

UNITED WISDOM

Boredom: What Happens When There Is Nothing to Distract You

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I46 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Boredom: What Happens When There Is Nothing to Distract You

Epigraph

> *“Remote interest”.*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, chapter XI. A short fragment about an interest that connects the effort of attention with something beyond the immediate impression; initial capitalisation is editorial.

What this article is about

Imagine a free evening. Work messages have stopped, the household task is finished, and nobody needs an answer. You could open a book, go outside, call someone, or simply sit. Yet all the options seem equally unconvincing. Your hand searches for the next activity before you have decided what you want. “I’m bored,” you say. That brief statement does not yet tell us what is missing: a suitable challenge, an intelligible purpose, the opportunity to choose, or enough energy to start at all. There is no need immediately to uncover a hidden trauma or diagnose yourself in this scene. You can first examine the arrangement of this particular evening.

Boredom differs from the mere fact of being unoccupied. While waiting for a train, one person enjoys looking out of the window; another wants the minutes to pass faster. A busy day can also feel empty: there are many actions and little participation in them. These hypothetical examples introduce a useful distinction, rather than a law about everyone. “Nothing to distract me” sometimes means no entertainment, and sometimes no activity to which you want to give your attention. Sometimes it conceals another question: “Why am I continuing something to which I have long felt no connection?” Those questions call for different changes, although each initially appeared as boredom.

We will distinguish several possible situations without promising a universal remedy. William James’s historical psychology, Pascal’s Christian reflection on diversion, and contemporary models of boredom ask different questions; they cannot be combined into one proven theory of human beings. The everyday scenes and short practice below are editorial suggestions for observation, not an experimental protocol or treatment. The article has a more modest aim than a grand explanation: to make the opening statement precise enough for the next step to address the actual difficulty, instead of merely removing an unpleasant pause.

I. Many Activities, Little Participation

In a hypothetical conversation, someone lists available options: a film, a walk, cleaning, meeting a friend. Every option receives “I don’t feel like it.” The listener may interpret this as ingratitude: so many opportunities, and still the person is dissatisfied. But a list of opportunities and a readiness to participate are different things. “What else could I suggest?” is useful only up to a point. After that, it is worth asking what happens when the person considers each option. One seems too demanding; another has no connection with an important concern; a third is pleasant but requires social energy that is unavailable now. This examination guarantees no answer, but it stops treating all refusals as one character trait.

In their 2012 article, John Eastwood and colleagues connect boredom with difficulty engaging attention in a satisfying activity. The publisher’s abstract was read here, rather than the full paper; this is a theoretical definition, not a personal diagnosis. It makes participation a question without reducing everything to the number of available stimuli. Our next step is editorial: instead of listing entertainments, describe one activity in which participation is not coming together. What does it require? Where is the connection lost? What did the person expect from this time? An explanation of your own episode does not follow automatically from the definition, however convincing its familiar words may sound.

Suppose, for example, that someone chooses a film and checks the remaining running time after only a few minutes. They may call the film boring and switch it off. That is a legitimate decision, especially when watching was voluntary. But another question remains for understanding the evening: did they want this particular story, company beside them, relief from making decisions, or simply a reason not to choose anything of their own? Each expectation needs a different check. Another film title may not answer a wish for company. Conversely, one unsuccessful viewing does not prove that someone has lost their capacity to take an interest in life. The conclusion should remain proportionate to the observation.

II. Too Easy and Too Difficult

Before changing the difficulty, it helps to distinguish boredom from a lack of energy as far as ordinary description allows. “I want to do this but cannot collect myself now” differs from “I could do this but see no reason to begin.” They may coexist, and the article offers no reliable self-test between them. It is enough not to assume that an additional challenge is suitable by default. If someone is tired after necessary work, an invitation immediately to find an exciting challenge may add another demand. Acknowledging fatigue does not prove the cause of every other episode either. We are clarifying today’s conditions to avoid choosing an action that contradicts them from the outset.

