Psychopreneur Journal 2025, 9(2): 102-114
ISSN 2598-649X cetak/ ISSN 2598-6503 online

The Influence of Intrinsic Motivation and Free Time Management on Leisure Boredom Among University Students

Mario Rizky Yuwono*[1]
Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Airlangga

Endah Mastuti
Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Airlangga

Abstract. Leisure boredom is a significant concern among university students, as flexible class schedules may increase its prevalence. Leisure boredom has been linked to negative mental health outcomes and engagement in risky behaviors. Prior research suggests that intrinsic motivation and effective free time management can reduce leisure boredom. However, cultural differences necessitate caution when generalizing these findings to the Indonesian context. This study investigates the influence of intrinsic motivation and free time management on leisure boredom among Indonesian university students. A quantitative research design was employed, utilizing an online survey administered to 157 active university students recruited through social media. Translated and modified LBS, IMI, and FTMS were used as measurement tool. Multiple regression analysis was conducted using Jamovi software. The results indicate that (1) intrinsic motivation and free time management, when considered together, do not significantly predict leisure boredom ($R^2 = 0.242$, $p < .001$), (2) intrinsic motivation independently has a significant effect on leisure boredom ($\beta = -0.518$, $p < .001$), and (3) free time management does not exert a significant influence ($\beta = 0.015$, $p = .887$). These findings underscore the critical role of intrinsic motivation in alleviating leisure boredom among Indonesian university students. Author proposed universities to provide opportunities for students to develop awareness of leisure activities, leisure boredom, and coping strategies by creating leisure specific programs.

Keywords*: free time management, leisure boredom, intrinsic motivation, university student, leisure*

Abstrak. Kebosanan waktu luang merupakan masalah penting di kalangan mahasiswa, karena jadwal perkuliahan yang fleksibel dapat meningkatkan prevalensinya. Kebosanan waktu luang telah dikaitkan dengan dampak negatif terhadap kesehatan mental dan keterlibatan dalam perilaku berisiko. Penelitian sebelumnya menunjukkan bahwa motivasi intrinsik dan manajemen waktu luang yang efektif dapat mengurangi kebosanan waktu luang. Namun, perbedaan budaya mengharuskan kehati-hatian dalam menggeneralisasi temuan tersebut ke konteks Indonesia. Penelitian ini mengkaji pengaruh motivasi intrinsik dan manajemen waktu luang terhadap kebosanan waktu luang pada mahasiswa Indonesia. Desain penelitian kuantitatif digunakan dengan menyebarkan survei online kepada 157 mahasiswa aktif yang direkrut melalui media sosial. Alat ukur yang digunakan adalah LBS, IMI, dan FTMS yang telah diterjemahkan dan dimodifikasi. Analisis regresi berganda dilakukan menggunakan perangkat lunak Jamovi. Temuan ini mengindikasikan bahwa (1) motivasi intrinsik dan manajemen waktu luang secara bersama-sama tidak secara signifikan memprediksi kebosanan waktu luang ($R^2 = 0.242$, $p < .001$), (2) motivasi intrinsik secara independen memiliki pengaruh signifikan terhadap kebosanan waktu luang ($\beta = -0.518$, $p < .001$), dan (3) manajemen waktu luang tidak memberikan pengaruh yang signifikan ($\beta = 0.015$, $p = .887$). Hasil ini menegaskan peran kritis motivasi intrinsik dalam mengurangi kebosanan waktu luang di kalangan mahasiswa Indonesia. Penulis mengusulkan agar universitas menyediakan peluang bagi mahasiswa untuk mengembangkan kesadaran akan aktivitas waktu luang, kebosanan waktu luang, dan strategi mengatasinya dengan menciptakan program-program khusus terkait waktu luang.

Kata kunci: *kebosanan waktu luang, mahasiswa, manajemen waktu bebas, motivasi intrinsik, waktu luang*

[1] **Correspondence**: Mario Rizky Yuwono. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Airlangga. Jl. Airlangga No.4-6, Airlangga, Kecamatan Gubeng, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60115. Email: mario.rizky.yuwono-2021@psikologi.unair.ac.id

Leisure activity refers to the use of free time for activities beyond obligations or basic needs. The purpose of these activities is to engage in meaningful experiences that intrinsically motivate individuals to feel enjoyment, fun, refreshment, and pleasure (Veal, 1992; Wegner, 2011). Ideally, individuals should engage in leisure activities that are optimally arousing and psychologically rewarding. However, in reality, not all individuals can utilize their free time optimally and beneficially. Those who perceive themselves as having a lot of leisure time but few activities, or who experience a mismatch between expectations and reality in their leisure experiences, are at risk of experiencing leisure boredom (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990).

