



Castledown

 OPEN ACCESS

Technology in Language Teaching & Learning

ISSN 2652-1687

<https://www.castledown.com/journals/tltl/>

Technology in Language Teaching & Learning, 7(3), 102591 (2025)

<https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v7n3.102591>

Does Blended Learning Bring about Less Boredom to EFL Teachers?



FARZANEH KAZEMI 

FARNAZ HEYRAN KAHNAMUEI 

*Department of English Language and Literature,
Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign
Languages, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran*
Farzanehkazemi09@gmail.com

*Department of Occupational Health Engineering,
School of Public Health, Tabriz University of
Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran*
heyranfarnaz@gmail.com

Abstract

Considering the growing prevalence of the implementation of technology in the field of language education, the widely used approach called “blended Learning”, defined as a mixture of face-to-face education with computer-assisted instruction is reported to be beneficial in several aspects such as improved performance, a high-quality English learning context, and better performance in the integrated skills of the English language. However, a number of shortcomings, such as a greater load of responsibility, and the lack of familiarity with modern learning methods have also been reported in the literature. Taking the pivotal, yet underestimated role of teacher boredom in education quality, the study set out to explore whether this approach, as compared to traditional ones, brings about more boredom among EFL teachers. With the inclusion of 78 EFL teachers, the research used a questionnaire developed by Kruk et al., (2024), named the “L2 teacher boredom scale”, distributed via a Google Forms link. The scale involves five main factors, being “(F1) repetitiveness and monotony, (F2) inefficient communication, (F3) lack of satisfaction, (F4) lack of creativity, and (F5) lack of interest”. The answers provided by participants comparing boredom in traditional versus blended teaching methods revealed that there is a statistically significant relationship between the use of blended teaching and teachers’ boredom, in terms of all factors concerned. Moreover, repeated measures ANOVA as used to investigate the effect of demographic features on the level of boredom, and no statistically significant effect was observed. Considering the over-reliance of current teaching and educational

Copyright: © 2025 Farzaneh Kazemi & Farnaz Heyran Kahnmauei. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within this paper.

systems on technology, the study is believed to provide practical pedagogical implications for stakeholders in education, e.g., ongoing professional development, participatory instructional design, balanced curriculum structure, and monitoring emotional well-being.

Keywords: Blended learning; Boredom; EFL teacher boredom; E-learning; Teacher boredom

Introduction

Implementing technology as a tool to enhance learning has been growingly prevalent in recent decades. More precisely, in the realm of language education, approaches such as “Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL)” and “Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL)” have drawn the attention of a considerable number of researchers. Among a wide variety of concepts investigated, is mobile-assisted language use (MALU) (Jarvis & Achilleos, 2013), the impact of CALL on language learning as a whole (Nazeer et al., 2023), along with that on particular skills and sub-skills (Bumela, 2020; Enayati & Gilakjani, 2020; Tafazoli et al., 2019), recent trends in CALL (Chen et al., 2021; Chapelle, 2005; Chapelle, 2010; Garrett, 2009; Lim & Aryadoust, 2022), issues related to EFL teachers, such as their acceptance of CALL and feedback (Mei et al., 2018; Park & Son, 2022; Mohamed & Adnan, 2020), and the implementation of CALL under specific circumstances (Parmaxi & Zaphiris, 2016; Sylvén & Sundqvist, 2017).

In the context of English language education, especially in English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL) environment, the use of technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), mobile applications, social media, and gamification are among prevalent methods being adopted by English language instructors, as they have been reported to bring about a large number of beneficial outcomes.

The term blended learning, with its roots in business, related to corporate training (Sharma & Barrett, 2007), was subsequently applied in higher educational settings and currently in language education (Tomlinson & Whittaker, 2013). In spite of its widespread popularity in today’s world, many scholars find it hard to define, as the boundaries between web-enhanced learning, blended learning, and hybrid learning are to some extent blurry. However, according to Smith and Kurthen, (2007), when online activities rather than face-to-face classes are being used in an educational program, for below 45 per cent of the time, this approach can be regarded as blended learning. In the English teaching domain, when the content is delivered through more than one mode to increase the effectiveness, blended learning is taking place (Harvi Singh & Reed, 2001).

According to research carried out so far, a number of positive outcomes have been reported for the use of this method in English language teaching (ELT). To name some, enhanced language skills, a high-quality English learning context (Albiladi & Alshareef, 2019), escalation in student achievement (Pardede, 2012), provision of access to materials and learning tasks (Sari et al., 2018), effective teaching (Hockly, 2018), improved performance in the integrated skills of the English language (Hashemi & Na, 2020), more effective assessment (Sejdiu, 2014), greater English communication skills (Mahawan & Langprayoon, 2020) are among proven advantages of this method.

However, its implementation is not free from challenges for both teachers and learners. On the part of students, they deal with shortcomings, such as self-regulation, technology use (Rasheed et al., 2020), a greater load of responsibility, lack of familiarity with modern learning methods (Garcia-Ponce & Mora-Pablo, 2020), the lack of sufficient concentration, and difficulty of online interaction with peers (Sriwichai, 2020).

On the other hand, teachers face difficulties such as the use of technology (Rasheed et al., 2020), provision of the right design (Altay & Altay, 2019; Nissen & Tea, 2012), time issues (Alebaikan & Troudi, 2010; Benson & Anderson, 2010), inadequate teacher training courses in this realm (Ramalingam et al., 2022), lack of readiness (Rasskazova et al., 2017), dissatisfactory facilities (Le, et al., 2022), and the increase in workload (Asaad Hamza Sheerah, 2020). Moreover, while implementing technology in education, teachers may be prone to experience boredom due to several reasons, such as insufficient interaction with the learners, lack of use of body language, and restricted attendance on the part of students (Wang, 2024).

