

## The relationship between wellbeing and job satisfaction of instructors in English Programs

Gizem Adeka<sup>1</sup>, Enisa Mede<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Foreign Languages, Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Educational Sciences, Bahçeşehir University, Istanbul, Turkey

---

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Aug 7, 2021  
Revised Dec 24, 2021  
Accepted Jan 25, 2022

#### Keywords:

Language education  
Teacher characteristics  
Teacher job satisfaction  
Teacher wellbeing

---

### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between the wellbeing and job satisfaction of English instructors working at language preparatory programs offered by Turkish universities. The study also attempted to explore if any difference between these two variables existed in relation to the teachers' characteristics, i.e. years of experience, the proficiency level taught and educational degree. Finally, the reflections of the participants about the influential factors on their wellbeing and job satisfaction were further explored in this study. The quantitative data were obtained from 168 participants through teacher wellbeing survey and teacher job satisfaction survey, whereas the qualitative data came from semi-structured interviews carried out with 10 volunteers. The results revealed that there was a statistically significant, positive and moderate relationship between the participants' job satisfaction and their wellbeing. Besides, no difference was found between the participants' wellbeing and their teacher characteristics. Similarly, there was no difference between teachers' predefined characteristics and their job satisfaction. As for the results of the qualitative data, personal, organizational, student-related and pandemic-related factors were found to be influential on the wellbeing and job satisfaction of the participants. The obtained findings provide pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research in language education and teacher development.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



---

### Corresponding Author:

Gizem Adeka  
School of Foreign Languages, Kadir Has University  
Cibali Mah. Kadir Has Cad. No:17 Fatih/Istanbul  
Email: gizemaiyigun@gmail.com

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the most general sense, wellbeing is defined as the state of both physical and psychological health and happiness. Seligman [1] states that wellbeing empowers humans to thrive and fulfill their highest goals in life. As in most other jobs, high motivation and wellbeing are required in teaching. Aelterman *et al.* [2] define teacher wellbeing as "a positive emotional state, which is the result of harmony between the sum of specific environmental factors on the one hand, and the personal needs and expectations of teachers on the other". In other words, teacher wellbeing is affected by both personal characteristics such as self-regulatory patterns, self-efficacy beliefs, and emotion regulation strategies [3]-[5] and external factors such as workload, support from colleagues and principals, school climate, assessment and feedback, cooperation among staff and classroom climate [2], [6].

Despite a vast body of research conducted on professional or occupational wellbeing in general, the number of studies done investigating teacher wellbeing has been relatively smaller [2], [7], [8]. As they are

essential assets to the teaching and learning process, teachers' psychology and professional wellbeing are linked to how qualified they are in their instruction and how their students perform [9]. Similarly, Bajorek *et al.* [10] state that "A teacher with high job satisfaction, positive morale and who is healthy should be more likely to teach lessons which are creative, challenging and effective". Nevertheless, the majority of research investigating teachers focus on negative socio-affective constructs such as stress and burnout [11], [12]. Therefore, there is a need to be addressed in the literature, which is examining teachers' wellbeing from positive aspects.

Regarding the wellbeing of teachers in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts, Mercer [9] states that the psychology of language teachers has remained a neglected area in spite of numerous studies on the psychology of language learners [13], [14]. There is a strong connection between the wellbeing of teachers and their students and teaching a language necessitates interaction between teachers and students more than teaching other subjects due to its nature. Therefore, the present study focuses on the wellbeing of language teachers with regard to job satisfaction and teacher characteristics.

Job satisfaction refers to "a positive (or negative) and evaluative judgment one makes about one's job or job situation" [15]. In other words, it can also be defined as a variety of factors that influence one's experience with one's job and the quality of their professional life [16]. Furthermore, teacher job satisfaction can be defined as teachers' evaluation and perception of their professional role. Teachers job satisfaction is associated with three main factors, namely intrinsic, extrinsic and demographic factors e.g. age, marital status, gender. Intrinsic satisfaction can be described as teachers' feelings towards their profession and their interaction with students, whereas extrinsic factors are related to salary, support from colleagues, and administration and resources available to teachers [17].

Numerous studies have been done on the factors affecting the job satisfaction of teachers working at different levels [17]-[19]. Moreover, teacher job satisfaction in relation to negative socio-affective aspects such as stress and burnout [20]-[22] has been widely explored in literature. However, not enough research has been conducted investigating teacher job satisfaction from a positive perspective such as wellbeing. Therefore, the present study brings a new perspective to the existing literature on teacher job satisfaction as it examines the wellbeing and job satisfaction of EFL instructors related to their teacher characteristics.

Furthermore, despite certain quantitative studies investigating teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction through various variables [18], [23], [24], there is still a need for qualitative studies which provide in-depth information about these concepts. Thus, by exploring the perceptions of the participating instructors who work in preparatory programs at foundation universities regarding the influential factors that affect their wellbeing and job satisfaction, the current study sheds light on the importance of these concepts in the tertiary level.