Leisure boredom occurs when individuals experience a lack of satisfaction, lack of enjoyment, and lack of arousal due to their inability to optimize their free time(Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990) A study by the International Social Survey Programme, involving 52,000 respondents from 36 countries, found a prevalence of leisure boredom at 37.8%, indicating that it is a universal phenomenon (Haller et al., 2013). In Indonesia, leisure boredom is particularly relevant among university students, as flexible class schedules and increased free time, especially in the later semesters, can heighten the risk of boredom (Kosasih et al., 2021).

Leisure boredom negatively impacts students' mental health, including decreased well-being, psychological resilience, and leisure satisfaction (Dursun et al., 2021; Serdar et al., 2022; Wu-Ouyang, 2023), and triggers emotional distress (Kil et al., 2021). Furthermore, leisure boredom is associated with increased risky behaviors among students, such as internet addiction tendency, gaming disorder risk, and smartphone addiction (Kara, 2019; Kosasih et al., 2021; Serdar et al., 2022; Wang, 2019; Yuwono & Virlia, 2022). If left unaddressed, these negative impacts can affect students' academic aspects, including declines in learning achievement, academic achievement, academic performance, academic success, and learning performance (Floros et al., 2024; Foen Ng et al., 2013; Javaeed et al., 2020; Kuo et al., 2021; Sakız & Aftab, 2019; Yu et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2024).

Preliminary data were collected to gain an updated understanding of leisure boredom among Indonesian university students. The initial data were gathered from 200 active university students across various levels using convenience sampling by distributing an online survey through social media. The questionnaire used was *Leisure Boredom Scale* by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990) that has been translated and validated for this article. The results showed that 46.5% of students felt that time passed very slowly during their free time, and 47.5% did not enjoy their leisure activities but were unsure of alternative activities. Additionally, 54% of students wanted to do something in their free time but did not know what to do. Moreover, 44.5% of students spent a significant portion of their free time sleeping.

Research on leisure boredom in Indonesia remains limited, with only four studies recorded in the GARUDA database between 2014 and 2024. These studies examine leisure boredom in relation to phubbing, internet addiction, and gaming disorder risk (Kosasih et al., 2021; Putri & Rusli, 2021; Wazkia & Yanna Primanita, 2023; Yuwono & Virlia, 2022). In contrast, at the international level, at least 14 related studies were found in the Scopus database over the same period. These studies discuss leisure boredom in contexts such as risky behaviors, substance

use, technology use, and mental health. These international studies were conducted in Belgium, South Africa, Taiwan, China, Turkey, the United States, and Germany (Çakır, 2019; Dursun et al., 2021; Kil et al., 2021; Layland et al., 2021; Leung, 2015; Leung & Zhang, 2016; Miller et al., 2014; Spaeth et al., 2015; Spruyt et al., 2018; Tan & Lu, 2019; Wang, 2019; Weybright et al., 2015; Wu-Ouyang, 2022; Wu-Ouyang, 2023).

A research gap in Indonesia regarding leisure boredom, particularly as a dependent variable, was identified. In Indonesia, although leisure boredom has been identified as a contributing factor to social issues such as phubbing, internet addiction, and gaming disorder, there is a lack of research that has made leisure boredom the primary focus of research. Finkielsztein's literature review suggests that the lack of research happened because many researchers considered any type of boredom as a trivial emotion/problem compared to other social issues, therefore being undermined and neglected for the "bigger" and "visible" social issues (Finkielsztein, 2021; Finkielsztein, 2022) is study positions leisure boredom as the dependent variable, hoping to fill the gap and provide insight in the Indonesian context.

Intrinsic motivation, which refers to the natural drive to engage in activities for the inherent satisfaction and enjoyment they provide, is one of the factors influencing leisure boredom (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2020). Research have shown that intrinsic motivation affects leisure boredom(Barnett & Klitzing, 2006; Weissinger et al., 1992). Another factor influencing leisure boredom is free time management, which involves applying techniques to plan and organize activities during free time. The goal is to enhance the quality of experiences during uncommitted time. Previous studies indicate that free time management affects leisure boredom(Çakır, 2019; Wang, 2019).