Boredom, as an umbrella term, can stem from the extent to which one feels does not possess any control over the activities which leads to a sense of achievement and how valuable the results they perceive are for them. Thus, when individuals see a sort of lack of significance and intention, they eventually feel bored. To provide a more meticulous definition, Pawlak et al. (2020) consider it as a blend of disengagement, lack of satisfaction, determination, motivation, dynamism, and a misleading notion of time.

Considering the unquestionable role of teachers' boredom on education quality in general, the present study is set to explore whether blended learning can be considered a source of boredom for EFL teachers. To this end, this research seeks to address the following questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between using blended teaching techniques and EFL teachers' perceived boredom, as compared with traditional methods?
2. Are there any variations in the level of boredom experienced by EFL teachers, based on their age, gender, educational background, teaching organization, and teaching experience?

Review of Related Literature

Theoretical Framework

Blended Learning

E-learning or the use of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) in education, as defined by Asabere and Enguah (2012), refers to taking advantage of the internet, intranets/extranets, video, audio, and other media to provide access to education. As far as the merits of this approach to learning are concerned, its assistance in exam preparation and searching activities (Okonu et al., 2023), more student-centered education (Hidayati, 2016), providing a greater extent of creativity, novelty, and flexibility (Chouthaiwale & Alkamel, 2018), higher level of motivation, enhanced language proficiency (Desai, 2023), the provision of authentic material (Desai, 2023; Padurean & Margan, 2009; Sabiri, 2020), and being time- and energy-saving (Ahmad et al., 2021) are beyond any question.

Furthermore, as a sub-division of E-learning, blended learning, as the term is self-suggesting, is a mixture of face-to-face education with computer-assisted instruction (Graham, 2006; p. 97) and is considered the inclusion of an extensive range of methods, environments, and learning styles (Bojović, 2017). Moreover, according to Allen et al. (2010), the use of the term "blended" is due to the integration of ICT in both teaching and learning settings. It, therefore, is not a mere combination, rather, it is an amalgamation of teaching ideas, models, and methods, with a perspective toward novelty and creation (Teng & Zeng, 2022).

In general, six main types of blended learning are categorized (Horn & Staker, 2011; Remizantseva, 2019) as follows:

- a. **Face-to-Face Driver**, where the teacher is directly involved in a physical classroom;
- b. **Rotation**, in which students are provided with an opportunity to take part in online rather than in-person classes;
- c. **Flex**, where the main interaction between teachers and the students takes place via the Internet;
- d. **Online Lab**, entailing to work in classrooms with particular equipment, with the presence of an instructor;
- e. **Self-Blend**, where students opt for online courses themselves;
- f. **Online Driver**, in which in-person classes are rare.

Teacher Boredom

Boredom can be classified into two main categories *trait* boredom and *state* boredom. Whereas the former is generally a steady disposition and is experienced regularly, such as on occasions of doing a task, the latter is more temporary in nature and is aroused in reaction to a particular condition (Putwain et al., 2018).

Relevant to the context of this study, in academic settings, boredom can be a result of objectively feeling a lower level of motivation while subjectively being dissatisfied, frustrated, and disinterested (Tam et al., 2020). The prevalence of this emotion is so that it has been reported to be one of the most frequently experienced states in a typical classroom (Shen, 2022; Pekrun et al., 2010; Daschmann et al., 2011; (Tam et al., 2020). As per the abovementioned typology, *state boredom* in classroom can be seen in cases of absence of matching between the teaching procedures and the proficiency level of the students (Derakhshan et al., 2021) where *trait boredom*, or *boredom proneness* (Bench & Lench, 2013) has its roots on the learners' (and the teachers') characteristics and their proneness to this feeling in the majority of their lives (Derakhshan et al., 2021).

Although recent years have seen an exponential growth of interest in exploring student boredom (Kruk & Zawodniak, 2018; Li, 2021; Ali El Deen, 2023; Pawlak et al., 2022; Pawlak et al., 2020; Daschmann et al., 2014; Goetz & Hall, 2014; Sharp et al., 2016; Li et al., 2023), far too little attention has been paid to teacher boredom (Tam et al., 2020; Wang, 2024). However, bored teachers are considered to be among the paramount factors which contribute to demotivated students and their poor performance (Lisa et al., 2017; Pekrun et al., 2010; Sulea et al., 2015; Tam et al., 2020; Tze, Daniels & Klassen, 2016).

Related Literature

With the development of using technology in education, and then becoming an integral part of it, a considerable amount of literature has been published, focusing on the psychological aspects of this phenomenon (Abbas et al., 2018; Stockwell & Reinders, 2019; Yu, 2022). However, despite the undeniable importance of contemplating the way educators feel and their emotions (Schutz & Lee, 2014), this domain has largely concentrated on the students' emotions (Fried et al., 2015).

The research concerning boredom in teachers can be divided into four main classes: (1) prevalence of teacher boredom, (2) those focusing on underlying reasons, (3) the studies comparing teacher boredom in different situations, e.g., two teaching approaches, and (4) the effect of teacher boredom on the teaching quality.

For one thing, regarding the widespread presence of teacher boredom in educational contexts, Shen (2022) conducted a systematic review to investigate the effect of emotion regulation on EFL teachers' burnout, anxiety, and boredom. The review revealed that boredom *is a common feeling* that roughly 25percent of all sessions bring about boredom to the teachers (Keller et al., 2014). Similarly, Farrell (2022) reported boredom among the three most frequently reported emotions by novice ESL (English as a second language) teachers. Moreover, Derakhshan et al., (2024) discovered boredom to be among the most regular negative emotions of 35 EFL Iranian university teachers.