The current study is hoped to contribute to the field of foreign language education in several aspects. First, it explores positive psychological and professional condition of language teachers from the wellbeing and job satisfaction perspectives rather than negative emotional aspects. Hence, it might provide a further understanding of teachers' psychology and complement previous research in the field. Second, by investigating the relationship between teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction, the present study might raise awareness in teachers on the significance of their wellbeing and job satisfaction. Besides, the obtained findings might lead institutions to take measures in order to ensure instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction as it provides information about whether there is a significant difference between certain teacher characteristics (e.g., years of experience, the proficiency level taught, and educational degree) and teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the current study might provide professional development units with insights on how they can support teachers with different levels of wellbeing and job satisfaction as it attempts to find out the participants' perceptions about the influential factors on their wellbeing and job satisfaction.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationship between teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction of Turkish EFL instructors who work in the preparatory programs at foundation universities in Istanbul and examine whether there is any difference between their teacher characteristics in terms of wellbeing and job satisfaction. Besides, the present study aims to explore the perceptions of the participating instructors about the influential factors that affect their wellbeing and job satisfaction. Therefore, the present study addresses the following research questions: i) Is there any relationship between the job satisfaction and wellbeing of Turkish EFL instructors of the preparatory programs?; ii) Is there any significant difference between the participating instructors' job satisfaction and the following teacher characteristics (Years of teaching experience, Educational degree, The proficiency level taught); iii) Is there any significant difference between the participating instructors' wellbeing and the following teacher characteristics (Years of teaching experience, Educational degree, The proficiency level taught); iv) What are the perceptions of the participating instructors about the influential factors on their wellbeing and job satisfaction?

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

A mixed type method was adopted as a research design in this study in order to investigate the relationship between the wellbeing and job satisfaction of Turkish EFL instructors who work in the preparatory programs of foundation universities in Istanbul and the difference between certain teacher characteristics, namely years of experience, educational level, and the proficiency level taught, and the participants' wellbeing and job satisfaction. The explanatory sequential design was employed to explain the quantitative data. First, the quantitative data were collected and interpreted in order to see the general picture, and then qualitative data were obtained and analyzed so as to gain a deeper understanding of the research problem [25].

The study was conducted in the preparatory programs of the foundation (non-profit, private) universities in Istanbul, Turkey during the fall semester of the academic year 2020-2021. For the quantitative part of the study, 168 Turkish EFL instructors were reached using the snowball sampling. The participants worked in English programs at around 10 foundation (non-profit, private) universities located in Istanbul. For the qualitative part of the study, the convenience sampling method was used to interview with 10 volunteers.

When the teacher characteristics of the participants were examined, it was found that the highest percentage of the participating teachers (28.6%) had 6 to 10 years of experience. There were 42 of the participants (25%) had 1 to 5 years of experience, whereas the number of the instructors who had more than 20 years of experience (17.3%) was 29. 25 of the participants (14.9%) had 11-15 years of experience, while 24 of the instructors (14.3%) had 16 to 20 years of experience. Besides, 13 participants (7.7%) taught A1 level, whereas 52 of them (31%) had students with A2 level English proficiency. The A levels are called basic user. The highest percentage of the instructors taught B1 level (38.7%). The number of instructors who had students with B2 level English proficiency (17.9%) was 30, and only 8 teachers taught C1 level. No participants had students with C2 level English proficiency. The B levels are named as independent user while the C levels refer to proficient user. As for the participants' educational degrees, the highest percentage of the instructors held an MA degree (51.8%) followed by BA graduates (41.1%). 12 instructors (7.1%) held a Ph.D.

After the piloting of the Teacher Wellbeing Survey and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey, they were administered in the format of an online form to Turkish EFL instructors who work in the preparatory programs of foundation universities in Istanbul. Following the collection and analysis of the surveys, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants to gain a deeper understanding of the quantitative data.

### 2.1. Teacher wellbeing survey (TWBS)

In this study, the first section of the Teacher Wellbeing Survey consisted of three questions about the participants' years of experience, educational degree, and the proficiency level they are teaching in order to investigate the difference between the teacher characteristics, wellbeing, and job satisfaction of Turkish EFL instructors who work at the preparatory schools of foundation universities. The participants were expected to choose the relevant answer among the options. The levels were given different names in the institutions, such as A1, Beginner, Track 1, or Route 1. However, as they were based on the descriptors in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (research in [26] they were named A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 to be able to address different preparatory programs.

The second part, the teacher wellbeing survey, was adapted from TWBS, which was originally created by Collie [27]. The original teacher wellbeing scale developed by Collie [27] was a 60-item scale that included three main factors, namely workload wellbeing, organizational wellbeing, student interaction wellbeing. It also aimed to measure the factors which were associated with teachers' experiences: stress, job satisfaction, and flourishing. The tool used in the present study to measure wellbeing was adapted from the original version of the TWBS since it provided an extensive and more accurate overview of the teachers' professional and subjective wellbeing. During the adaptation process, the number of items was reduced from 60 to 33 as they were not relevant to the context of the study. After the adaptation, the Teacher Wellbeing Survey was piloted with 125 Turkish EFL instructors who work in the preparatory programs at foundation universities in Istanbul. In order to test the validity of the survey and determine the factors, exploratory factor analysis was conducted in statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). Based on the results, five cross-loading items were removed from the survey. The number of questions was 28 after the factor analysis. The factors used in the study were named organizational wellbeing, teaching-related wellbeing, workload wellbeing, and general wellbeing. The KMO value was .867, which indicates that sampling was adequate. After cross-loading items were removed, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated as .937, which indicates that the survey was highly reliable.