While intrinsic motivation and effective free time management have been shown to reduce such boredom in Western contexts (Barnett & Klitzing, 2006; Wang et al., 2011), cultural differences in time perception and motivation (Hall, 1959; Hofstede, 2011) suggest these relationships may vary in Indonesia.

Hall, in his book *Silent Language* (1959) explains the differences in time perception between Western and Eastern societies. Western societies emphasize punctuality and structured activities, whereas Eastern societies are more relaxed and flexible, viewing time as cycles (Hall, 1959). These findings align with an international survey which revealed that Asian societies focus on the present and perceive time as cycles, while Western societies see time as a resource to be maximized (Haller et al., 2013).

Haller et al. (2013) survey also found differences in leisure activity motivations and preferences between Asian and Western societies. Asians tend to engage in leisure activities that benefit the collective well-being, whereas Western societies prioritize individual well-being. These findings are consistent with Hofstede's cultural model, which states that Western countries score high on Indulgence and Individualism, while Asian countries score high on Restraint and Collectivism (Hofstede, 2011).

This study aims to further investigate these relationships by considering external validity—examining the extent to which research findings can be generalized across different measurements, populations, and time periods (Steckler & McLeroy, 2008). Based on cultural differences, there is a justification to explore whether these

findings can also be generalized within the context of the Indonesian population. The research question for this study is: **"Can intrinsic motivation and free time management affect leisure boredom among university students?"**

METHOD

Research Design

A quantitative approach with a correlational design is employed in this study. Intrinsic motivation is designated as Independent Variable 1, free time management as Independent Variable 2, and leisure boredom as the Dependent Variable.

Participant and Location

The population in this study consists of university students in **Indonesia**. The criteria for respondents include students of any academic level (D1-D4, S1-S3) who are currently enrolled in an active study program.

Research Instrument

The measurement tools used in this study are the **Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI)**, **Free Time Management Scale (FTMS)**, and **Leisure Boredom Scale (LBS)**.

These measurement tools have undergone a **forward translation** and **back translation** process from English to Indonesian by two translators. Additionally, their validity was tested using the **Content Validity Index (CVI)** to assess the relevance, importance, and clarity of the instruments, evaluated by three raters. The translation process was conducted to ensure content equivalence between the original and translated versions (Beaton et al., 2000). The validity test using the Content Validity Index (CVI) was conducted to ensure that the measurement instruments are relevant and accurately represent the psychological concepts being studied (Yusoff, 2019). The author also collected 200 respondents to conduct **Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)** and reliability testing after the translation process and CVI assessment.

The Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) is an instrument used to measure intrinsic motivation (Ryan et al., n.d.). This inventory consists of six subscales and 45 items. In this study, the author utilizes two subscales: interest/enjoyment and perceived competence. The subscales were modified to assess the three dimensions of intrinsic motivation—interest, enjoyment, and satisfaction—as proposed by Ryan and Deci (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2020). The modification of the interest/enjoyment subscale into separate dimensions was done by distinguishing items that measure interest and enjoyment. The modification of the perceived competence subscale into the satisfaction dimension was based on the presence of items measuring satisfaction, such as *"I am satisfied with my performance at this task"* and *"After working at this activity for a while, I felt pretty competent."* Items from the perceived competence subscale that strictly measured competence were excluded from the modified instrument.

The initial instrument consisted of 13 items in statement form, using a 5-point Likert scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly Agree). One interest dimension item was removed due to a factor loading < 0.4, and four satisfaction dimension items were excluded as they measured perceived competence rather than satisfaction. From the initial 13 items, a final set of 8 items was used. The final CFA results were: CFI = 0.985, TLI = 0.975, SRMR = 0.0447, RMSEA = 0.0702. The instrument demonstrated good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.883 to 0.890.

The Free Time Management Scale (FTMS) is a multidimensional instrument used to measure free time management (Wang et al., 2011). This scale comprises four dimensions: setting goals and priorities, free time management techniques, attitudes toward free time, and preferences for organizing and scheduling activities.

It consists of 15 items in statement form, using a 5-point Likert scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly Agree). One preference for organizing and scheduling activities item was removed due to a factor loading < 0.4, leaving a total of 14 final items used in the study. The final CFA results were: CFI = 0.904, TLI = 0.877, SRMR = 0.0590, and a RMSEA = 0.0105. The instrument demonstrated good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.779 to 0.874.

