Well-Being and Burnout Levels of EFL Teachers Working in Public and Private High Schools: The Roles of School Principals

Elif SEVEN[1], Turgay HAN[2]

[1]Department of English Language and Literature, Ordu University, Turkey
[2]Department of English Language and Literature, Ordu University, Turkey

Abstract

This study examined English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' well-being and burnout in public and private high schools in Türkiye, with particular attention to the role of school principals. A convergent mixed-methods design was employed. Quantitative data included responses from 64 EFL teachers to the PERMA-Profiler and Copenhagen Burnout Inventory. The study also conducted semi-structured interviews with 10 EFL teachers and 11 school principals. The quantitative findings indicated relatively high overall well-being and similar levels across the three burnout dimensions. Personal and work-related burnout were negatively correlated with overall well-being, whereas student-related burnout showed no significant relationship. Although burnout levels did not differ significantly between public and private school teachers, public school teachers reported higher Meaning scores. Younger and less experienced teachers also showed greater vulnerability to burnout. The interviews revealed different challenges across the two school contexts. Public school teachers emphasized crowded classrooms, curriculum constraints, and limited English lesson hours, while private school teachers described financial concerns, parental pressure, and job insecurity. Teachers valued principals who communicated openly, understood their professional needs, and helped manage external pressures. Principals described well-being through observable cues and saw their role as creating a positive climate and buffering teachers from external pressures. The findings suggest that school principals can contribute to supportive working environments, although many of the challenges affecting EFL teachers extend beyond their control.

Keywords: *EFL Teacher Well-Being, Burnout, School Principals, School Type, PERMA Model, Mixed-Methods Research.*

1. Introduction

Teacher well-being depends on internal traits such as grit and external conditions like workload and institutional support [1]–[3]. While stress, burnout, and attrition affect educators broadly [4], [5], language teachers carry discipline-specific challenges, notably target-language anxiety, heightened emotional labor, demanding instructional methods, and intercultural pressures [6]–[9].

An ecological perspective shows that intersecting individual, social, and institutional factors shape language teacher well-being [5], [10]. Among organizational influences, school leadership, especially transformational leadership that inspires staff and addresses their needs, plays an important role in supporting teacher well-being and reducing burnout, with implications for teacher retention [11]–[13].

Although recent research increasingly explores EFL teacher well-being ecologically [5], [10], [14], the intersections among individual, social, and institutional factors remain under-researched [15]. Teacher well-being scholarship has historically centered on negative constructs like burnout, highlighting personal factors, limited autonomy, low self-efficacy, and administrative pressures [16]. Despite school principals' pivotal role in shaping well-being, including fostering supportive climates that promote teaching enjoyment [2], research remains predominantly focused on teacher perspectives and overlooks administrative viewpoints [6], [14], [17], [18]. Research in Türkiye suggests that school leadership and institutional climate strongly influence teacher outcomes [12], [19]. Kılınç et al. [19] found that leadership grounded in transparent communication, collaboration, and instructional backing helped teachers mitigate stressors and enhanced well-being. Similarly, Çilek et al. [20] surveyed 1,240 teachers and found that principal support and resilience were directly and indirectly associated with teacher leadership through work engagement. Despite these insights, empirical research still relies primarily on teacher self-reports to assess leadership effectiveness [12], [21]. Most existing research focuses on public or tertiary contexts, leaving private-school EFL educators underexamined, although some studies have compared burnout across public and private schools [22], [23].

This study addresses two key gaps in the literature. First, research on teacher well-being has relied predominantly on teacher self-reports and largely overlooked school principals [24], despite evidence that school leaders critically shape job satisfaction and burnout through cultivating positive school climates [25]. Second, while Turkish scholarship has examined principal support and resilience [20], transformational leadership and burnout [12], and leadership styles and subjective well-being [21], few studies directly investigate teacher well-being from school principals' perspectives [6], [14], [17], [24].

To address these limitations, this convergent mixed-methods study examines EFL teachers' well-being and burnout across public and private high schools in an urban center in Türkiye, exploring how principals and teachers perceive principals' attitudes and practices in relation to these outcomes.