In Erin Westgate and Timothy Wilson’s MAC model, attention and meaning are considered separately; boredom can involve insufficient or excessive demands. Selected parts of the 2018 paper were read, including limitations: correlation establishes no direction of causation. Tables, the full text, and data are not reproduced here. This is a brief basis for a distinction, not a reader-assessment instrument. Applying the distinction to a hypothetical everyday situation produces two different questions: does the activity contain a task that can hold participation, and is that participation manageable under present conditions? The same wish to leave an activity does not yet produce the same answer.

Imagine a familiar work operation. Records must be transferred according to the same rule; the decisions have already been made, and there is little new to learn. Someone may know why the result matters and still be bored by the process. A different scene involves a new set of instructions in which unfamiliar symbols appear faster than the previous ones can be understood. Here too, someone may stop following and call the whole thing uninteresting. The first task may allow a change in the working method or a reasonable reduction in repetitions. In the second, clarifying the incomprehensible step may help more. These are editorial options to check in the particular task; they are not prescriptions deduced from the research model.

A suitable difficulty need not turn every task into an absorbing game. Some necessary actions remain repetitive even when done well. Sometimes it is enough to make them finite: to know what today’s work includes and where it will end. In a difficult task, finiteness might mean one understood example instead of an immediate demand to master everything. If a change does not help, that is information about the attempt, not proof of laziness. Nor should dangerous or responsible work be made more complicated to combat boredom. Interest does not cancel instructions, safety, or the right to stop when continuing requires attention that is unavailable.

III. Why Do I Need This Time?

You can understand a task perfectly and still see no reason to give it your evening. Suppose someone reads only because they once decided to become “better educated.” Another text is now in front of them, but there is no question they want to investigate. The broad value of education does not automatically become an interest in every page. Sometimes the intention can be narrowed: find out how the author supports one disputed conclusion, or examine a particular concept encountered at work. That intention can be revised. It requires neither declaring all previous reading meaningless nor promising that every useful goal will feel pleasant while being pursued.

In the chapter read, James relates voluntary attention to mediated interest. This is historical reasoning from 1890, not a contemporary rule for how long attention should last. In our editorial scene, a more distant interest can be ordinary: learning to ask a precise question, finishing work for someone who has been promised a result, or understanding how a familiar

object functions. Stating an important goal is not enough, however. There needs to be a visible connection between the present action and that goal. When the connection is absent, acknowledging the gap may help more than repeatedly saying that the activity should be enjoyable. A goal may matter while the chosen way of approaching it is unsuitable.

Meaning is not always personal in a narrow sense. Sometimes we do a boring task because another person needs it: completing a document, preparing a room, carrying out our part of a shared project. We can respect a promise while honestly acknowledging the lack of pleasure. Every obligation need not be decorated with an inspiring story. A question arises when such obligations occupy almost all available time and the right to pursue our own interest is continually postponed. The discussion of boredom may then become a discussion of workload and agreements. That transition needs grounding in actual circumstances, rather than turning one difficult evening into a final conclusion about another person’s unfairness or our own destiny.

IV. A Pause Without a Requirement to Be Useful

The opposite mistake is to assume that every unoccupied interval requires a meaningful task. Imagine a walk with no destination or goal. Someone notices that they are already listing ways to make it useful: think through a project, train attention, take a beautiful photograph. They can choose one of these. They can also let the walk remain a walk, if that fits their intention and circumstances. Boredom does not oblige us to turn rest into another productive activity. “What should I get out of this?” may belong to an earlier work mode that is still operating after work has ended. This is a possible description of the scene, not a claim about the hidden cause of all restlessness.