## 2.2. Teacher job satisfaction survey

In the study, as another data collection instrument, the teacher job satisfaction survey was adapted from Lester [28]. The original survey consisted of 66 items in nine subscales, namely supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition. The items were presented on a likert response set on a scale from 1 to 5 (from strongly disagree to strongly agree). The participants indicated to what extent they agreed or disagreed with each item.

During the adaptation process, the number of items was reduced from 66 to 35 as some items were not relevant to the context of the study. Besides, the items which aimed to measure the same aspect were eliminated from the survey. Furthermore, the wording of some items was changed to make it more suitable for the context of the study. After the adaptation, the survey was piloted with a sample of 125 Turkish EFL instructors who work in the preparatory programs at foundation universities in Istanbul. In order to test the validity of the survey and determine the factors, exploratory factor analysis was conducted in SPSS. Based on the results, seven cross-loading items were removed from the survey. The number of questions was 28 after the factor analysis. The factors used in the study were named teaching work, administration, security, responsibility, and challenges. KMO value was .830, which indicates that sampling was adequate. After cross-loading items were removed, the cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated as .898, which indicates that the survey was highly reliable.

## 2.3. Semi-structured interviews

After the collection and analysis of the quantitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants because “interviews enable participants –be they, interviewers or interviewees – to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view” [29]. Thus, four questions were addressed to the participants in order to find out their perceptions regarding the influential factors of their wellbeing and job satisfaction. The questions were prepared by the researcher and checked by an ELT expert in order to avoid ambiguity and bias. The questions were sent to the participants via e-mail. After the participants’ responses were obtained, they were analyzed through content analysis [25].

The data collected to reach the aims of the study were obtained from both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data obtained from the surveys were analyzed through SPSS, whereas the qualitative data gained from the semi-structured interviews were examined through content analysis.

Specifically, pearson correlation was used to test whether there was any relationship between the job satisfaction and wellbeing of Turkish EFL instructors of the preparatory program in foundation universities in Istanbul. Two assumptions should be fulfilled to be able to conduct this analysis: having continuous variables and normal distribution of the data [30]. In the current study, the mean scores of both the teacher wellbeing survey and the teacher job satisfaction survey are continuous variables. Besides, according to Tabachnick and Fidell [31], when the skewness and kurtosis values remain in the band of  $\pm 1.5$ , it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed. Therefore, the mean of the teacher wellbeing survey was normally distributed, with skewness of -.243 (SE=.187) and kurtosis of -.449 (SE=.373). Finally, the mean of the teacher job satisfaction survey was found to be normally distributed as the value of skewness was -.081 (SE=.187) while the value of kurtosis was .513 (SE=.373).

Moreover, to examine whether there is any difference between the job satisfaction, wellbeing, and each teacher characteristic of the participants, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. In order to conduct ANOVA, certain assumptions such as normal distribution of the data, homogeneity of variance, and independence of samples should be confirmed [30]. As aforementioned, the mean scores of teacher wellbeing survey and teacher job satisfaction survey were normally distributed. Furthermore, homoscedasticity was checked through Levene’s test in SPSS. The p-values for the mean of the teacher wellbeing survey by years of experience, the proficiency level taught, and educational degree were 289, 060, 259, respectively. Moreover, the p-values for the mean of the teacher job satisfaction survey by years of experience and the proficiency level taught were 259 and 537, respectively. As they were greater than .05, it was concluded that they met the homogeneity of variance assumption of ANOVA. However, the p-value for the mean of the teacher job satisfaction survey by educational degree was 014. Thus, it was concluded that the variances were not equal, and the Welch test was applied.

Finally, semi-structured interviews were analyzed through content analysis. The categories and themes regarding the perceptions of Turkish EFL instructors about the influential factors of their wellbeing and job satisfaction were determined through coding. More specifically, after in-depth coding was conducted, major themes and categories that emerged from the codes related to teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction were identified.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first question in the study aimed to explore whether there was any relationship between the participants' wellbeing and job satisfaction. Pearson correlation was used to examine the relationship between the two variables. When the mean scores of the teacher wellbeing survey and teacher job satisfaction survey were correlated, it was found that there was a statistically significant, positive, and moderate correlation between the two variables,  $r(166)=.651$ ,  $p<.01$  [32]. The obtained results report that when the participants' level of wellbeing increased, their level of job satisfaction also increased or vice versa. The reason might lie in that the factors affecting the wellbeing and job satisfaction of teachers positively or negatively are similar due to the nature of the job as well as the human character. For instance, studies on teacher wellbeing indicated that good relationships with colleagues, student achievement, and teaching efficacy were connected to high wellbeing [33]-[35]. Similarly, collegiality, teachers' efficacy beliefs, and student success were also the indicators of teacher job satisfaction [36]-[38].