EFL teachers were selected as they face discipline-specific stressors such as foreign language anxiety, intensive emotional labor, and demanding instructional methodologies [6]–[9]. In addition, some studies of school leadership in Türkiye have focused on teachers in general rather than EFL teachers specifically [21], [26]. Ultimately, this study aims to describe the leadership practices that principals and teachers associate with teacher well-being and burnout across both sectors. Accordingly, it addresses the following central research questions:

1. What are the well-being and burnout profiles of EFL teachers, and how do these constructs interact and vary across institutional and demographic variables? (*1a) What are the levels of well-being (PERMA) and burnout (CBI) among EFL teachers, and do they significantly differ by school type (public vs. private) or demographic/professional characteristics? (1b) What is the relationship between EFL teachers' well-being dimensions and their burnout levels?*
2. How do school principals and EFL teachers perceive, experience, and manage teacher well-being, burnout, and principal support practices within public and private school contexts? *(2a) How do high school principals understand, identify, and define EFL teacher well-being in their institutions? (2b) How do EFL teachers perceive their principals' attitudes, guidance, and protective buffer roles in relation to their well-being and burnout?*
3. In what ways and to what extent do the qualitative insights into school dynamics converge with and explain the quantitative patterns of EFL teacher well-being and burnout across public and private high schools? *(3a) How do qualitative themes regarding school dynamics (e.g., parental relations, pay, job security) contextualize and explain the quantitative differences observed between public and private schools?*

2. Method

This study employs a convergent mixed-methods design [27] within a bounded instrumental case study framework [28] to investigate school principals' roles in EFL teacher well-being and burnout. The quantitative strand uses the PERMA-Profiler and Copenhagen Burnout Inventory to assess levels, institutional/demographic differences, and interactions among constructs. Concurrently, the qualitative strand examines principals' and teachers' perspectives on teacher well-being, burnout, and administrative support. The study analyzed the strands independently and integrated them during interpretation to capture nuances beyond standardized metrics [27]. Instrumentally focused on leadership's role [28], the case is bounded by public and private high schools in a city centre in Türkiye and involves EFL teachers and principals, with data collected from December 2025 to July 2026.

2.1. Sample

The target population included EFL teachers and principals across 17 public and 11 private high schools ($N = 243$ English teachers) in an urban central district in Türkiye (District Directorate of National Education, personal communication, April 13, 2026). The quantitative strand employed convenience and snowball sampling [27], yielding 64 respondents, with 54 valid responses for the CBI and 50 for the PERMA-Profiler. For the qualitative strand, purposive sampling [29] was used to recruit one EFL teacher and one principal from each of 10 participating schools (seven public, three private). Inclusion criteria required voluntary consent and at least one year of experience. The study purposefully included one private middle school principal with an EFL teaching background for subject-specific insight. Participating principals had 16–44 years of total professional experience, including 4–43 years in administrative roles.

In the quantitative strand, the 64 EFL teachers were mostly female (65.1%), aged 41 or above (57.8%), and highly experienced, with 60.9% having 16 or more years of teaching experience and 57.8% having worked at their current school for 7 or more years. Most worked in public schools (75.0%), taught only at the high school level (64.1%), and held permanent positions (88.9%). Among those who reported

their field, 62.5% studied ELT and 27.1% studied English Language and Literature. Most (67.2%) had no prior training in stress management or well-being, and 12.0% held an international certification. Percentages are based on valid responses, as some items were missing.
In the qualitative strand, we interviewed 10 EFL teachers (nine female, one male) from private schools (n = 3), Anatolian high schools (n = 4), and one each from a science, sports, and Imam Hatip high school. Of the six who reported age, ages ranged from 33 to 62. Total teaching experience ranged from 11 to 37 years (M = 24.1). We also interviewed 11 principals (eight male, three female). Of the seven who reported their age, ages ranged from 41 to 57. Their former teaching subjects varied, with geography the most common (n = 3).

2.2. Research Context

In Türkiye, English teacher candidates complete a four-year undergraduate program and then face a competitive appointment process, as the country has more candidates than the system requires [30]. Because public appointments are limited, many teachers work in private schools, where research reports job insecurity, heavy workloads, long hours, and low wages [31], [32]. Their client-centered model also brings high parent expectations [33], including availability via WhatsApp outside working hours [34]. Public school teachers face heavy workloads, limited autonomy, large classes, and extensive bureaucratic duties [20], [22], [35], [36]. In both sectors, inflation and the rising cost of living have eroded the real value of teacher salaries [30].