As far as the underlying reasons of teacher boredom are concerned, Wang (2023) probed into how bored 216 Chinese EFL teachers feel they are while teaching online. In a comparison between face-to-face and online classes, the latter was seen to be more boring. The study found that factors involved in this boredom can be grouped as *(1) those who have something to with the learners, (2) the task itself, (3) those with a relation to IT, and (4) teacher-related ones*, where the last two were considered as the most regularly reported reasons. In line with the scope of this study, Khajavy et al., (2018), by investigating both positive as well as negative emotions of 11 Iranian teachers, by conducting semi-structured interviews, found that the main sources of teacher boredom in their under-study population were *demotivated and uncollaborative students*. Another research by Dumančić (2018) probed into the root causes of boredom among primary- and secondary English teachers. According to results obtained from this study, although a larger number of instructors did *not report any effect of their boredom on their educational quality*, others believed that when they were bored, their instruction would suffer as well. In an attempt to find out the causes of this feeling, they discovered that the factors responsible for boredom are as follows: *(a) content with too much focus on grammar, (b) the subject matter, (c) the learners' behavior, low level of motivation and insufficient knowledge, and (d) student assessment*.

The third group of studies attempted to make a comparison between teaching procedures, in terms of the level of teacher boredom they lead to. For instance, Pawlak et al., (2021) compared the concept of boredom between online and in-person classes and also between content-based against skills-based courses. Their qualitative study involved 34 EFL teachers, who were supposed to comment on these variables through interviews and online questionnaires. As obtained by the data analysis, most of them found online courses more boring than traditional, face-to-face ones. More interestingly, they did not see any difference in terms of boredom comparing skills-based and content-based courses. They also explored whether teachers (and students) were equipped with strategies to handle boredom. The research demonstrated that teachers had an extensive range of useful strategies whereas students did not.

As per the fourth category, regarding the effect of teacher boredom on students and class as a whole, Tam et al., (2019) aimed at investigating the effect of teacher boredom on the extent to which learners feel bored during their learning journey. With a sample including 437 students, they found that the more bored a teacher is, the less motivated the learners are prone to feel. It was noted that as students perceive their instructor as bored, they feel bored as well, which then results in a decrease in their motivation levels. Further, the study by Borgonovi et al., (2023) explored the notion of academic boredom and its relationship with the use of ICT. It was reported that when learners use ICT for entertainment purposes, they experience being bored. However, teacher enthusiasm contributed to less boredom, irrespective of ICT usage. Put simply, teacher enthusiasm was found to act as a moderator factor between these two variables.

As mentioned earlier, in spite of undeniable significance of the effect of teacher boredom on the education quality and affections of students, to the best of our knowledge, very few studies have investigated the impact of the use of blended learning teaching method on this concept. Hence, this study seeks to obtain data that would contribute to addressing this research gap.

Methodology

Participants and Sampling

The study aimed to investigate the extent to which Iranian EFL teachers feel bored while using a blended teaching approach. To this end, participants were selected by random sampling technique through the distribution of online questionnaires in online social media groups e.g., Telegram groups. A sample of 78 EFL teachers took part in this research, 41 percent of which were females, as opposed to 59 percent male. As far as their educational level is concerned, 24.4 percent reported holding B.Sc. or B.A. degrees, 51.3 percent M.A. or M.Sc. degrees, 20.5 Ph.D., and 3.8 percent other degrees. As per their teaching experience, 16.7 percent had an experience of less than two years, 26.9 percent 2 to 5 years, 38.5 percent 5 to 10 years, and 17.9 percent over 10 years. With regards to their organizational institute, 44.9

Table 1 *Demographic information of the participants*

Variable		Number	%
Age	Under 20	3	3.8
	20–30	14	17.9
	30–40	38	48.7
	40–50	20	25.6
	Over 50	3	3.8
	Total	78	100.0
Academic Level	BA/B.Sc.	19	24.4
	MA/M.Sc.	40	51.3
	Others	3	3.8
	Ph.D.	16	20.5
	Total	78	100.0
Major	English Language Teaching	18	23.1
	English Language Literature	24	30.8
	English Language Translation	28	35.9
	Other	8	10.3
	Total	78	100.0
Gender	Female	32	41.0
	Male	46	59.0
	Total	78	100.0
Years of Teaching Experience	2–5	21	26.9
	5–10	30	38.5
	Less than 2	13	16.7
	More than 10	14	17.9
	Total	78	100.0
Educational Organization	Institute	35	44.9
	School	10	12.8
	Both (School and Institute)	21	26.9
	Other	12	15.4
	Total	78	100.0

percent were employed in institutes, 12.8 percent in schools, 26.9 percent in both, and 15.4 percent in other organizations, such as universities. Table 1 depicts the demographic features of the participants.

Data Collection and Instruments

To compare how bored English language teachers feel they are while using blended learning, versus traditional class forms, an English questionnaire developed by Kruk et al., (2024), named the “L2 teacher boredom scale”, was distributed via a Google Forms link. With the utmost priority of ethical concerns, they were given an informed consent form prior to the representation of the set of questions. The form ensured their responses remained confidential and informed them regarding the purpose of the study. In the initial part, EFL teachers were supposed to fill in some information regarding their demographic information, and the second part included questions about their perceived boredom. The questionnaire was modified, so that each question was presented in two forms: first, starting with “In traditional teaching methods,”, and second, “While using blended teaching methods,”. The modified version was pilot tested to be revalidated and the Cronbach alpha was found to be 0.7, which is an acceptable rate (Taber, 2018). The questionnaire involved five general factors, being “(F1) repetitiveness and monotony, (F2) inefficient communication, (F3) lack of satisfaction, (F4) lack of creativity, and (F5) lack of interest” (Kruk et al., 2024; p. 12). It involved rating statements such as “While using blended teaching methods, constructing language tests is interesting for me.” on a 7-point Likert scale from ‘completely disagree’ (1) to ‘completely agree’ (7). The answers to each factor were then compared to explore which approach brought more boredom to Iranian EFL teachers.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 27th version. More particularly, Descriptive Statistics, two independent samples T-test (Student, 1908), and repeated measures ANOVA were the main tools to conduct the analyses throughout this study. T-test was used since the research aims to investigate the effects of the use of blended teaching as the independent variable on Iranian EFL teachers’ boredom as the dependent variable. Repeated measures ANOVA was used to investigate the effect of demographic information on boredom levels. Furthermore, the normality of our sample was tested through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, where the Sig. A value of greater than 0.05 represents the normal distribution of the data.