Besides, the qualitative findings of the present study also demonstrated that certain organizational factors such as excessive workload, low pay, and lack of support contributed to both low wellbeing and job dissatisfaction of the participating teachers. In addition, the instructors who described their wellbeing using positive adjectives preferred to use words with positive connotations to talk about their satisfaction with their current job, which indicates a relationship between teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction.

Finally, there are a few studies in the literature that suggest that there is a relationship between teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction [39]-[41]. For instance, Rastegar and Moradi [41] suggested that teachers' job satisfaction and spiritual wellbeing were significantly and negatively correlated. Besides, Kidger *et al.* [40] stated that the poor wellbeing of teachers was strongly associated with job dissatisfaction. Finally, Karabati *et al.* [39] also reported that employees with high job satisfaction were found to have strong subjective happiness and satisfaction with their life. Although not many in number, all these studies are in accordance with the finding of the present study.

The second research question of the current study aimed to investigate whether there was a significant difference between the job satisfaction of the participants and the following teacher characteristics: years of experience, the proficiency level taught, and educational degree. To begin with, the difference between the participants job satisfaction and their years of experience was examined. One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there was a significant difference between the job satisfaction of the participants and their years of experience. No statistically significant difference could be seen between the job satisfaction of the instructors and their years of experience,  $F(4, 163)=0.801$ ,  $p=0.526$ . Hence, this result suggests that the participants' job satisfaction did not differ in terms of their teaching experience among the group of instructors with 1-5 years of experience ( $M=3.72$ ,  $SD=.30$ ), instructors with 6-10 years of experience ( $M=3.74$ ,  $SD=.42$ ), instructors with 11-15 years of experience ( $M=3.59$ ,  $SD=.38$ ), instructors with 16-20 years of experience ( $M=3.76$ ,  $SD=.47$ ), and instructors with more than 20 years of experience ( $M=3.70$ ,  $SD=.38$ ). It is probably due to the unique challenges brought by the COVID-19 pandemic. That is to say; after the breakout of the pandemic, teachers had to adapt to a new teaching environment, which is online platforms, and develop new skills regardless of their teaching experience. Therefore, all experience groups needed to start from the beginning, and those who didn't wish to adopt new practices left the profession. However, as there have not been enough studies on teacher job satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic yet, further research is needed to confirm these interpretations.

Besides, various studies in literature concur with the finding of the present study regarding the difference between teacher job satisfaction and teaching experience [42]-[45]. However, there are many studies that claim more or less experienced teachers have a greater level of job satisfaction. Thus, there is still a need for further investigation of the topic.

Secondly, the participants' job satisfaction was explored in terms of the proficiency level taught. In order to measure whether the job satisfaction of the participants differed based on the proficiency level they are teaching, One-way ANOVA was run. There was no statistically significant difference between the teachers' job satisfaction and the proficiency level taught,  $F(4, 163)=0.134$ ,  $p=0.970$ . Thus, it can be inferred that the instructors' job satisfaction did not differ in terms of the proficiency level taught among the group of instructors teaching A1 level ( $M=3.75$ ,  $SD=.45$ ), instructors teaching A2 level ( $M=3.70$ ,  $SD=.43$ ), instructors teaching B1 level ( $M=3.69$ ,  $SD=.36$ ), instructors with teaching B2 level ( $M=3.73$ ,  $SD=.37$ ), and instructors teaching C1 level ( $M=3.76$ ,  $SD=.31$ ). Although there are various studies in literature examining EFL teachers' English proficiency in relation to different variables [46]-[48], no studies have been found examining the English proficiency level taught with regard to teacher job satisfaction. Therefore, this result contributes to the existing literature. However, further research is required to confirm the finding of the present study.

Lastly, the job satisfaction of the participants was investigated based on their educational degrees. Welch test was utilized to find out whether there was a significant difference between the job satisfaction of the participants and their educational degree. There was no statistically significant difference between the instructors' job satisfaction and their educational degree, Welch's  $F(2,28.311)=0.258$ ,  $p>.05$ . Therefore, it was

concluded that the teachers' job satisfaction did not differ based on their educational degree among the group of instructors with BA degree ( $M=3.73$ ,  $SD=.38$ ), instructors with MA degree ( $M=3.69$ ,  $SD=.35$ ), and instructors with PhD degree ( $M=3.66$ ,  $SD=.66$ ). This finding is in contradiction with some studies in the literature which suggest that job satisfaction of teachers increases as their level of education increases e.g. [17], [49]. The reason might lie in that the instructors who work in preparatory programs are more interested in practical ideas that they can implement in their classrooms. Hence, professional development activities might be more favored over academic studies. In other words, having a postgraduate degree may not have a direct impact on the instructors' actual teaching practices. Therefore, it may not cause a difference in the instructors' job satisfaction.