2.3. The PERMA-Profiler as the Data Collection Tool

The PERMA-Profiler, developed by Butler and Kern [37] from Seligman's [38] Well-Being Theory, assesses well-being across five elements: Positive Emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment. The full 23-item version, rated on a 0-10 scale, also includes items on negative emotion, physical health, loneliness, and overall well-being. It captures well-being as a multidimensional construct rather than merely the absence of distress and is considered valid and reliable [37], [39]. Demirci et al. [40] adapted it into Turkish, confirmed the five-factor structure, and reported good internal consistency (α = .91) and temporal stability (r = .83 over three weeks); the PERMA framework has also been used with English teachers in Türkiye [41]. This study used the Turkish version.

2.4. Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) as the Data Collection Tool

The CBI, developed by Kristensen et al. [42], has 19 items across three subscales: personal, work-related, and client-related (here, student-related) burnout. In this study, participants rated items from 1 (never) to 5 (always). It is freely available, reliable, and widely used in healthcare [43] and education [44]. This study used the Turkish adaptation by Bakoğlu Deliorman et al. [45], developed in a university context, which showed strong internal consistency (personal: α = .90; work-related: α = .86; student-related: α = .71). The CBI was administered anonymously online via Google Forms. Using both instruments captures positive psychological resources and occupational fatigue.

2.5. Semi-Structured Interviews as the Data Collection Tool

Semi-structured interviews explored how principals and EFL teachers perceived and experienced teacher well-being, burnout, and principal support in their schools. Interview questions were based on Seligman's [38] PERMA model and the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory [42], with separate protocols for teachers and principals. The teacher protocol covered (a) professional background and general satisfaction, (b) workload, resources, and school climate, (c) context-specific challenges and solutions, particularly the public-private distinction, (d) health and well-being, and (e) negative emotions and coping strategies, with questions on school leadership and principal support throughout. The principal protocol focused on attitudes toward teacher well-being and strategies used to support it.
Two experts reviewed the protocols, and we made minor revisions for clarity and relevance. Interviews lasted about 30 minutes, were conducted in Turkish to allow comfortable self-expression, and were audio-recorded with consent. Participation was voluntary, and we anonymized transcripts.

2.6. Quantitative Data Analysis

We analyzed PERMA-Profiler and CBI data using descriptive and inferential statistics. We tested normality with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Because some variables were non-normal and subgroup sizes were unequal and sometimes small, we used non-parametric tests: the Mann-Whitney U test for two independent groups and the Kruskal-Wallis H test for three or more, followed by Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparisons when significant. Spearman's rho examined relationships between CBI burnout dimensions, PERMA well-being dimensions, and the total score, as well as continuous professional variables such as weekly teaching hours and average class size.
Analyses were conducted in jamovi (Version 2.7.14) [46], which runs on R [47]. We assessed internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha and ordinal alpha, and convergent validity with average variance extracted (AVE), using the semlj module [48]. The significance level was set at α = .05.

2.7. Qualitative Data Analysis

We analyzed interviews with principals and EFL teachers using reflexive thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's [49], [50] six-phase framework. The first author transcribed recordings using Transcriber Premium, an AI-based tool, then reviewed and corrected the transcripts during familiarization by reading each transcript multiple times and taking notes. The first author then imported the transcripts into Dedoose for coding. The first author generated initial codes and grouped them into broader themes, which were later reviewed, defined, and named. In the final phase, the themes were explained with participant quotes and linked them to the research questions and the literature.

2.8. Ethics

The study received approval from the Ordu University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee (Decision No. 2025-180, 24 October 2025) and permission from the Turkish Ministry of National Education. We informed participants of the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty, and we obtained written informed consent before data collection. We removed or anonymized school names and identifying information. We stored audio recordings and data on a password-protected device and will permanently delete them after the study.