Rest without an explicit task need not feel pleasant immediately either. Someone may discover that free time is not coming together yet. That does not make rest wrong. Naming the expectation helps: they wanted to lie down and make no decisions, wanted entertainment, or wanted to feel that the day belonged to them. Those expectations differ. One may be met without the others. A ready-made evening programme, for example, reduces the need to choose but may not provide a sense of making your own decision. Conversely, your ability to choose may be intact while you simply want someone to suggest an easy activity now. There is no obligation to prove independence in every free minute.

There is also a distinction between an available pause and a pause you can choose. While waiting to be called, you may be formally free but unable to leave, begin a long task, or forget the time. That unoccupied interval contains a restriction. In this hypothetical example, advice to immerse yourself in favourite work simply does not fit the situation. You might look for a small activity that is easy to end, or acknowledge the inconvenience of waiting. Not every queue needs to be filled with personal development. Sometimes the main question is organisational:

can a time be clarified, a notification provided, or a different arrangement agreed? The answer depends on real possibilities, and the experience need not become pleasant to demonstrate a correct attitude towards it.

Observe a pause only as far as is appropriate and voluntary. This article does not propose sitting until boredom disappears, depriving yourself of contact, or considering distraction a defeat. In some episodes, it is enough to acknowledge a wish for a change of surroundings. In others, a little investigation before switching activities may help. Either decision remains open to revision. What needs checking is not endurance but whether the chosen approach fits the actual task. If observation becomes an irritating test of spiritual maturity, you can end it. The newly available time does not immediately need to be filled with an explanation of why the exercise failed.

V. Diversion and the Question That Remains

In fragment 139 of Pensées, Pascal considers human diversion against vulnerability and mortality. This is a Christian philosophical perspective; the selected fragment was read, not the whole work. The translator of the available English edition was not established, so it is not directly quoted. This perspective asks what remains behind changing activities, but it does not diagnose a bored contemporary reader. Not every entertainment is an escape, and not every pause conceals one great fear. A comparison should preserve the scope of the author’s question rather than presenting it as a laboratory finding.

In a hypothetical scene, someone changes activities several times but repeatedly returns to the thought of an unresolved conversation. They are not obliged to address it now. They can nevertheless distinguish two tasks: make the evening more enjoyable and decide what to do about the conversation. The first does not automatically perform the second, nor is it required to. A break may be reasonable. A more precise formulation is: “I’m resting today, and I want to return to the question tomorrow.” This editorial suggestion makes sense only if returning is genuinely possible. Setting a time does not itself resolve the disagreement’s content.

Sometimes no major postponed question can be found. There is no need to invent one to make observation look profound. You can note something simpler: the options do not fit, energy is low, company is unavailable, or a familiar activity has ended. Acknowledging this ordinariness keeps the investigation honest. Pascal’s thought can remain interesting in its own right even when a particular evening is better understood through scheduling and limited opportunities. Reading a tradition helps when it expands the available questions; it becomes constraining when every answer is declared superficial in advance. Meeting another author’s thought does not oblige you to translate all your experience into that author’s language.

VI. Who May Call Another Person Boring?

Boredom becomes more complicated when it is attached to a person. Suppose someone catches themselves wanting to leave a meeting and concludes, “They’re uninteresting.” This may express a real lack of shared interest. It may also conceal different expectations: one came to discuss a decision, while the other wants to describe the past week. You do not have to make yourself enjoy every conversation. It still helps to distinguish an assessment of the entire person from a description of this interaction. “I’m finding it hard to engage with this topic now” leaves more room for precision than a final verdict on another person’s ability to be interesting.

You can examine your own participation. Did you ask questions, suggest a topic, or explain what you expected from the meeting? Those questions do not make you responsible for the entire conversation. They only separate an available action from unavailable control over someone else. In a hypothetical example, both people wait a long time for initiative and then each decides that the other is boring. Changing one remark might clarify the situation without guaranteeing closeness. Sometimes clarification does reveal a lack of common topics. That is a legitimate outcome. Respecting someone does not require pretending that every meeting satisfies your interest.