The third research question in the study aimed to explore whether there was a significant difference between the participants' wellbeing and the following teacher characteristics: years of experience, the proficiency level taught, and educational degree. Firstly, the difference between the participants' wellbeing and their years of experience was investigated. In order to find out whether there was a significant difference between the wellbeing of the participants and their years of experience, One-way ANOVA was used. There was no statistically significant difference between the wellbeing of the instructors and their years of experience,  $F(4,163)=0.729$ ,  $p=.574$ . In other words, the teachers' wellbeing did not differ based on their teaching experience among the group of instructors with 1-5 years of experience ( $M=5.50$ ,  $SD=.68$ ), instructors with 6-10 years of experience ( $M=5.57$ ,  $SD=.86$ ), instructors with 11-15 years of experience ( $M=5.58$ ,  $SD=.83$ ), instructors with 16-20 years of experience ( $M=5.80$ ,  $SD=.78$ ), and instructors with more than 20 years of experience ( $M=5.70$ ,  $SD=.64$ ). The finding contradicts with various studies in literature because some studies suggest that as years of experience increase, the level of teachers' wellbeing decreases [6], [50], [51], whereas other studies propose that experienced teachers have a greater level of wellbeing [52]. Hence, the current study contributes to the existing body of research on teacher wellbeing. The reason behind this finding might be due to the significant changes in both the personal and professional lives of the instructors due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Furthermore, the wellbeing of the participants was investigated based on the proficiency level taught. One-way ANOVA was utilized in order to examine whether the wellbeing of the participating instructors differed according to the proficiency level they are teaching. There wasn't a significant difference between the proficiency level taught and the participants' wellbeing,  $F(4, 163)=0.496$ ,  $p=.739$ . This finding showed that the instructors' wellbeing did not differ based on the proficiency level taught among the group of instructors teaching A1 level ( $M=5.55$ ,  $SD=.83$ ), instructors teaching A2 level ( $M=5.62$ ,  $SD=.74$ ), instructors teaching B1 level ( $M=5.61$ ,  $SD=.75$ ), instructors teaching B2 level ( $M=5.52$ ,  $SD=.92$ ), and instructors teaching C1 level ( $M=5.94$ ,  $SD=.29$ ). Despite several studies in the literature investigating EFL teachers' English proficiency with regard to certain factors [46]-[48], there have been no studies exploring the relationship between the English proficiency level taught and teacher wellbeing so far. Hence, this finding fills a gap in the existing body of research on teacher wellbeing. Nevertheless, further research is needed to validate the result of the current study.

Finally, the participants' wellbeing was explored in terms of their educational degree. One-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate whether there was any difference between groups based on their educational degree. There was no statistically significant difference between participants' educational degree and their wellbeing,  $F(2,165)=0.550$ ,  $p=.578$ . Specifically, the participants' wellbeing did not differ in terms of their educational degree among the group of instructors with BA degree ( $M=5.56$ ,  $SD=.82$ ), instructors with MA degree ( $M=5.62$ ,  $SD=.73$ ), and instructors with PhD degree ( $M=5.80$ ,  $SD=.63$ ). This finding is in line with Yildirim [6]. However, it conflicts with the study of Kwon *et al.* [53], which suggests that teachers with higher educational degrees report a lower level of wellbeing. Therefore, more research is needed to confirm this finding. The underlying reason might be that EFL instructors in preparatory programs are more interested in professional development activities such as courses, seminars, and workshops that offer them practical ideas to implement in their classrooms rather than academic studies.

The fourth research question of the study aimed to explore the perceptions of the participating instructors about the influential factors on their wellbeing and job satisfaction. In order to find out how the participants perceived the factors that were influential on their wellbeing and job satisfaction as a teacher, semi-structured interviews were conducted. After the responses of the teachers were analyzed, four main themes were identified: low wellbeing, high wellbeing, job satisfaction, and job dissatisfaction.

Regarding low wellbeing, the data analysis indicated that distance education and its challenges brought by the COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on the wellbeing of the participating instructors. Those whose workload increased and had extra responsibilities felt overwhelmed and depressed during this period. Besides, the lack of appreciation and support contributed to a decrease in the teachers' motivation. Finally, teachers who worked with disengaged students had difficulty with managing their lessons.

In terms of high wellbeing, the analysis revealed that positive personality, position and background, and the spiritual value assigned to the teaching role were identified as personal factors that led to a high level of wellbeing. Another significant factor was rapport with students and the participants' contribution to their students' achievement. Finally, recognition, support, and appreciation from the administration, sufficient income, and relations with colleagues were positively influential in the participating teachers' wellbeing.

A variety of organizational factors such as relationship with administration and colleagues, autonomy, salary and so on were found to be influential on the participating instructors' job satisfaction. Besides, as in the high level of wellbeing, helping students progress in English and building good rapport contributed to the job satisfaction of the teachers. Finally, those who were willing to improve themselves professionally and had higher motivation towards their profession seemed to be more content with their current job situation.

The job dissatisfaction of the participants was mostly related to organizational factors such as low salary, workload, and lack of appreciation. However, an enormous increase in work hours and responsibilities with distance education not only affected the participants but their families. It was found that some teachers had difficulty with creating a balance between their personal and professional life. Thus, it resulted in turnover intentions.