Results

To investigate the effect of using a blended teaching approach on teacher boredom and compare it with traditional teaching methods, a total of 78 EFL teachers were involved in the study. Table 2 depicts the descriptive statistics for the five main factors of the questionnaire.

To probe into whether teacher boredom varies significantly when implementing blended teaching as compared to traditional teaching, initially, the normality of the data for the two teaching procedures was tested through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. According to the results, the data was normally distributed (P-value = 0.200). Subsequently, the two independent samples T-test was employed. Table 3 represents the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Table 4 indicates the difference in terms of each factor involved in the study between the two teaching approaches.

As per the results provided by this test, with regard to the first factor, i.e., repetitiveness and monotony, EFL teachers reported more boredom ($t(10) = 31.222, p = .000$) when implementing a blended teaching approach ($M \pm SD = 436.17 \pm 7.885$) as compared to traditional one ($M \pm SD = 218.00 \pm 15.192$). Similarly, a statistically significant difference ($t(8) = 58.336, p = .000$) was seen in terms of the second

Table 2 Descriptive statistics for (F1) repetitiveness and monotony, (F2) inefficient communication, (F3) lack of satisfaction, (F4) lack of creativity, and (F5) lack of interest

Teaching approach	Factor	Mean	Std. deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Blended Teaching	F1	436.17	7.885	62.167	1.216 ± .845	1.375 ± 1.741
	F2	433.20	6.017	36.200	-.187 ± .913	-.036 ± 2.000
	F3	440.75	3.775	14.250	-.358 ± 1.014	.257 ± 2.619
	F4	439.67	3.055	9.333	.935 ± 1.225	.
	F5	431.00	3.651	13.333	.000 ± 1.014	-3.300 ± 2.619
Traditional Teaching	F1	218.00	15.192	230.800	1.189 ± .845	1.872 ± 1.741
	F2	212.60	5.941	35.300	1.108 ± .913	1.268 ± 2.000
	F3	211.75	5.500	30.250	-1.270 ± 1.014	2.426 ± 2.619
	F4	205.33	9.452	89.333	1.390 ± 1.225	.
	F5	202.00	3.464	12.000	.000 ± 1.014	-6.000 ± 2.619

Table 3 Normality test of Kolmogorov–Smirnov for variables

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Blended Teaching Boredom	.100	22	.200*
Traditional Teaching Boredom	.117	22	.200*

*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 4 Two-independent samples t-test results for each factor

Boredom factor	Teaching approach	M ± SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Repetitiveness and Monotony	Blended Teaching	436.17 ± 7.885	31.222	10	.000
	Traditional Teaching	218.00 ± 15.192			
Inefficient Communication	Blended Teaching	433.20 ± 6.017	58.336	8	.000
	Traditional Teaching	212.60 ± 5.941			
Lack of Satisfaction	Blended Teaching	440.75 ± 3.775	68.657	6	.000
	Traditional Teaching	211.75 ± 5.500			
Lack of Creativity	Blended Teaching	439.67 ± 3.055	40.861	4	.000
	Traditional Teaching	205.33 ± 9.452			
Lack of Interest	Blended Teaching	431.00 ± 3.651	90.995	6	.000
	Traditional Teaching	202.00 ± 3.464			

factor- inefficient communication, where blended teaching was observed to bring about more boredom ($M \pm SD = 433.20 \pm 6.017$) than its counterpart ($M \pm SD = 212.60 \pm 5.941$). Regarding the third factor, likewise, it resulted in more boredom ($t(6) = 68.657$, $p = .000$) while using the blended approach in teaching ($M \pm SD = 440.75 \pm 3.775$) than traditional approaches ($M \pm SD = 211.75 \pm 5.500$).

In addition, lack of creativity was a boredom-causing factor with a considerable difference ($t(4) = 40.861$, $p = .000$) between blended ($M \pm SD = 439.67 \pm 3.055$) as opposed to conventional teaching methods ($M \pm SD = 205.33 \pm 9.452$). Ultimately, the fifth factor, lack of interest, also varied significantly ($t(6) = 90.995$, $p = .000$) between the two covered teaching approaches, where blended education was perceived to lead to more boredom ($M \pm SD = 431.00 \pm 3.651$) than the other one ($M \pm SD = 202.00 \pm 3.464$).

Overall, as can be seen from Table 5, an inclusive test comparing the approaches indicated that blended teaching ($M \pm SD = 1917.80 \pm 492.587$) makes EFL teachers more bored ($t(8) = 3.955$, $p = .004$) than the traditional one ($M \pm SD = 928.40 \pm 265.014$).

Table 5 *Two-independent samples t-test results for the two teaching approaches*

	Teaching approach	M $\pm$ SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
EFL Teachers' Boredom	Blended Teaching	1917.80 $\pm$ 492.587	3.955	8	.004
	Traditional Teaching	928.40 $\pm$ 265.014			

To investigate the effect of demographic variables i.e., age, academic level, major, gender, years of teaching experience, and educational organization on the level of boredom experienced by EFL teachers, repeated measures ANOVA was used. As per Table 6, there is no statistically significant effect on part of the gender of EFL teachers on the level of boredom they experience ($P\text{-value} = 0.142$). Similarly, Age did not show a significant effect with a $P\text{-value}$ of equal to 0.596. The third demographic variable, i.e., years of teaching experience did not have any statistically significant effect as well ($P\text{-value} = 0.093$). with regard to the major of participants, no significant effect was reported on the level of boredom ($P\text{-value} = 0.111$). Likewise, the academic degree EFL teachers hold did not prove to play significant role on the extent to which they feel bored ($P\text{-value} = 0.130$). Thus, it is apparent from the data illustrated in Table 6 that the level of boredom I not affected by the demographic information of EFL teachers in this study.

