1–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50769-5

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, *18*, 315–341.

Pekrun, R., & Stephens, E. J. (2010). Achievement emotions: A control-value approach. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*(4), 238–255.

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.

Raffaelli, Q., Mills, C., & Christoff, K. (2018). The knowns and unknowns of boredom: A review of the literature. *Experimental Brain Research*, *236*, 2451–2462.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1161.

Sharp, J. G., Sharp, J. C., & Young, E. (2020). 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

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

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*, 89–111.

Xie, J. (2021). The effects of boredom on EFL learners' engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 743313.