Overall, the qualitative findings suggested that the factors affecting the instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction were similar due to the profession itself, human nature, and the current state of the world. First of all, it was concluded that the changes brought by the COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on the instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction. The findings regarding the effects of pandemic-related factors on teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction are in line with the studies carried out by [54]-[57]. Secondly, organizational factors were found to have both negative and positive impacts on the instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction. Factors such as low salary, lack of support and appreciation, and excessive workload were related to low wellbeing, and job dissatisfaction, whereas factors such as high salary, positive relations with colleagues, and administration and promotion were associated with high wellbeing and job satisfaction. These findings concur with several studies in literature [6], [38], [58]-[60].

Another significant finding was that the students of instructors were very influential on their wellbeing and job satisfaction both negatively and positively. Student achievement and motivated students affected the wellbeing and job satisfaction of the participants positively. However, demotivated students and being unable to contribute to student success caused low wellbeing and job dissatisfaction. Various studies in literature resonate with these findings [36], [61]-[63].

Finally, personal factors such as positive personality traits, motivation towards teaching, and efforts for professional development increased the instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction. These findings are in line with some studies in the literature [6], [64], [65], which reported a relationship between individual factors and teachers job satisfaction.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, the results of quantitative data indicated that there was a statistically significant, positive, and moderate relationship between the participants' job satisfaction and wellbeing. Besides, no difference was found between the participants' wellbeing and their teacher characteristics. Similarly, there was no difference between the teacher characteristics of the participants and their job satisfaction. Regarding the findings of qualitative data, it is concluded that exploring teachers' perceptions regarding their wellbeing and job satisfaction yields valuable data for administrators and professional development units in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning processes.

The study has several recommendations for future research in the field of language education and teacher development. First of all, professional development units of the preparatory programs might design courses that aim to increase teachers' wellbeing and job satisfaction and report the effects of these implementations on teachers to contribute to the existing literature. Besides, the institutions can carry out needs analysis in order to identify the factors that affect the instructors' wellbeing and job satisfaction. In addition, further research on the job satisfaction of EFL instructors during the COVID-19 pandemic can be carried out in order to gain a deeper understanding of the topic. Moreover, future studies can investigate teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction for a longer period and with a larger sample size in order to identify the changes over time. Furthermore, further studies can be conducted to find out the effect of the proficiency level taught on teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction in order to confirm the findings of the current study. Besides, future research might compare the wellbeing and job satisfaction of Turkish EFL instructors in preparatory programs at foundation universities with the wellbeing and job satisfaction of those at state universities to bring a new perspective to the field. Finally, future studies might collect data through lesson observations in order to gain insights regarding teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction. Therefore, the findings of this study should be accepted as suggestive rather than descriptive.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. E. P. Seligman, *Flourish: a visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2011.
- [2] A. Aelterman, N. Engels, K. Van Petegem, and J. P. Verhaeghe, "The well-being of teachers in Flanders: The importance of a supportive school culture," *Educational Studies*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 285–297, Sep. 2007, doi: 10.1080/03055690701423085.
- [3] U. Klusmann, M. Kunter, U. Trautwein, O. Lüdtke, and J. Baumert, "Teachers' Occupational Well-Being and Quality of Instruction: The Important Role of Self-Regulatory Patterns," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 100, no. 3, pp. 702–715, Aug. 2008, doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.100.3.702.
- [4] V. Mehdinezhad, "Relationship between High School teachers' wellbeing and teachers' efficacy," *Acta Scientiarum Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, Nov. 2012, doi: 10.4025/actascieduc.v34i2.16716.
- [5] H. Yin, S. Huang, and L. Lv, "A multilevel analysis of job characteristics, emotion regulation, and teacher well-being: A Job Demands-Resources Model," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 9, no. NOV, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02395.
- [6] K. Yıldırım, "Main factors of teachers professional well-being," *Educational Research and Reviews*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 153–163, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.5897/err2013.1691.