It is also easy to make yourself the object of that verdict. “I have nothing to talk about” may mean that the day was ordinary, the audience does not interest you, you do not want to disclose something private, or the conversation requires an unfamiliar form. It does not entail “I am a boring person.” You can choose one detail and see whether there is a shared interest, or decline to tell a story. The right not to disclose everything remains even when someone expects entertainment. Observation helps if it restores the distinction between one conversation and a whole person. It should not become another obligation to produce an interesting image of yourself for every listener.

Relationships also include a right not to entertain continuously. If one person must maintain the other’s mood whenever the other is bored, an agreement needs discussing. You can want a shared activity and propose it directly without making refusal proof of a lack of love. You can agree on time together while leaving each person time without the other’s participation. These suggestions are editorial; they do not explain the arrangement of a particular couple in advance. The essential distinction is that a wish for contact deserves discussion, while a demand continually to remove another person’s boredom cannot silently be treated as contact’s natural content. Sometimes the issue is precisely an expectation that nobody has yet expressed.

VII. Boring Work and Real Restrictions

People are not always free to choose another activity. They may be on duty, waiting for an institutional decision, or performing obligatory repetitive work. “Find your own meaning” can be an overly easy suggestion here. Meaning does not remove fatigue, a lack of authority, or the structure of a process. If an action is required, first establish what can actually change: the sequence of operations, break timing, distribution of repetitions, or the opportunity to ask a manager a question. Sometimes only a small choice is available. Acknowledging its limits is more accurate than blaming someone for insufficient interest in conditions they did not choose. Observation does not replace changes in work organisation.

Imagine an employee who must remain at a post until a replacement arrives. They know why this matters, but the wait drags. They may have no right arbitrarily to increase the workload, switch on a distracting programme, or leave. Ways of addressing boredom must then stay within the applicable requirements. It may be appropriate to discuss an authorised break or clarify the handover procedure. This article does not propose making those changes unilaterally. Interest should particularly not become the main criterion in work involving other people’s safety. Boredom may prompt an organisational conversation; the decision depends on the task, authority, and real conditions, rather than the attractiveness of another entertainment.

A different check helps in more flexible work: have we expanded the obligation beyond what is needed? Suppose a personal project requires a simple result, but someone demands that they complete a complex system nobody is using yet. They are bored by the repetitions while refusing permission to simplify them. They can ask who expects the additional part and what would happen without it. The answer may confirm its necessity or open an opportunity to reduce it. This is no invitation to abandon obligations at the first inconvenience. It distinguishes the actual agreement from an additional demand that still needs justification.

VIII. Change One Condition

After making distinctions, it is tempting to design a perfect programme against boredom. Yet an overly large programme can itself become an unsuitable activity. Sometimes it helps more to select one condition for a small trial. In a hypothetical scene, someone is reading instructions and loses the thread. They might take just one example, clarify an unfamiliar word, or ask what action is required at the end. If the difficulty is a lack of purpose, more terminology may not help. If it is an incomprehensible step, a grand conversation about life’s meaning may be unnecessary. The trial should address a particular hypothesis, rather than demonstrate readiness to work on yourself in every available way.

For an honest trial, record the original expectation before the outcome. Otherwise, success makes it easy to decide that we knew the cause all along, while failure makes it easy to claim that we were testing something else. In a hypothetical example, someone intended to find out whether a clear stopping point would help them begin a task. If they finish one step but still do not want to work on the whole project, those are two different outcomes. The first answers the original question; the second leaves a broader question open. Neither dismissing the completed work nor declaring the whole project suitable is necessary. Such precision protects a small decision from an excessive conclusion and helps select the next conversation without invented certainty.

You can observe the result in ordinary language. Did starting become easier? Was the selected step completed? Is there a wish to continue? There is no need to assign a numerical interest score if the task does not require one. Nor should every brief revival be declared a solution. A new condition may help briefly or reveal that the original difficulty was named incorrectly. Either provides material for the next decision. This is an editorial logic for a trial, not a verified therapeutic method for boredom. Its usefulness is limited by the possibility of changing conditions safely and voluntarily; dangerous tasks and prescribed care have their own decision procedures.