3. Results

3.1. Quantitative Results

3.1.1. Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity

We examined internal consistency of the CBI and PERMA-Profiler using Cronbach's alpha (α) and ordinal alpha (Oα), and convergent validity using average variance extracted (AVE) (Table 1).

Table 1. *Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity of the CBI and PERMA Subscales*

CBI Subscale	α	Oα	AVE	PERMA	α	Oα	AVE
Personal Burnout	.90	.92	.69	Positive Emotions	.85	.86	.68
Work-Related Burnout	.88	.90	.60	Engagement	.70	.75	.52
Student-Related Burnout	.83	.86	.58	Relationships	.78	.82	.62
				Meaning	.78	.81	.59
				Accomplishment	.55	.59	.39
				Health	.89	.92	.79
				Negative Emotions	.71	.71	.48
				Total Well-Being	.92	.93	.52

Note. α = Cronbach's alpha; Oα = ordinal alpha; AVE = average variance extracted.

Most subscales met the .70 threshold for acceptable reliability. The CBI subscales showed good internal consistency (α = .83 to .90), as did PERMA Total Well-Being (α = .92, Oα = .93). Accomplishment was the exception (α = .55, Oα = .59). Most AVE values exceeded .50, except for Accomplishment (.39) and Negative Emotions (.48). Convergent validity was therefore generally acceptable, but Accomplishment should be interpreted with caution.
Descriptive statistics. Supplementary Table S1 reports descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, median, and missingness) for all CBI and PERMA subscales. Briefly, participants reported burnout levels near the scale midpoint (M ≈ 2.90 on a 1–5 scale). In contrast, overall well-being was relatively high (M = 7.50, SD = 1.23 on a 0–10 scale), led by Accomplishment (M = 7.66, SD = 1.11) and

Engagement (M = 7.65, SD = 1.46), with comparatively lower levels of negative emotions (M = 5.17, SD = 1.75) and loneliness (M = 4.22, SD = 2.59) (see Table S1).

3.1.2. Correlations Among Burnout and Well-Being Dimensions

Supplementary Table S2 details Spearman's rank-order correlations among the CBI and PERMA dimensions. Within the CBI, subscales demonstrated moderate to strong positive correlations ($\rho = .580$ to $.877$, $p < .01$). For the PERMA profile, Total Well-Being was strongly and positively associated with all positive dimensions ($\rho = .697$ to $.893$, $p < .01$), most notably Positive Emotions ($\rho = .893$) and Meaning ($\rho = .888$), while exhibiting an inverse relationship with Negative Emotions ($\rho = -.383$, $p < .01$) and a non-significant link to Loneliness ($\rho = -.13$). Crucially, Personal Burnout ($\rho = -.545, p < .01$) and Work-Related Burnout ($\rho = -.560, p < .01$) were inversely linked to Total Well-Being and positively related to Negative Emotions ($\rho = .578$ and $.481$, respectively). In contrast, Student-Related Burnout showed no significant associations with any PERMA dimension (see Table S2).

3.1.3. Burnout and Well-Being by Demographic and Professional Variables

Table 2 summarizes the significant results.

Table 2. Significant Differences in Burnout and Well-Being by Demographic and Professional Variables

Variable	Outcome	Test result	Pattern (M)
Age	Work-related burnout	H(3) = 9.23, p = .026	≤30 years (3.46) > 31-35 years (1.93)
Total experience	Personal burnout	H(3) = 10.31, p = .016	0-5 years (3.50) > 11-15 years (1.97)
	Work-related burnout	H(3) = 12.19, p = .007	0-5 years (3.67) > 11-15 years (2.03)
	Meaning	H(3) = 10.69, p = .014	11-15 years (8.12) and 16+ years (7.61) > 0-5 years (6.37)
	Total well-being	H(3) = 8.85, p = .031	11-15 years (7.99) and 16+ years (7.62) > 0-5 years (6.56)
School type	Meaning	U = 159.50, p = .046	Public (7.62) > private (6.93)
Level taught	Engagement	U = 178.50, p = .020	High school only (8.01) > high school and other levels (7.07)
	Total well-being	U = 187.50, p = .033	High school only (7.71) > high school and other levels (7.17)
International certification	Meaning	U = 62.50, p = .039	No certificate (7.66) > certificate (5.72)

Note. Only significant results (p < .05) are shown. CBI items were rated on a 5-point scale and PERMA items on a 0-10 scale.