The Leisure Boredom Scale (LBS) is an instrument used to measure leisure boredom (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990). This scale is a unidimensional scale that measures the perception of free time as boredom. It consists of 16 items in statement form, using a 5-point Likert scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly Agree). Eight items were removed due to factor loadings < 0.4, leaving a final set of eight items for use. The final CFA results were: CFI = 0.948, TLI = 0.927, SRMR = 0.0426, RMSEA = 0.0958. The instrument demonstrated good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.882.

Data Collection

Convenience sampling was used by distributing a Google Forms survey link through social media platforms such as Twitter, WhatsApp, Line, and Instagram. The data collection period spanned from September 4, 2024, to September 25, 2024. The survey distribution was facilitated by asking the author's colleagues to share the link on their respective social media accounts.

A total of 370 responses were collected, but after a data screening process, 13 responses were eliminated due to ambiguous demographic information that could not be coded. Ultimately, 357 valid responses were retained. From this dataset, 200 responses were used for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). These same 200 responses then used as preliminary data, while the remaining 157 responses were utilized as this article's main data. Both preliminary data and main data was analyzed using questionnaires that has been validated with CFA.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted using Jamovi software, with several assumption tests performed before hypothesis testing. These assumption tests included **correlation tests**, **normality tests**, **linearity tests**, **autocorrelation tests**, **outlier tests**, **multicollinearity tests**, and **homoscedasticity tests**. The hypothesis was then tested using **multiple regression analysis** to examine the relationships between the variables.

Based on Pearson correlation tests, intrinsic motivation and free time management were found to be significantly correlated with leisure boredom, with correlation values of -0.492 and -0.367 ($p < 0.001$). The Shapiro-Wilk normality test indicated that the data was not normally distributed, but Q-Q plots showed that the data could still be considered normal. The linearity test confirmed a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The autocorrelation test, with a Durbin-Watson value of 2.08 and p-value of 0.604, indicated no significant

autocorrelation. The outlier test showed no significant influence on the model. The multicollinearity test, with a VIF value of 2.36 and a tolerance value of 0.423, indicated no multicollinearity issues. The homoscedasticity test revealed heteroscedasticity in the data, leading to the use of Bootstrap BCa with 1000 resamples to ensure the validity of the results.

Table 1 (preliminary data) and table 2 (main data) described the university student's leisure boredom while Table 3 shows the distribution of participants across several categories.

Table 1. Leisure Boredom Preliminary Data

No.	Items (In Bahasa Indonesia)	Stongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
1	Waktu luang terasa sangat lambat	16.5	16.5	19.5	19	27.5
2	Waktu luang terasa membosankan	21.5	20	17.5	14.5	26.5
3	Selama waktu luang merasa hanya membuang-buang waktu	27.5	13	21	15	22.5
4	Selama waktu luang, sering kali tidak menyukai apa yang dilakukan namun tidak tahu apalagi yang bisa saya lakukan	21	15.5	15	20	27.5
5	Selama waktu luang, ingin melakukan sesuatu tapi tidak tahu yang harus dilakukan	12.5	15	18.5	21	33
6	Menghabiskan terlalu banyak waktu luang untuk tidur	20.5	14.5	19.5	18	26.5
7	Aktivitas waktu luang tidak membuat bersemangat	31	23.5	19	14	12.5
8	Tidak memiliki banyak keterampilan waktu luang	20	23	28	12.5	15

Table 2. Leisure Boredom Main Data

No.	Items (In Bahasa Indonesia)	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
1	Waktu luang terasa sangat lambat	24	11	11	19	33
2	Waktu luang terasa membosankan	25	15	13	19	26
3	Selama waktu luang merasa hanya membuang-buang waktu	31	15	16	14	24
4	Selama waktu luang, sering kali tidak menyukai apa yang dilakukan namun tidak tahu apalagi yang bisa saya lakukan	22	15	15	21	26
5	Selama waktu luang, ingin melakukan sesuatu tapi tidak tahu yang harus dilakukan	18	11	14	23	34
6	Menghabiskan terlalu banyak waktu luang untuk tidur	24	19	18	15	23
7	Aktivitas waktu luang tidak membuat bersemangat	32	14	24	12	17
8	Tidak memiliki banyak keterampilan waktu luang	24	18	25	15	17