If the trial does not help, you can revise the hypothesis or end the investigation for today. There is no need to prove that ten more attempts must yield the right result. Instead of making the activity harder, someone may acknowledge a need for rest or conversation rather than another task. That remains a decision about the current episode, however. It does not automatically explain all earlier experience or guarantee relief. A good small check preserves the right to a negative result: the proposed change did not fit. That is more precise than “I can’t do anything again” or “No activities have any meaning.”

IX. When One Word Is Not Enough

“Boredom” can be a useful opening to a conversation but an insufficient ending. Suppose someone says that nothing has interested them for a long time. It is important not to argue about whether they are trying hard enough. You can clarify the duration, changes in ordinary activities, and what help they need. This article does not identify a condition from a collection of signs or propose replacing professional assessment with philosophy. If a difficulty persists, noticeably interferes with everyday life, or concerns the person themselves, discussing an appropriate professional is a separate option. Increasing activities’ difficulty is no universal answer to a lasting loss of interest.

You need not be completely certain of a cause before asking for support. It helps, nevertheless, to make the request specific: “I want to talk about how my days have changed,” “I need help distributing work,” or “I don’t know whom to ask about how I’m feeling.” Those

requests have different recipients. A friend may provide company, a manager may discuss workload, and a competent professional may assess a question within their field. One listener need not perform all those roles. Nor should we promise that a meaning we have found will necessarily restore another person’s interest. Even a good idea requires their freely chosen response and may not address the actual difficulty.

An ordinary boring evening, difficult working conditions, and a lasting change in the capacity to participate in life should not be reduced to a single scale. They can be discussed alongside one another, but decisions will differ. Sometimes observation therefore ends with a simple boundary: our own guesses cannot take us further now. That boundary does not make earlier questions useless. They may help describe an episode more precisely and choose the conversation that is needed. If there is immediate danger to life or safety, a philosophical explanation must not delay local emergency help. Establishing a cause and obtaining necessary help need not occur in one fixed sequence.

X. Returning to Participation Without a Grand Verdict

Once boredom is somewhat clearer, finding a new life mission is not obligatory. You can finish a task, choose rest, acknowledge the absence of suitable company, or agree on a later conversation. The decision’s scale matches the question’s scale. Suppose, after an unsuccessful evening, someone notices that they wanted neither new impressions nor entertainment, but to do something with another person. That is not proof of profound loneliness or an obligation immediately to change their relationships. Tomorrow, however, they can propose a particular walk together instead of another list of entertainments. One precise suggestion can be more useful than a large description of personality, because it can be discussed and changed if necessary.

Participation itself does not always look like excitement. It may be quiet, brief, and mixed with effort. Someone works through one paragraph, asks a question, repairs a familiar object, or listens to an answer to the end. There is no need to demand in advance that this episode prove a restored appetite for all of life. You can simply notice that a connection between action and interest occurred here. On another day, it may not occur; that does not cancel today’s observation. An encouraging instance should not become a new standard to meet always. Freedom to try includes freedom not to turn a discovered approach into a permanent obligation.

The opening phrase was “nothing to distract me.” It may now acquire a more precise continuation: nothing manageable with the energy available; no clear reason to continue; a wish for contact; too many conditions that were not chosen; a need to ask for support. Not every episode will receive a clear name, and some questions will remain open. Still, making distinctions already changes how experience is approached. It allows a next step without a

final verdict on yourself, other people, or the world. Boredom remains an unpleasant experience that need not be romanticised. But a conversation about it can become concrete enough to return participation in their own decision to the person involved.