Table 6 *Repeated measures ANOVA (tests of within-subjects effects)*

Source of variation	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Boredom * Gender	825.879	1	825.879	3.040	.142
Boredom * Age	563.330	3	187.777	.691	.596
Boredom * Years of Teaching Experience	3094.642	3	1031.547	3.797	.093
Boredom * Major	2757.208	3	919.069	3.383	.111
Boredom * Last Academic Degree	2489.674	3	829.891	3.055	.130

Discussion and Conclusion

Due to the prevalence of blended teaching approaches in recent years, the study set out to explore the effect of implementing this approach from teachers' perspectives. To this end, the present research investigated whether the use of this approach can lead to EFL teachers' boredom, comparing it with

the use of conventional and traditional teaching approaches. A scale developed by Kruk et al., (2024) was used to compare the level of boredom experienced by the participants. The questionnaire took five main boredom-causing factors into consideration: (F1) repetitiveness and monotony, (F2) inefficient communication, (F3) lack of satisfaction, (F4) lack of creativity, and (F5) lack of interest. According to the results obtained, EFL teachers experience remarkably greater boredom while using blended learning than traditional teaching methods. In addition, it was found that the extent of boredom EFL instructors experience is not affected by their demographic information i.e., age, academic level, major, gender, years of teaching experience, and educational organization.

This study produced results that corroborate the findings of a great deal of the previous work in this field. For one thing, the findings about the factor of “the lack of interest” are in line with the study carried out by Khajavy et al. (2018), who reported that uninterested and demotivated students can lead to teacher boredom. Moreover, other studies have proven the second factor- inefficient communication between teachers and learners to be very crucial. For instance, Wang (2024) found that as students provide a restricted amount of feedback and involve in fewer activities, their instructor would feel more bored. Moreover, Pawlak et al. (2024) also reported that when the students do not take part in tasks and demonstrate a lower level of English language proficiency, this can result in English teacher boredom.

As per the factor concerning the repetitiveness of teaching, previous studies have also reported the task itself as a pivotal contributor. Pawlak et al. (2024) found that teachers mostly complain about teaching the same grammatical structure several times and found this situation tiresome. Wang (2024) observed that tedious educational materials make Chinese EFL teachers bored. Similarly, according to Dumančić (2018), teachers get bored when dealing with tasks which are grammar-related and not interesting.

In addition, in accordance with the third influential factor, Farrell (2022) also reported that teacher frustration can lead to boredom. The study also suggested that teachers are recommended to express their thoughts and emotions to achieve a better understanding and regulation.

Moreover, implementing tasks that require less creativity would bring about boredom as a person’s mind is not dealing with tasks that require greater cognitive effort. It has also been reported as a precedent of boredom in previous research. As shown by Pawlak et al., (2024), teaching materials that are not challenging can be taken into account as boring.

From an overall perspective, teachers reported that blended teaching approach is more boring as it may be monotonous, requires less communication than in-person classes, they do not have a sufficient degree of satisfaction, creativity, and interest in what they are doing. Further, the absence of significant difference across demographic variables is indicator of boredom not confined to a specific set of EFL teachers and its widespread state and reveals that boredom is a systematic issue related to the design and implementation of blended learning environments themselves. Hence, it could conceivably be hypothesized that emotional factors such as boredom are not merely individual experiences but are formed by broader pedagogical structures. The findings reinforce the idea that teaching in in-person classes engages teachers and the students simultaneously and they are involved in the process of education. They then highlight the need to consider the affective experiences of teachers when evaluating the effectiveness of instructional models.

Pedagogical Implications

Some of the issues emerging from this finding would relate particularly to stakeholders in education, considering the over-reliance of current teaching and educational systems on technology. While implementing blended learning and teaching has proven to be accompanied by several merits, such as

escalation in student achievement (Pardede, 2012), improved performance in the integrated skills of the English language (Hashemi & Na, 2020), and easier access to materials and learning tasks (Sari et al., 2018), the psychological aspects such as the emotions both educators and learners experience should not be overlooked. That being said, they are recommended taking advantage of brainstorming sessions with both parties to consider their concerns and provide an engaging environment as possible. This can lead to an increase in their sense of ownership, reduce feelings of monotony, and foster a more personalized and fulfilling teaching and learning experience. Additionally, teacher training programs should incorporate modules on maintaining engagement and creativity in blended environments and step beyond technical proficiency to encompass strategies for building interaction, variety, and autonomy into blended teaching. Educational institutions should avoid over-reliance on digital materials and ensure that curriculum structures leave room for teacher-led improvisation, collaboration, and discussion. To this end, hybrid approaches that allow for both digital and human-centered teaching elements may mitigate boredom and support deeper engagement. Further, they should establish mechanisms to regularly monitor teacher affective states, including boredom, stress, and burnout. Anonymous surveys or reflective check-ins can provide valuable feedback and pave the way to the identification of areas in need of support.

They can also benefit from specialists in the fields of ergonomics and technology, so that the teaching procedures can be performed in their highest proficiency and lowest undesired side-effects, such as boredom and promote both student and teacher engagement.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Work

First, the study was carried out in the context of Iran and further work is required to include a sample from a wider variety of countries, considering a more extensive range of cultures and beliefs. Furthermore, As the study investigated only English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher, other educational groups can also be taken into consideration, such as those in other disciplines, to take disciplinary variation into account as well. Additionally, the study explored the concept of boredom among a sample of 78 people, which was recommended to be extended for future studies to achieve higher generalizability. Ultimately, several other psychological traits, e.g., anxiety, and burnout, can be subject for further investigation to compare the two teaching approaches (traditional and blended learning).