Table 3. Demographic Data

Demographics	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Age	-	-	-
18 - 25	83	52.9 %	52.9 %
26 - 45	73	46.5 %	99.4 %
46 - 65	1	0.6 %	100.0 %
Sex	-	-	-
Female	131	83.4 %	83.4 %
Male	26	16.6 %	100.0 %
Current Educational Level	-	-	-
D3 (Diploma 3)	18	11.5 %	11.5 %
S1 (Bachelor's Degree)	100	63.7 %	75.2 %
S2 (Master's Degree)	12	7.6 %	82.8 %
D1 (Diploma 1)	21	13.4 %	96.2 %
S3 (Doctoral Degree)	2	1.3 %	97.5 %
D2 (Diploma 2)	4	2.5 %	100.0 %
Employment Status	-	-	-
Employed	53	33.8 %	33.8 %
Unemployed	104	66.2 %	100.0 %

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The model demonstrated a relationship between intrinsic motivation, free time management, and leisure boredom, with an R-value of 0.492 and an R^2 value of 0.242, meaning that 24.2% of the variance in leisure boredom could be explained by the model. With a significance level of $p < 0.001$, the model was found to be statistically significant. However, intrinsic motivation contributed significantly to the model, with a coefficient of -0.518 ($p < 0.001$), indicating that an increase in intrinsic motivation led to a decrease in leisure boredom. Conversely, free time management was not found to be a significant predictor, with a coefficient of 0.015 ($p = 0.887$). Therefore, this study concludes that only intrinsic motivation has a significant effect on leisure boredom, while free time management does not.

This study found that intrinsic motivation contributes to reducing leisure boredom. These results align with previous research which indicated that intrinsic motivation can decrease leisure boredom among students (Barnett & Klitzing, 2006; Weissinger et al., 1992). These findings also support the Self-Determination Theory proposed by Ryan and Deci, which suggests that intrinsic motivation is a primary driver for individuals to engage in activities that provide satisfaction and enjoyment (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2020). A total of 46% of students reported that their leisure activities made them feel excited and that they did not perceive them as a waste of time. This suggests that intrinsic motivation encourages students to participate in activities aligned with their interests and preferences, ultimately reducing leisure boredom.

On the other hand, 47% of students reported not enjoying their leisure activities but feeling they had no alternatives, while 57% expressed a desire to do something but did not know what. This indicates a lack of intrinsic motivation, as the activities they engage in do not provide satisfaction or enjoyment, or they are forced to participate in activities they do not enjoy, leading to leisure boredom due to the absence of enjoyable alternatives (monotony). This condition worsens leisure boredom, aligning with Ryan and Deci's Self-Determination Theory, which explains that in the stage of amotivation, individuals lack the drive to engage in activities due to feelings of incompetence, lack of interest, or an unclear connection between the activity and their personal goals (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2020).

The results of this study imply that intrinsic motivation is relevant to students from Eastern countries, despite contradicting the findings of Haller et al. and Hofstede, which suggest that external motivation is more dominant among individuals from Eastern cultures. (Haller et al., 2013; Hofstede, 2011). The explanation regarding the relevance of intrinsic motivation can be explains that the high level of intrinsic motivation in individuals from Eastern countries is due to the process of "internalization" of extrinsic motivation, where external factors are seen as internalized by the individual (Hagger et al., 2014).

This study found that free time management did not contribute to reducing leisure boredom, which contradicts the findings of who suggested that good free time management could reduce leisure boredom (Çakır, 2019; Wang et al., 2011).

Wang et al. (2011) employed a quantitative approach using adapted scales, FTMS and WHOQOL-BREF, and regression analysis. Their sample comprised of 403 Taiwanese undergraduates. Their result suggested that effective management (planning, goal-

setting) enhances life satisfaction (which led to reduced boredom in daily life), but merely having more free time does not necessarily lead to increased life satisfaction.

Çakır (2019) employed a quantitative approach using adapted scales, FTMS and LBS with two dimensions (Boredom and Satisfaction), and analyzing data via MANOVA and Pearson correlations. Their sample compromised of 252 Turkish sport-science students. Their results suggested that students who planned their free time experienced less boredom. Gender and age differences were notable: male students scored higher in time management, and younger participants (17–20 years) reported better outcomes in programming and boredom reduction. Wealthier students also exhibited stronger management skills, particularly in scheduling.