Teachers with 0–5 years of teaching experience reported higher Personal and Work-Related Burnout and lower Meaning and Total Well-Being than more experienced teachers. Younger teachers (30 and below) also reported higher work-related burnout than those aged 31-35. Public-school teachers reported higher Meaning than private-school teachers. Teachers who taught only at the high-school level reported higher Engagement and Total Well-Being than those who also taught other levels. Teachers without an international certificate reported higher Meaning than those with one. No significant differences emerged by gender, employment status, tenure at the current school, field of graduation, number of additional duties, or prior well-being training (all p > .05). Weekly teaching hours and class size were not significantly correlated with any scale (|ρ| ≤ .27). However, longer teaching hours showed weak positive associations with burnout, strongest for work-related burnout (ρ = .26). Several subgroups were small (e.g., contract-based teachers n = 4-6; certified teachers n = 6), and no correction was applied across the many tests, so the isolated p-values near .05 should be interpreted cautiously.

3.2. Qualitative Findings

The analysis of interviews with 11 principals (P01-P11) and 10 EFL teachers (T01-T10) generated three themes (Table 3). ES translated quotations, and TH checked them.

Table 3. *Themes, Subthemes, and Representative Evidence*

Theme	Subtheme	Summary	Representative quote
1. Principals' understanding of EFL teacher well-being	Definition	Well-being was seen as coming to school willingly; some principals defined it in terms of performance expectations. In private schools, it was linked to demand and reputation.	"Not dragging their feet to work" (P08, public)
	Influencing factors	Salary (private schools), materials, physical conditions.	"The most important thing here is salary" (P02, private)
	Indicators	Openness to communication, interactions with students, voluntary projects, student feedback, body language, and regular meetings.	"You can already feel the teacher's unhappiness there" (P11, private)
2. Principals' support practices and responses to burnout	Roles	Provide a positive climate and resources, buffer teachers from parents and other stakeholders, and maintain discipline.	"Instead of passing everything on directly, like a telephone line… filter it" (P09, public)
	Strategies	Regular meetings, improved teachers' rooms and facilities, materials, flexible scheduling, professional development, and mediating with institution owners.	"One of the first things I did was to take a comfortable sofa from the principal's office and place it in the teachers' room" (P04, public)
	First responses to burnout	A private, non-judgmental conversation that explores causes, practical adjustments (e.g., schedule), and mediation between teacher and class.	"I would call my teacher friend to my office" (P10, public)
3. Teachers' experiences of well-being, burnout, and principal support	Ideal principal	Teachers valued principals with an EFL background, who understand their needs without lengthy explanations.	"The administrator who can understand you needs to be an English teacher" (T04, public)
	Factors shaping well-being	Negative: crowded, mixed-level classes; unmotivated students; reduced English hours; rigid curriculum; paperwork; low pay; the secondary status of English. Positive: professional satisfaction, student feedback, open communication with administrators, peer support.	"Language education is not possible in classes of 40 or 45" (T04, public)
	Public-private differences	Private: low and unequal pay, parent pressure, grade expectations, job insecurity, stigma. Advantages: smaller classes, language activities, staying in a preferred city.	"…they think they have bought the whole school" (T01, private)