References

- Abbas, I. D. H., Dehham, S. H., & Akbar, N. A. (2018). The psychological effects of clickers technology on English language students. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 9(10), 740. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.01225.1>
- Ahmad, M., Rashid, R. A., Mansor, N. R., Ahmad, M., Sung, C. M., Hussain, E. M., & Abdullah, N. A. C. (2021, February). The impact of integrating ICT in Malay foreign language teaching and learning. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1793, No. 1, p. 012070). IOP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.1.8>
- Albiladi, W. S., & Alshareef, K. K. (2019). Blended learning in English teaching and learning: A review of the current literature. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(2), 232–238. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1002.03>
- Alebaikan, R., & Troudi, S. (2010). Blended learning in Saudi universities: challenges and perspectives. *ALT-J*, 18(1), 49–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09687761003657614>
- Ali El Deen, A. A. M. M. (2023). Students' boredom in English language classes: Voices from Saudi Arabia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1108372. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1108372>
- Allen, B., Crosky, A., Yench, E., Lutze-Mann, L., Blennerhassett, P., Lebard, R., ... & Wilk, K. (2010). A model for transformation: A trans-disciplinary approach to disseminating good practice in

- blended learning in science faculty. *Curriculum, technology & transformation for unknown future. Proceedings of ascilite Sydney*, 36–48. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228784331_A_model_for_transformation_A_transdisciplinary_approach_to_disseminating_good_practice_in_blended_learning_in_a_science_faculty
- Altay, I. F., & Altay, A. (2019). A systematic review of studies on blended learning in EFL environment. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 11(1), 125–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/20812>
- Asaad Hamza Sheerah, H. (2020). Using blended learning to support the teaching of English as a foreign language. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL*, (6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.13>
- Asabere, N. Y., & Enguah, S. E. Development of an Information & Communication Technology (ICT) Business Model for Electronic Learning (E-Learning). *International Journal of Engineering Science & Advanced Technology*, 2(5), 1178–1191. <http://www.ijesat.org/>
- Bench, S. W., & Lench, H. C. (2013). On the function of boredom. *Behavioral Sciences*, 3(3), 459–472. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs3030459>
- Benson, V., & Anderson, D. (2010). Towards a strategic approach to the introduction of blended learning: Challenges faced and lessons learned. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01066.x>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2013.48A001>
- Bojović, M. D. (2017). Blended learning as a foreign language learning environment. *Teme-Časopis za Društvene Nauke*, 41(4), 1017–1036.
- Borgonovi, F., Pokropek, M., & Pokropek, A. (2023). Relations between academic boredom, academic achievement, ICT use, and teacher enthusiasm among adolescents. *Computers & Education*, 200, 104807. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104807>
- Bumela, L. (2020). Designing 21st century language learning scenario in Indonesia: A Perspective from computer-assisted language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Arabic Studies*, 2(1), 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/ijas.v2i1.6106>
- Chapelle, C. A. (2005). Computer-assisted language learning. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 743–755). Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470694138.ch41>
- Chapelle, C. A. (2010). The spread of computer-assisted language learning. *Language teaching*, 43(1), 66–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005850>
- Chen, X., Zou, D., Xie, H. R., & Su, F. (2021). Twenty-five years of computer-assisted language learning: A topic modeling analysis. *Language Learning & Technology*, 25(3), 151–185.
- Chouthaiwale, S. S., & Alkamel, M. A. A. (2018). The positive effect of ICT on the English language learning and teaching. *Proceedings of Dialoguing Borders: Vital Issues in Humanities, Commerce, IT and Management*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329572050_The_positive_Effect_of_ICT_on_the_English_Language_Learning_and_Teaching
- 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>
- Daschmann, E. C., Goetz, T., & Stupnisky, R. H. (2014). Exploring the antecedents of boredom: Do teachers know why students are bored? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 39, 22–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.11.009>
- Derakhshan, A., Kruk, M., Mehdizadeh, M., & Pawlak, M. (2021). 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., Wang, Y., & Ghiasvand, F. (2024). “I never make a permanent decision based on a temporary emotion”: Unveiling EFL teachers’ perspectives about emotions in assessment. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(6), 2659–2684. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0089>

- Desai, N. (2023). A study on the role of ICT in Language learning. *Revista Review Index Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 3(1), 05–11. <https://doi.org/10.31305/rrijm2023.v03.n01.002> <https://doi.org/10.31305/rrijm2023.v03.n01.002>
- Dumančić, D. (2018). Investigating boredom among EFL teachers. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 6(1), 57–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/exell-2019-0006>
- Enayati, F., & Gilakjani, A. P. (2020). The impact of computer assisted language learning (CALL) on improving intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(1), 96–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.10560>
- Eren, A. (2016). Unidirectional cycles of boredom, boredom coping strategies, and engagement among prospective teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19, 895–924. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11218-016-9348-8>
- Farrell, T. S. (2022). 'I felt a sense of panic, disorientation and frustration all at the same time': the important role of emotions in reflective practice. *Reflective Practice*, 23(3), 382–393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2038125>
- Garcia-Ponce, E. E., & Mora-Pablo, I. (2020). Challenges of using a blended learning approach: A flipped classroom in an English teacher education program in Mexico. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 10(2), 116–133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v10i2.1209>
- Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems. *The handbook of blended learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs*, 1, 3–21. https://www.researchgate.net/deref/httpspercent3Apercent2Fpercent2Fcreativecommons.orgpercent2Flicensespercent2Fby-nc-sapercent2F4.0percent2F?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGF-nZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19
- Garrett, N. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning trends and issues revisited: Integrating innovation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 719–740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00969.x>
- Goetz, T., & Hall, N. C. (2014). Academic boredom. In *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 311–330). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203148211>
- Harvi Singh, H., & Reed, C. (2001). A white paper: achieving success with blended learning. Retrieved April, 10, 2006.
- Hashemi, A., & Na, K. S. (2020). The effects of using blended learning in teaching and learning English: A review of literature. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences*, 18, 173–179.
- Hidayati, T. (2016). Integrating ICT in English language teaching and learning in Indonesia. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 3(1), 38–61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v3i1.173>
- Hockly, N. (2018). Blended learning. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx058>
- Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2011). The rise of K–12 blended learning. *Social Innovations Journal*, (6). <https://socialinnovationsjournal.com/index.php/sij/article/view/7985>
- Hubbard, P., & Levy, M. (2016). Theory in computer-assisted language learning research and practice. In *The Routledge handbook of language learning and technology* (pp. 24–38). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657899>
- Jarvis, H., & Achilleos, M. (2013). From Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) to Mobile Assisted Language Use (MALU). *Tesl-ej*, 16(4), n4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0768.pub2>
- Keller, M. M., Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Pekrun, R., & Hensley, L. (2014). Exploring teacher emotions: A literature review and an experience sampling study. *Teacher motivation*, 69–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203119273-5>
- Khajavy, G. H., Ghonsooly, B., Fatemi, A. H., & Frenzel, A. C. (2018). Antecedents of pleasant and unpleasant emotions of EFL teachers using an appraisal–theoretical framework. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(2), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2018.120559>

- Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2018). Boredom in practical English language classes: Insights from interview data. *Interdisciplinary views on the English language, literature and culture*, 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211064944>
- Kruk, M., Pawlak, M., Shirvan, M. E., & Taherian, T. (2024). Factor structure and psychometric properties of the L2 teacher boredom scale. *System*, 125, 103403. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103403>
- Le, T. N., Allen, B., & Johnson, N. F. (2022). Blended learning: Barriers and drawbacks for English language lecturers at Vietnamese universities. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 19(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530211048235>
- 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., & Hu, Y. (2023). Foreign language learning boredom: Conceptualization and measurement. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(2), 223–249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0124>
- Lim, M. H., & Aryadoust, V. (2022). A scientometric review of research trends in computer-assisted language learning (1977–2020). *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2675–2700. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1892768>
- Lisa, R., Tina, S., Robert, S., and Nett, U. E. (2017). Perceived academic control and academic emotions predict undergraduate university student success: examining effects on dropout intention and achievement. *Front. Psychol.* 8, 243. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00243> <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00243>
- Mahawan, K., & Langprayoon, P. (2020, November). The effect of blended learning with collaborative learning upon English communication skills of English teaching program students. In *2020 5th International STEM Education Conference (iSTEM-Ed)* (pp. 55–58). IEEE. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/iSTEM-Ed50324.2020.9332775>
- Mei, B., Brown, G. T., & Teo, T. (2018). Toward an understanding of preservice English as a Foreign Language teachers' acceptance of computer-assisted language learning 2.0 in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 56(1), 74–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0735633117700144>
- Mohamed, S., & Adnan, F. (2020). Feedback in computer-assisted language learning: a meta-analysis. *TESL-EJ*, 24(2), n2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/2008954>
- Nazeer, I., Sonam, S., & Sadia, S. (2023). The impact of computer-assisted language learning on second language acquisition. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(4), 27–38. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/the-impact-of-computer-assisted-language-learning-on-second-language-acquisition> (accessed: 13.02.2025)
- Nissen, E., & Tea, E. (2012). Going blended: new challenges for second generation L2 tutors. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.636052>
- Okonu, K. N., & Ibenne, S. K. (2023). Utilization of information and communication technology and students' learning activities in secondary school libraries in Emohua local government area, Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Technologies in Library and Information Management*, 9(2), 26–42.
- Padurean, A., & Margan, M. (2009). Foreign language teaching via ICT. *Revista de Informatica Sociala*, VII(12). <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?>
- Pardede, P. (2012). Blended Learning for ELT. *Online Submission*, 2(3), 165–178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33541/jet.v2i3.54>
- Park, M., & Son, J. B. (2022). Pre-service EFL teachers' readiness in computer-assisted language learning and teaching. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 42(2), 320–334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1815649>

- Parmaxi, A., & Zaphiris, P. (2016). Computer-mediated communication in computer-assisted language learning: implications for culture-centered design. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 15, 169–177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10209-015-0405-4>
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020). The neglected emotion of boredom in teaching English to advanced learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 497–509. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12302>
- Pawlak, M., Derakhshan, A., Mehdizadeh, M., & Kruk, M. (2021). Boredom in online English language classes: Mediating variables and coping strategies. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688211064944. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/13621688211064944>
- Pawlak, M., Kruk, M., & Zawodniak, J. (2024). Teachers reflecting on boredom in the language classroom. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssl.t.42828>
- Pawlak, M., Kruk, M., Zawodniak, J., & Pasikowski, S. (2022). Examining the underlying structure of after-class boredom experienced by English majors. *System*, 106, 102769. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102769>
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020a). *Boredom in the foreign language classroom: A micro-perspective*. Springer Nature. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50769-5>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Daniels, L. M., Stupnisky, R. H., and Perry, R. P. (2010). Boredom in achievement settings: exploring control–value antecedents and performance outcomes of a neglected emotion. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 102, 531–549. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019243>
- Putwain, D., Pekrun, R., Nicholson, L., Symes, W., Becker, S., & Marsh, H. (2018). Control-value appraisals, enjoyment, and boredom in mathematics. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(6), 1339–1368. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218786689>
- Ramalingam, S., Yunus, M. M., & Hashim, H. (2022). Exploring English as a second language educators’ challenges of teaching communication skills in blended learning environments: A Malaysian scenario. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(2), 1388–1405.
- Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 144, 103701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701>
- Rasskazova, T., Muzafarova, A., Daminova, J., & Okhotnikova, A. (2017). Challenges of teaching a blended English course to university students. In *The International Scientific Conference eLearning and Software for Education* (Vol. 3, p. 303). “Carol I” National Defence University.
- Remizantseva, K. (2019). Using the model of blended learning in teaching the English language to students of non-language specialties. *Проблеми інженерно-педагогічної освіти*, 64, 143–154.
- Sabiri, K. A. (2020). ICT in EFL teaching and learning: a systematic literature review. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 11(2), 177–195. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cet.665350>
- Sari, I. F., Rahayu, A., Apriliandari, D. I., & Sulisworo, D. (2018). Blended learning: Improving student’s motivation in English teaching learning process. *International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching*, 6(1), 163–170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18298/ijlet.2434>
- Sejdiu, S. (2014). English language teaching and assessment in blended learning. *Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology*, 67–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14434/jotlt.v3n2.5043>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2014.1000282>
- Shen, G. (2022). Anxiety, boredom, and burnout among EFL teachers: the mediating role of emotion regulation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 842920. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.842920>
- Smith, G. G., & Kurthen, H. (2007, July). Front-stage and back-stage in hybrid e-learning face-to-face courses. In *International Journal on E-Learning* (Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 455–474). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