The explanation for this discrepancy can be found in the research by Haller et al., which discusses the differing views on time management between Asian and Western cultures (Haller et al., 2013). Asian societies tend to be more focused on the present and view leisure time as a passing cycle, where everything will happen in its own time. In the context of this study, this suggests that students are more likely to engage in activities without planning, focusing on the current moment, making free time management seem irrelevant or unnecessary. In contrast, Western cultures view time as a resource to be maximized, so free time management is considered important in daily life.

Although Taiwan and Turkey can be considered Eastern country, their geo-socio-economic might have been a factor on why their result mirrored western view of time and leisure. As a high-income, industrialized society compared to Indonesian, Taiwanese students may internalize leisure time management as a practical skill for their academic or professional success. Turkey has a mix of Eastern and Western cultural norms based on their geographic location. Urban Turkish youth, may have adopt goal-oriented leisure habits influenced by western value.

On the other hand, despite the observed pattern of an increase in free time management scores followed by a decrease in leisure boredom scores, the data analysis showed that this result was not significant. This may be due to the cognitive bias known as the "planning fallacy" experienced by students. One characteristic of the planning fallacy is excessive optimism in predicting completion time (Buehler et al., 1994, 2010). In the context of this study, this means that even though students plan their leisure time, they do not carry out those plans. This is likely due to errors in estimating the time allocation, leading students to focus more on completing their tasks or obligations, which causes their leisure activities to be delayed or not implemented at all.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that intrinsic motivation plays a role in reducing students' leisure boredom, consistent with previous findings indicating that this motivation drives engagement in satisfying activities. Students who engage in activities aligned with their interests feel more enthusiastic and do not feel their leisure time is wasted. On the other hand, a lack of intrinsic motivation increases boredom. However, further research is needed to understand whether this motivation is internal or internalized.

Although free time management did not show a significant contribution to reducing boredom, there was a pattern of increased time management followed by a decrease in

boredom. Cultural differences between Asian societies, which tend to focus on the present, and Western societies, which view time as a resource, may explain this result. Additionally, the cognitive bias of "planning fallacy" may also influences students' leisure time planning.

Overall, this study provides valuable insights into the relevance of intrinsic motivation in reducing leisure boredom among Indonesian students, while also highlighting the challenges in applying effective free time management, influenced by cultural factors and cognitive biases.

Future research could consider several aspects, including conducting a comparative study in Indonesia to examine differences in leisure boredom based on factors such as age, education, socio-economic status, and gender. Using probability sampling could also enhance the generalizability of the results. Additionally, collecting data on respondents' leisure activities to observe patterns and preferences, as well as considering the academic semester, could provide deeper insights. Re-validating the measurement tools with experts specific to the variables and re-translating them according to guidelines could also improve the quality of future research.

Based on Kara, Satılmış et al., Temel and Tükel research conclusion and suggestion, author propose universities can provide opportunities for students to develop awareness of leisure activities, leisure boredom, and coping strategies. One approach is to identify students' talents, interests, or needs. Based on this assessment, universities can design specific leisure programs to help students engage in activities that enhance their well-being. Additionally, universities can expand non-academic facilities or offer students opportunities to participate in university-funded activities (Kara, 2019 Satılmış et al., 2023; Temel & Tükel, 2022).

REFERENCES

Barnett, L. A., & Klitzing, S. W. (2006). Boredom in free time: Relationships with personality, affect, and motivation for different gender, racial and ethnic student groups. *Leisure Sciences*, *28*(3), 223–244. doi: 10.1080/01490400600598053

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the Process of Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Self-Report Measures. *SPINE*, *25*(24), 3186–3191.

Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Peetz, J. (2010). The Planning Fallacy. Cognitive, Motivational, and Social Origins. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 43, Issue C, pp. 1–62). Academic Press Inc. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(10)43001-4

Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Ross, M. (1994). Exploring the "Planning Fallacy": Why People Underestimate Their Task Completion Times. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Vol. 67, Issue 3).

Çakır, V. O. (2019). The relationship between leisure time management and perceptions of boredom. *World Journal of Education*, *9*(3), 38. doi: 10.5430/wje.v9n3p38

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268.

Dursun, M., Emre Yarayan, Y., Arı, Ç., Ulun, C., & Kocamaz Adaş, S. (2021). Covid-19 in Turkey: Leisure boredom, psychological resilience, physical activity and emotional state. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, *2021*(15), 460–486. doi: 10.46661/ijeri.5588

Finkielsztein, M. (2021). Boredom and Academic Work. In *Routledge Advances in Sociology*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.