Across the themes, principals defined and monitored well-being through observable cues and tried to support it through relational, climate-related, and buffering practices, within limits they acknowledged. Teachers valued feeling understood, supported, and protected by their principals, but described many stressors that principals cannot remove, such as curriculum, English lesson hours, class size, and paperwork.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Regarding RQ1, RQ1a, and RQ1b (well-being and burnout profiles), teachers showed a generally positive well-being profile, with Accomplishment and Engagement scoring highest, consistent with research on the role of positive workplaces, teacher-student relationships, and job satisfaction [11], [51]. However, Nadlifah et al. [52] found Accomplishment less developed. Teachers also reported negative emotions, in line with Butler and Kern's [37] multidimensional view and MacIntyre et al.'s [15] argument that positive and negative outcomes are not simple opposites. Burnout was similar across the three CBI dimensions. Burnout did not differ by school type, partly consistent with Karanfil and Yeşilbursa [22], who found no significant differences in emotional exhaustion or depersonalization but significantly higher personal accomplishment among private school teachers. Ebrahimi et al. [53] also found no statistically significant overall effect of working context on EFL teachers' workplace well-being. However, public-school teachers reported higher Meaning, which may reflect the low pay, job insecurity, and profit-oriented priorities reported in private language schools [5]. Younger teachers (30 and below) reported higher work-related burnout than those aged 31-35, and early-career teachers (0-5 years) reported higher personal and work-related burnout and lower Meaning and Total Well-Being than more experienced colleagues. İlya [54], by contrast, found no effect of experience on burnout. Teachers who taught only at high school level reported higher Engagement and Total Well-Being, unlike Yukselir and Ozer [55], who found no differences across levels. Teachers with an international certificate reported lower Meaning (n = 6), which is unexpected given the importance of professional development [56] and should be treated cautiously. Weekly teaching hours and class size were not significantly related to

burnout and well-being, consistent with Hismanoglu and Ersan [57] but not with Demirel and Cephe [58] or Goetze [59].

Regarding RQ2a, principals defined well-being either through performance and institutional expectations, especially in private schools, which relates to PERMA's Accomplishment dimension [37], [38], or as *"not dragging one's feet to work,"* which reflects Positive Emotion and Engagement and a hedonic view of well-being [60]. They identified well-being through observable cues such as body language, communication, and student feedback, as Mugabekazi and Hui [61] did, and valued regular contact, as Kılınç et al. [19] did. For RQ2b, both groups saw a positive environment, motivation, physical conditions, and materials as supportive, in line with Babic et al. [62] and Demir [11]. Teachers expected principals to buffer them from parents, students, and other stakeholders, consistent with Karacabey et al. [12], who found that transformational leadership reduces burnout indirectly through organizational support and resilience. When asked how they would respond to signs of burnout, principals described private conversations, flexible scheduling, mediation, and guidance, suggesting that their intended support involved both communication and practical assistance. Teachers also felt better understood by principals with an EFL background or awareness of language teaching, reflecting the field-specific challenges of EFL teaching [5], [7], [8], [15].

Regarding RQ3 and RQ3a (integration), personal and work-related burnout were negatively related to Total Well-Being, whereas student-related burnout was not. Students were both a stressor (low motivation, mixed proficiency, crowded classes) and a source of motivation and satisfaction, so student-related difficulties did not necessarily lower well-being [15], [63]. Teachers described problems at the classroom, school, and system levels, including curriculum issues, reduced English hours, and English's secondary status on the university entrance exam. Principals could not solve all of these but could still help through a positive climate, resources, and buffering, since institutional and individual factors shape well-being [14], [64]. Although burnout did not differ by school type, stressors did: public school teachers cited large, mixed-level classes, limited hours, curriculum, paperwork, and low motivation, while private school teachers cited finances, parental pressure, grade expectations, job insecurity, and performance demands, so similar burnout levels did not mean identical experiences. For RQ3a, these private school pressures may help explain the lower Meaning scores, but because the interviews did not directly address Meaning, this should be interpreted cautiously. The survey did not measure principal support, so the study could not quantitatively test its link to well-being.

Teachers also linked reduced English hours and English's secondary status in national examinations to their frustration. These accounts suggest that reviewing English lesson hours may ease time pressure, but this rests on interview data alone. The sample was small and local, drawn through convenience and snowball sampling. Only 64 of 243 teachers responded to the survey (50–54 valid responses per scale); subgroups were small and unequal. The Accomplishment subscale had low reliability ($\alpha = .55$). Self-report measures may reflect social desirability. The interviews included one teacher and one principal per school, and the anonymous survey could not be linked to them, so integration was at the group level. Principal support was not measured quantitatively, and the interviews did not explore Meaning, so those links remain tentative. The study was also cross-sectional and limited to high schools. Future studies could measure principal support directly and pair teacher and principal data within schools, test the public-private Meaning difference with larger samples, and use longitudinal designs to follow burnout and well-being across career stages.

Acknowledgements

This paper is derived from Elif Seven's master's thesis, conducted under the supervision of Turgay Han at Ordu University. Additionally, the authors used generative artificial intelligence solely to polish the manuscript's readability and language.