- Sriwichai, C. (2020). Students' Readiness and Problems in Learning English through Blended Learning Environment. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 6(1), 23–34.
- Stockwell, G., & Reinders, H. (2019). Technology, motivation and autonomy, and teacher psychology in language learning: Exploring the myths and possibilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39, 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190519000084>
- Student. (1908). The probable error of a mean. *Biometrika*, 6(1): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2331554>.
- Sulea, C., Van Beek, I., Sarbescu, P., Virga, D., and Schaufeli, W. B. (2015). Engagement, boredom, and burnout among students: basic need satisfaction matters more than personality traits. *Learn. Individ. Differ.* 42, 132–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.08.018>
- Sylvén, L. K., & Sundqvist, P. (2017). Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) in extracurricular/extramural contexts. *CALICO Journal*, 34(1), i–iv. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/cj.31822>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tafazoli, D., María, E. G., & Abril, C. A. H. (2019). Intelligent language tutoring system: Integrating intelligent computer-assisted language learning into language education. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE)*, 15(3), 60–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/IJICTE.2019070105>
- Tam, K. Y., Poon, C. Y., Hui, V. K., Wong, C. Y., Kwong, V. W., Yuen, G. W., & Chan, C. S. (2020). Boredom begets boredom: An experience sampling study on the impact of teacher boredom on student boredom and motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 124–137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12309>
- Teng, X., & Zeng, Y. (2022). The effects of blended learning on foreign language learners' oral English competence. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(2), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpsls.1202.09>
- Tomlinson, B., & Whittaker, C. (2013). Blended learning in English language teaching. *London: British Council*, 252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000366>
- Wang, Y. (2024). Probing into the boredom of online instruction among Chinese English language teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Current Psychology*, 43(13), 12144–12158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-04223-3>
- Yu, X. (2022). The English as a foreign language learners' psychological and emotional perception on technology integration in language classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 906750. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.906750>

Appendix

L2 Teacher Boredom Scale (Kruk et al., 2024) (F1) repetitiveness and monotony (questions 1, 2, 6, 7, 16, 18), (F2) inefficient communication (questions 3, 4, 5, 12, 15), (F3) lack of satisfaction (questions 10, 11, 13, 14), (F4) lack of creativity (questions 19, 20, 21), and (F5) lack of interest (questions 8, 9, 17, 22).

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. While using technology in my teaching process, constructing language tests is interesting for me.							
2. While using technology in my teaching process, I am bored during test administration.							
3. While using technology in my teaching process, I am not bored talking to students who communicate in English poorly.							
4. While using technology in my teaching process, I feel bored in a class of passive students.							
5. While using technology in my teaching process, I feel tired explaining simple things which are too difficult for my students.							
6. While using technology in my teaching process, I do not get bored teaching the same material.							
7. While using technology in my teaching process, I get bored teaching some things (e.g., grammar, listening, writing).							
8. While using technology in my teaching process, time often seems to be passing slowly when I teach English.							
9. While using technology in my teaching process, teaching English often means doing repetitive or monotonous things.							

(Continue)

(Continued)

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. While using technology in my teaching process, I am often excited about teaching English.							
11. While using technology in my teaching process, I often feel like teaching English.							
12. While using technology in my teaching process, If I am not teaching something more challenging, I feel tired and bored.							
13. While using technology in my teaching process, it seems that teaching English is the same all the time; it is getting boring.							
14. While using technology in my teaching process, it is easy for me to concentrate while teaching English.							
15. While using technology in my teaching process, having to listen to my students who speak English poorly bores me tremendously.							
16. While using technology in my teaching process, checking my students' assignments bores me immensely.							
17. While using technology in my teaching process, it happens that in the classroom I just sit at my desk pretending to be doing something (important).							
18. While using technology in my teaching process, in situations where I have to wait (e.g., for my students to finish an assignment or during tests), I get restless.							
19. While using technology in my teaching process, many people would say that I am a creative and imaginative English teacher.							

(Continue)

(Continued)

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
20. While using technology in my teaching process, I am very active when it comes to teaching English.							
21. While using technology in my teaching process, I often try to come up with new ways of teaching English.							
22. While using technology in my teaching process, I get restless and I cannot wait for the class to end.							
23. While using traditional approaches teaching process, constructing language tests is interesting for me.							
24. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I am bored during test administration.							
25. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I am not bored talking to students who communicate in English poorly.							
26. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I feel bored in a class of passive students.							
27. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I feel tired explaining simple things which are too difficult for my students.							
28. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I do not get bored teaching the same material.							
29. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I get bored teaching some things (e.g., grammar, listening, writing).							

(Continue)

(Continued)

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
30. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, time often seems to be passing slowly when I teach English.							
31. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, teaching English often means doing repetitive or monotonous things.							
32. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I am often excited about teaching English.							
33. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I often feel like teaching English.							
34. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, If I am not teaching something more challenging, I feel tired and bored.							
35. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, it seems that teaching English is the same all the time; it is getting boring.							
36. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, it is easy for me to concentrate while teaching English.							
37. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, having to listen to my students who speak English poorly bores me tremendously.							
38. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, checking my students' assignments bores me immensely.							
39. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, it happens that in the classroom I just sit at my desk pretending to be doing something (important).							

(Continue)

(Continued)

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
40. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, in situations where I have to wait (e.g., for my students to finish an assignment or during tests), I get restless.							
41. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, many people would say that I am a creative and imaginative English teacher.							
42. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I am very active when it comes to teaching English.							
43. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I often try to come up with new ways of teaching English.							
44. While using traditional approaches in my teaching process, I get restless and I cannot wait for the class to end.							