What this means in practice

Choose one recent ordinary episode you called boring. Exclude situations requiring emergency help, compliance with a special instruction, or assessment of a noticeable deterioration in your condition. Write down the place, the available activity, and what you expected from the time. For example: “I chose a film in the evening but wanted company.” This is hypothetical, not a suggestion of the correct cause. If there is no precise expectation, record that. Do not add an explanation merely to make the note look finished.

Separate three questions: was it clear what to do; was it manageable now; and was it clear why you needed this particular activity? “I don’t know” is acceptable. If necessary, add a fourth: could I choose the conditions? This is an editorial reminder, not a validated scale. Do not use it to assess another person’s character, prove laziness, or establish a medical cause. Its aim is to distinguish possible next actions in your particular episode.

If safe and appropriate, select one small change: clarify a step, reduce the task to a finite part, propose a shared activity, or end a voluntary viewing. State the expected result simply: “I want to understand one example,” or “I want to find out whether company is available.” Do not promise yourself to eliminate boredom altogether. After the trial, record what actually happened. A mismatch between expectation and outcome calls for revising the hypothesis, not blaming yourself for performing the exercise incorrectly.

End the note with one decision or an open question. You may change nothing today. You may recognise that further reflection needs a conversation with an appropriate person. If the exercise irritates you, intensifies an unpleasant state, or becomes coercive, stop. There is no requirement to endure until a useful discovery arrives. Daily repetition is unnecessary; the note makes sense while it helps describe experience more accurately. Its value depends on usefulness for the next decision, rather than diary length or the number of explanations found.

Key quotation

> *“Light and shade”.*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, chapter XI, the opening paragraph on selective interest; initial capitalisation is editorial. This short image concerns the organisation of experience, not a promise that every effort of attention will remove boredom.

Connections between traditions

• **James's historical psychology:** a question about how interest connects attention with an object. Neither a modern concentration standard nor a diagnosis.

• **Pascal's Christian philosophy:** a question about diversion and human vulnerability. Not a laboratory account of every instance of boredom; a selected fragment, without direct quotation.

• **Contemporary boredom psychology:** Eastwood and colleagues offer a theoretical focus on participation; Westgate and Wilson distinguish attention and meaning, insufficient and excessive demands. These are different models, with limited reading scopes here.

• **Editorial comparison:** activity, participation, and expectations for time can be distinguished while preserving the right to rest, changed conditions, and appropriate help. Agreement among all authors on one nature of boredom is not claimed.

Sources

1. William James. *The Principles of Psychology* (1890), chapter XI, Attention. Selected paragraphs on interest and voluntary attention were read, not the entire volume. Chapter text, York University. Rights for this web edition were not established; the original book's US status is stated separately in the Project Gutenberg catalogue.

2. Blaise Pascal. *Pensées*, fragment 139, Divertissement. The selected fragment of the available English edition was read; its translator was not established, and it is not directly quoted. Text.

3. John D. Eastwood, Alexandra Frischen, Mark J. Fenske, Daniel Smilek. *The Unengaged Mind: Defining Boredom in Terms of Attention*. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2012, 7(5). DOI: 10.1177/1745691612456044. The publisher's abstract was read; the restricted full text was not. Publisher.

4. Erin C. Westgate, Timothy D. Wilson. *Boring Thoughts and Bored Minds: The MAC Model of Boredom and Cognitive Engagement* (2018). DOI: 10.1037/rev0000097. Selected definitions, model discussion, methods, and limitations were read, not the entire paper or data. Author-hosted PDF. The document specifies personal use without broad dissemination; the file, tables, and direct quotations are excluded from this kit.

5. NHS, England. *Where to get urgent help for mental health*. Urgent-help sections and the dated footer were read; English service numbers are not transferred to other countries. An urgency boundary only, without personal assessment. Official page.

Tags

boredom, attention, interest, participation, meaning, free time, rest, expectation, pause, task difficulty, demands, repetition, work, choice, conditions, agreements, communication, entertainment, observation, self-inquiry, precision, hypothesis, small trial, boundaries, help, James, Pascal, psychology, philosophy, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.