REFERENCES

[1] Shanmugam P., Hidayat R., "Assessing grit and well-being of Malaysian ESL teachers: Application of the PERMA model", Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, vol. 19, no. 2, 2022, pp. 153–181.

[2] Zhang L.J., Fathi J., Mohammaddokht F., "Predicting teaching enjoyment from teachers' perceived school climate, self-efficacy, and psychological wellbeing at work: EFL teachers", Perceptual and Motor Skills, vol. 130, no. 5, 2023, pp. 2269–2299.

[3] Hojo M., "Association between student-teacher ratio and teachers' working hours and workload stress: Evidence from a nationwide survey in Japan", BMC Public Health, vol. 21, 2021, art. 1635.

[4] Borman G.D., Dowling N.M., “Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research”, Review of Educational Research, vol. 78, no. 3, 2008, pp. 367–409.
[5] Mercer S., “The wellbeing of language teachers in the private sector: An ecological perspective”, Language Teaching Research, vol. 27, no. 5, 2023, pp. 1054–1077.
[6] MacIntyre P.D., Ross J., Talbot K., Mercer S., Gregersen T., Banga C.A., “Stressors, personality and wellbeing among language teachers”, System, vol. 82, 2019, pp. 26–38.
[7] Borg S., “The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers”, Language Teaching Research, vol. 10, no. 1, 2006, pp. 3–31.
[8] Horwitz, E.K., “Even teachers get the blues: Recognizing and alleviating language teachers’ feelings of foreign language anxiety”, Foreign Language Annals, vol. 29, no. 3, 1996, pp. 365–372.
[9] Gkonou C., Miller E.R., “Caring and emotional labour: Language teachers’ engagement with anxious learners in private language school classrooms”, Language Teaching Research, vol. 23, no. 3, 2019, pp. 372–387.
[10] Sulis G., Mercer S., Babic S., Mairitsch A., “Language teacher wellbeing across the career span”, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 2023.
[11] Demir B., “Exploring English language instructors’ perspectives and practices on teacher well-being”, International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology, vol. 9, no. 3, 2024, pp. 1491–1510.
[12] Karacabey M.F., Özkul R., Polatcan M., Bellibaş M.Ş., “Transformational leadership and teacher burnout in Türkiye: The moderated mediation role of organisational support, teacher resilience, and teacher workload”, Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 2025, advance online publication.
[13] Madigan D.J., Kim L.E., “Towards an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta-analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers’ intentions to quit”, Teaching and Teacher Education, vol. 105, 2021, art. 103425.
[14] Hofstadler N., Babic S., Lämmerer A., Mercer S., Oberdorfer P., “The ecology of CLIL teachers in Austria – an ecological perspective on CLIL teachers’ wellbeing”, Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, vol. 15, no. 3, 2021, pp. 218–232.
[15] MacIntyre P.D., Gregersen T., Mercer S., “Language teachers’ coping strategies during the COVID-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions”, System, vol. 94, 2020, art. 102352.
[16] Bing H., Sadjadi B., Afzali M., Fathi J., “Self-efficacy and emotion regulation as predictors of teacher burnout among English as a foreign language teachers: A structural equation modeling approach”, Frontiers in Psychology, vol. 13, 2022, art. 900417.
[17] Shin S., Mercer S., Babic S., Sulis G., Mairitsch A., King J., Jin J., “Riding the happiness curve: The wellbeing of mid-career phase language teachers”, The Language Learning Journal, vol. 51, no. 2, 2023, pp. 195–207.
[18] Zhang N.Y., Siaw Y.L., Jiang N., “The relationship between principal instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and classroom management: A cross-sectional study in China”, Frontiers in Psychology, vol. 16, 2025, art. 1589958.
[19] Kılınç A.Ç., Savaş G., Atmaca T., Dolapcı E., Çevik S., “Exploring school principals’ leadership strategies to enhance teacher well-being: A case study of a disadvantaged school in Türkiye”, Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, no. 44, 2025, pp. 128–157.
[20] Çilek A., Kılınç A.Ç., Erdoğan O., Arslan K., Sezgin F., “Linking principal support and teacher resilience to teacher leadership in Türkiye: The mediating role of teacher work engagement”, Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 2025, advance online publication.
[21] Arslan Ş.N., Zincirli M., “Öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinin liderlik tarzlarına ilişkin algıları ve öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teachers’ perceptions of school administrators’ leadership styles and their subjective well-being]”, Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi: Teori ve Uygulama, vol. 13, no. 26, 2022, pp. 302–326.
[22] Karanfil F., Yeşilbursa A., “Scrutinising burnout in English language teachers working in state and private schools in Turkey”, The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, vol. 11, no. 2, 2021, pp. 1–17.
[23] Kimsesiz F., “The effect of school type on EFL teachers’ burnout: The case in Turkey”, Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, vol. 15, no. 4, 2019, pp. 1413–1425.
[24] Hascher T., Waber J., “Teacher well-being: A systematic review of the research literature from the year 2000–2019”, Educational Research Review, vol. 34, 2021, art. 100411.
[25] Cohen J., McCabe E.M., Michelli N.M., Pickeral T., “School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education”, Teachers College Record, vol. 111, no. 1, 2009, pp. 180–213.