Finkielsztein, M. (2022). The Significance of Boredom: A Literature Review. *Journal of*

Boredom Studies Issue, *1*, 1–33. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7144313

Floros, G. D., Glynatsis, M. N., & Mylona, I. (2024). No End in Sight; Assessing the Impact of Internet Gaming Disorder on Digital Eye Strain Symptoms and Academic Success. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, *14*(3), 531–539. doi: 10.3390/ejihpe14030035

Foen Ng, S., Syamimi Iliani Che Hassan, N., Hairunnisa Mohammad Nor, N., & Ain Abdul Malek, N. (2013). The Relationship Between Smartphone Use and Academic Performance: A Case of Students in a Malaysian Tertiary Institution. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *5*(4). www.mojet.net

Hagger, M. S., Rentzelas, P., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2014). Effects of individualist and collectivist group norms and choice on intrinsic motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, *38*(2), 215–223. doi: 10.1007/s11031-013-9373-2

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The Silent Language*. Doubleday & Company.

Haller, M., Hadler, M., & Kaup, G. (2013). Leisure Time in Modern Societies: A New Source of Boredom and Stress? *Social Indicators Research*, *111*(2), 403–434. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0023-y

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1). doi: 10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Weissinger, E. (1990). Perceptions of boredom in leisure conceptualization, reliability and validity. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *22*(1), 1–17.

Javaeed, A., Jeelani, R., Gulab, S., & Ghauri, S. K. (2020). Relationship between internet addiction and academic performance of undergraduate medical students of Azad Kashmir. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, *36*(2), 229–233. doi: 10.12669/pjms.36.2.1061

Kara, F. M. (2019). Internet addiction: Relationship with perceived freedom in leisure, perception of boredom and sensation seeking. *Higher Education Studies*, *9*(2), 131–140. doi: 10.5539/hes.v9n2p131

Kil, N., Kim, J., Park, J., & Lee, C. (2021). Leisure boredom, leisure challenge, smartphone use, and emotional distress among U.S. college students: are they interrelated? *Leisure Studies*, *40*(6), 779– doi: 10.1080/02614367.2021.1931414

Kosasih, A. V. N. A., Sarbini, S., & Mulyana, A. (2021). Leisure boredom dan religiusitas: Pengaruhnya terhadap kecenderungan adiksi internet. *Psympathic : Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, *8*(1), 47–56. doi: 10.15575/psy.v8i1.12352

Kuo, Y. K., Wang, J. H., Kuo, T. H., & Ho, L. A. (2021). Leisure Satisfaction Influences Learning Performance Among Community College Students. *SAGE Open*, *11*(4). doi: 10.1177/21582440211067238

Layland, E. K., Ram, N., Caldwell, L. L., Smith, E. A., & Wegner, L. (2021). Leisure boredom, timing of sexual debut, and co-occurring behaviors among South African adolescents. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *50*(6), 2383–2394. doi: 10.1007/s10508-021-02014-8

Leung, L. (2015). Using tablet in solitude for stress reduction: An examination of desire for aloneness, leisure boredom, tablet activities, and location of use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *48*, 382–391. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.068

Leung, L., & Zhang, R. (2016). Predicting tablet use: A study of gratifications-sought, leisure boredom, and multitasking. *Telematics and Informatics*, *33*(2), 331–341. doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2015.08.013

Miller, J. A., Caldwell, L. L., Weybright, E. H., Smith, E. A., Vergnani, T., & Wegner, L. (2014). Was Bob Seger right? Relation between boredom in leisure and [Risky] sex. *Leisure Sciences*, *36*(1), 52–67. doi: 10.1080/01490400.2014.860789

Putri, W. D., & Rusli, D. (2021). Pengaruh leisure boredom terhadap phubbing pada remaja di Kota Padang. *Jurnal Riset Psikologi*, *2*. doi: 10.24036/jrp.v2021i2.11461

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development,

and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 68–78.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *61*. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., Cerasoli, S., & Lemos, K. (n.d.). *Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) Scale Description*. Retrieved January 10, 2024, from https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/intrinsic-motivation-inventory/

Sakız, H., & Aftab, R. (2019). Academic achievement and its relationships with psychological resilience and socio-demographic characteristics. *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*, *7*(4), 263–273. doi: 10.1080/21683603.2018.1446372

Satılmış, S. E., Cengiz, R., & Güngörmüş, H. A. (2023). The Relationship between University Students' Perception of Boredom in Leisure Time and Internet Addiction during Social Isolation Process. *Bağımlılık Dergisi*, *24*(2), 164–173. doi: 10.51982/bagimli.1137559