- [7] L. Bermejo, V. Hernández-Franco, and M. Prieto-Ursúa, "Teacher Well-being: Personal and Job Resources and Demands," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 84, pp. 1321–1325, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.750.
- [8] R. J. Collie, J. D. Shapka, N. E. Perry, and A. J. Martin, "Teacher Well-Being: Exploring Its Components and a Practice-Oriented Scale," *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 744–756, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1177/0734282915587990.
- [9] S. Mercer, "Psychology for language learning: Spare a thought for the teacher," *Language Teaching*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 504–525, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1017/S0261444817000258.
- [10] Z. Bajorek, J. Gulliford, and T. Taskila, "Healthy teachers, higher marks? Establishing a link between teacher health & wellbeing, and student outcomes," 2014. [Online]. Available: [www.theworkfoundation.com](http://www.theworkfoundation.com).
- [11] A. G. Dworkin, "Perspectives on teacher burnout and school reform," *International Education Journal*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 69–78, 2001.
- [12] E. M. Skaalvik and S. Skaalvik, "Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1059–1069, May 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001.
- [13] Z. Dömyei, *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Routledge, 2014.
- [14] R. L. Oxford, "Powerfully Positive: Searching for a Model of Language Learner Well-Being," 2016, pp. 21–37.
- [15] H. M. Weiss, "Deconstructing job satisfaction. Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences," *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 173–194, Jun. 2002, doi: 10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1.
- [16] Z. Zahoor, "A comparative study of psychological well-being and job satisfaction among teachers," *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 181–184, 2015, [Online]. Available: [http://www.iahrw.com/index.php/home/journal\\_detail/19#list](http://www.iahrw.com/index.php/home/journal_detail/19#list).
- [17] R. D. Sharma and J. Jyoti, "Job satisfaction of university teachers An empirical study," *Journal of Services Research*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 51–80, 2009.
- [18] B. Feng, "A study of teacher job satisfaction and factors that influence it," *Chinese Education and Society*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 47–64, Sep. 2007, doi: 10.2753/CED1061-1932400506.
- [19] X. Ma and R. B. MacMillan, "Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction," *J Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 93, no. 1, pp. 39–47, Sep. 1999, doi: 10.1080/00220679909597627.
- [20] R. J. Collie, J. D. Shapka, and N. E. Perry, "School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 104, no. 4, pp. 1189–1204, 2012, doi: 10.1037/a0029356.
- [21] E. Hawe, B. Tuck, R. Manthei, V. Adair, and D. Moore, "Job Satisfaction and Stress in New Zealand Primary Teachers," *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 193–205, 2000.
- [22] L. G. M. Prick, "Satisfaction and stress among teachers," *International Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 363–377, Jan. 1989, doi: 10.1016/0883-0355(89)90034-7.
- [23] P. D. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, and S. Mercer, "Language teachers' coping strategies during the Covid-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions," *System*, vol. 94, p. 102352, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102352.
- [24] M. Emin Türkoğlu, R. Cansoy, and H. Parlar, "Examining Relationship between Teachers' Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 765–772, 2017, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2017.050509.
- [25] J. W. Creswell, *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2002.
- [26] "The CEFR Levels," *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>.
- [27] R. J. Collie, "Understanding Teacher Well-being and Motivation: Measurement, Theory, and Change Over Time," University of British Columbia, 2014.
- [28] P. Lester, "Development and Factor Analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 223–233, 1987, doi: 10.1177/0013164487471031.
- [29] L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison, *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- [30] A. Ural and I. Kılıç, *Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi (In Turkish)*, 6th ed. 2021.
- [31] B. G. Tabachnick and L. S. Fidell, "Using Multivariate Statistics" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 611–628, 2017, [Online]. Available: <https://www.amazon.com/Using-Multivariate-Statistics-Barbara-Tabachnick/dp/0205849571>.
- [32] P. Schober and L. A. Schwarte, "Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation," *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, vol. 126, no. 5, pp. 1763–1768, May 2018, doi: 10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864.
- [33] S. Huang and H. Yin, "Teacher Efficacy and Affective Well-Being in Hong Kong: An Examination of Their Relationships and Individual Differences," *ECNU Review of Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 102–126, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.30926/ecnuroe201801205.
- [34] S. Owen, "Professional learning communities: building skills, reinvigorating the passion, and nurturing teacher wellbeing and 'flourishing' within significantly innovative schooling contexts," *Educational Review*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 403–419, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.1080/00131911.2015.1119101.
- [35] S. Roffey, "Pupil wellbeing—Teacher wellbeing: Two sides of the same coin?," *Educational and Child Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 4, p. 8, 2012.
- [36] G. V. Caprara, C. Barbaranelli, P. Steca, and P. S. Malone, "Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level," *Journal of School Psychology*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 473–490, Dec.