Serdar, E., Demirel, M., & Harmandar Demirel, D. (2022). The relationship between the leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction: A study on university students. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, *5*(1), 30–42. doi: 10.46328/ijte.235

Spaeth, M., Weichold, K., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2015). The development of leisure boredom in early adolescence: Predictors and longitudinal associations with delinquency and depression. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*(10), 1380–1394. doi: 10.1037/a0039480

Spruyt, B., Vandenbossche, L., Keppens, G., Siongers, J., & Van Droogenbroeck, F. (2018). Social Differences in Leisure Boredom and its Consequences for Life Satisfaction Among Young People. *Child Indicators Research*, *11*(1), 225–243. doi: 10.1007/s12187-016-9430-y

Steckler, A., & McLeroy, K. R. (2008). The importance of external validity. In *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(1), 9–10. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.126847

Tan, W. K., & Lu, K. J. (2019). Smartphone use at tourist destinations: Interaction with social loneliness, aesthetic scope, leisure boredom, and trip satisfaction. *Telematics and Informatics*, *39*, 64–74. doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2019.01.004

Temel, A. S., & Tükel, Y. (2022). Investigation of College Students' Perception of Boredom and Loneliness Level in Leisure Time Activities during Covid-19. *Pakistan Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*, *16*(2), 474–481. doi: 10.53350/pjmhs22162474

Veal, A. J. (1992). School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism Definitions of Leisure and Recreation. In *Australian Journal of Leisure and Recreation* (Vol. 2, Issue 4). www.business.uts.edu.au/lst/research

Wang, W. C. (2019). Exploring the relationship among free-time management, leisure boredom, and internet addiction in undergraduates in Taiwan. *Psychological Reports*, *122*(5), 1651–1665. doi: 10.1177/0033294118789034

Wang, W. C., Kao, C. H., Huan, T. C., & Wu, C. C. (2011). Free Time Management Contributes to Better Quality of Life: A Study of Undergraduate Students in Taiwan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *12*(4), 561–573. doi: 10.1007/s10902-010-9217-7

Wazkia, H., & Yanna Primanita, R. (2023). Pengaruh Leisure Boredom Terhadap Phubbing Pada Mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Padang. *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, *3*(4), 4689–4698.

Wegner, L. (2011). Through the lens of a peer: Understanding leisure boredom and risk behaviour in adolescence. *Journal of Occupational Theerapy*, *41*(1), 18–24.

Weissinger, E., Caldwell, L. L., & Bandalos, D. L. (1992). Relation between intrinsic motivation and boredom in leisure time. *Leisure Sciences*, *14*(4), 317–325. doi: 10.1080/01490409209513177

Weybright, E. H., Caldwell, L. L., Ram, N., Smith, E. A., & Wegner, L. (2015). Boredom prone or nothing to do?

Distinguishing between state and trait leisure boredom and its association with substance use in South African adolescents. *Leisure Sciences*, *37*(4), 311–331. doi: 10.1080/01490400.2015.1014530

Wu-Ouyang, B. (2022). Are smartphones addictive? Examining the cognitive-behavior model of motivation, leisure boredom, extended self, and fear of missing out on possible smartphone addiction. *Telematics and Informatics*, *71*. doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2022.101834

Wu-Ouyang, B. (2023). More mobile connectedness, less wellbeing? Examining how multiplatform mobile connectedness affect negative wellbeing through FoMO and leisure boredom. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *35*(5), 291–302. doi: 10.1027/1864-1105/a000388

Yu, L., Daniel, D. T., & Zhu, X. (2018). The influence of personal well-being on learning achievement in university students over time: Mediating or moderating effects of internal and external university engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(JAN). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02287

Yusoff, M. S. B. (2019). ABC of Content Validation and Content Validity Index Calculation. *Education in Medicine Journal*, *11*(2), 49–54. doi: 10.21315/eimj2019.11.2.6

Yuwono, M. R., & Virlia, S. (2022). Leisure boredom affects gaming disorder on emerging adult smartphone users. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, *37*(1), 1–18. doi: 10.24123/aipj.v37i1.2324

Zhang, J., Peng, C., & Chen, C. (2024). Mental health and academic performance of college students: Knowledge in the field of mental health, self-control, and learning in college. *Acta Psychologica*, *248*. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104351