- 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001.
- [37] G. Büyüksahin Çevik, "The Roles of Life Satisfaction, Teaching Efficacy, and Self-esteem in Predicting Teachers' Job Satisfaction," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 338–346, 2017, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2017.050306.
- [38] E. M. Skaalvik and S. Skaalvik, "Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1029–1038, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001.
- [39] S. Karabati, N. Ensari, and D. Fiorentino, "Job Satisfaction, Rumination, and Subjective Well-Being: A Moderated Mediation Model," *Journal of Happiness Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 251–268, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10902-017-9947-x.
- [40] J. Kidger *et al.*, "Teachers' wellbeing and depressive symptoms, and associated risk factors: A large cross sectional study in English secondary schools," *Journal of Affective Disorders*, vol. 192, pp. 76–82, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2015.11.054.
- [41] M. Rastegar and S. Moradi, "On the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, and Their Spiritual Sense of Well-Being," *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, vol. 06, no. 01, pp. 1–12, 2016, doi: 10.4236/ojml.2016.61001.
- [42] E. T. Canrinus, M. Helms-Lorenz, D. Beijaard, J. Buitink, and A. Hofman, "Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: Exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity," *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 115–132, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2.
- [43] A. Crossman and P. Harris, "Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers," *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 29–46, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1177/1741143206059538.
- [44] S. Green-Reese, D. J. Johnson, and W. A. Campbell, "Teacher Job-Satisfaction and Teacher Job Stress - School Size, Age and Teaching Experience," *Education*, vol. 112, no. 2, pp. 247–252, 1991.
- [45] A. Toropova, E. Myrberg, and S. Johansson, "Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics," *Educational Review*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 71–97, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247.
- [46] A. Tsang, "EFL/ESL Teachers' General Language Proficiency and Learners' Engagement," *RELC Journal*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 99–113, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0033688217690060.
- [47] L. Van Canh and W. A. Renandya, "Teachers' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use: A Conversation Analysis Study," *RELC Journal*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 67–81, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0033688217690935.
- [48] A. N. Wulyani, I. Elgort, and A. Coxhead, "Exploring EFL teachers' English language proficiency: Lessons from Indonesia," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 263–274, 2019, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20217.
- [49] M. M. Ghafoor, "Role of Demographic Characteristics on Job Satisfaction," *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, vol. 6, no. No. 1, pp. 30–45, 2012, [Online]. Available: <https://d1wqxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/11199193/My>.
- [50] A. Aelterman, N. Engels, K. Van Petegem, and J. P. Verhaeghe, "Het welbevinden van de leerkracht is een opgave voor de school. Beschrijving van een instrument om het welbevinden van leerkrachten te meten," in *Handboek personeelsbeleid: personeel en organisatie*, Wolters Plantyn, 2003, pp. 25–52.
- [51] U. Sann, "Job conditions and wellness of German secondary school teachers," *Psychology and Health*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 489–500, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1080/0887044031000147210.
- [52] K. Van Petegem, B. P. M. Creemers, Y. Rossel, and A. Aelterman, "Relationships Between Teacher Characteristics, Interpersonal Teacher Behaviour and Teacher Wellbeing," *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 34–43, 2005, [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23870662>.
- [53] K. A. Kwon *et al.*, "Neglected Elements of a High-Quality Early Childhood Workforce: Whole Teacher Well-Being and Working Conditions," *Early Childhood Education Journal*, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10643-020-01124-7.
- [54] R. Allen, J. Jerrim, and S. Sims, "How did the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic affect teacher wellbeing?," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://repec-cepeo.ucl.ac.uk/cepeow/cepeowp20-15.pdf>.
- [55] C. Petrie, "Current opportunities and challenges on Covid-19 in education. Spotlight: Quality education for all during Covid-19 crisis. OECD/Hundred Research Report #011.," 2020. [Online]. Available: [https://hundred-cdn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/report/file/15/hundred\\_spotlight\\_covid-19\\_digital.pdf](https://hundred-cdn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/report/file/15/hundred_spotlight_covid-19_digital.pdf).
- [56] A. Kızılkaya Namlı and M. A. Yücekaya, "Motivation And Job Satisfaction Of Physical Education Teachers During Pandemic," *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, vol. 17, no. Pandemi Özel Sayısı, pp. 3148–3172, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.26466/opus.887856.
- [57] A. Chitra, "Study on Impact of Occupational Stress on Job Satisfaction of Teachers during Covid-19 Pandemic Period," *Global Development Review*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 52–62, 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349760805>.
- [58] B. Aral and E. Mede, "The impact of emotions on the well-being of the english preparatory program instructors," *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 574, 2018, doi: 10.5961/jhes.2018.298.
- [59] S. Dinham and C. Scott, "A three domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction," *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 362–378, Oct. 1998, doi: 10.1108/09578239810211545.
- [60] I. Kim and W. Loadman, "Predicting Teacher Job Satisfaction," *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 1689–1699, 2013, [Online]. Available: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED383707>.
- [61] J. L. Engelking, "Teacher Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.," *Spectrum*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 33–38, 1986, [Online]. Available: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ334194>.
- [62] J. L. Spilt, H. M. Y. Koomen, and J. T. Thijs, "Teacher Wellbeing: The Importance of Teacher-Student Relationships," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 457–477, Dec. 2011, doi: 10.1007/s10648-011-9170-y.
- [63] C. N. Tsouloupas, R. L. Carson, R. Matthews, M. J. Grawitch, and L. K. Barber, "Exploring the association between teachers' perceived student misbehaviour and emotional exhaustion: The importance of teacher efficacy beliefs and emotion regulation," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 173–189, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1080/01443410903494460.
- [64] P. D. MacIntyre, J. Ross, K. Talbot, S. Mercer, T. Gregersen, and C. A. Banga, "Stressors, personality and wellbeing among language teachers," *System*, vol. 82, pp. 26–38, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.02.013.
- [65] A. K. Salaudin, M. Mohamed, and A. A. Kamal, "The Relationship Between Personality Traits and Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Teachers in Putrajaya," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 13, pp. 445–456, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.6007/ijarbs/v9-i13/6870.

**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

**Gizem Adeka**    graduated from Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education in 2015. She completed MA program on English Language Education at Bahçeşehir University in June, 2021. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the English Language Education program at Bahçeşehir University and working as an EFL instructor at Kadir Has University School of Foreign Languages. She can be contacted at email: [gizemaiygun@gmail.com](mailto:gizemaiygun@gmail.com).



**Enisa Mede**    is a Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education. She is an Associate Professor at the Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) of Bahçeşehir University (BAU), Istanbul. Her research interests lie in the area of curriculum design and evaluation, bilingual education, teacher education and language development in young learners. She has been offering Teaching Language Skills, School Experience and Practicum courses at the undergraduate level and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and courses at the graduate level. She has authored numerous articles in indexed journals and published many chapters in national and international books. She can be contacted at email: [enisa.mede@es.bau.edu.tr](mailto:enisa.mede@es.bau.edu.tr).