[26] İnce A., Demirhan G., “Covid-19 sürecinde öğretmenlerin pozitif liderlik algıları ile psikolojik iyi oluş düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teachers’ perceptions of positive leadership and their psychological well-being during the COVID-19 period]”, Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, vol. 8, no. 2, 2022, pp. 10–22.
[27] Creswell J.W., Plano Clark V.L., “Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.)”, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications, 2018.
[28] Stake R.E., “The art of case study research”, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications, 1995.
[29] Patton M.Q., “Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.)”, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications, 2015.
[30] TEDMEM, “2025 eğitim değerlendirme raporu [2025 education evaluation report] (TEDMEM Değerlendirme Dizisi 11)”, Ankara, Türk Eğitim Derneği, 2026.
[31] Yaman İ., Şahin M., “An investigation into the employment of English language teachers in the private sector in Turkey”, Journal of Language Research, vol. 3, no. 1, 2019, pp. 1–13.
[32] Yılmaz K., Alakuş H., Şahin Yıldız S., “Özel okul öğretmenlerinin sessiz istifa deneyimleri: Nitel bir araştırma [Quiet quitting experiences of private school teachers: A qualitative study]”, MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, vol. 14, no. 3, 2025, pp. 994–1012.
[33] Brady J., Wilson E., “Comparing sources of stress for state and private school teachers in England”, Improving Schools, vol. 25, no. 2, 2022, pp. 205–220.
[34] Toker Gökçe A., Balcı K., “Together in and out of school: The impact of school principals’ use of WhatsApp on teachers’ professional lives”, Educational Studies, vol. 49, no. 3, 2023, pp. 547–565.
[35] Seis Z., “The challenge EFL teachers face in Turkey: Burnout”, Futurity Education, vol. 3, no. 2, 2023, pp. 227–250.
[36] Yıldırım K., “Testing the main determinants of teachers’ professional well-being by using a mixed method”, Teacher Development, vol. 19, no. 1, 2015, pp. 59–78.
[37] Butler J., Kern M.L., “The PERMA-profiler: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing”, International Journal of Wellbeing, vol. 6, no. 3, 2016, pp. 1–48.
[38] Seligman M.E.P., “Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being”, New York, Free Press, 2011.
[39] Giangrasso B., “Psychometric properties of the PERMA-profiler as hedonic and eudaimonic well-being measure in an Italian context”, Current Psychology, vol. 40, no. 3, 2021, pp. 1175–1184.
[40] Demirci İ., Ekşi H., Dinçer D., Kardaş S., “Beş boyutlu iyi oluş modeli: PERMA ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenirliği [The five-dimensional well-being model: Validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the PERMA scale]”, The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being, vol. 5, no. 1, 2017, pp. 60–77.
[41] Bilhan A., Akçayoğlu M., “English language teachers’ wellbeing in the workplace: A case study in Türkiye”, Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, vol. 22, no. 1, 2025, pp. 239–263.
[42] Kristensen T.S., Borritz M., Villadsen E., Christensen K.B., “The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout”, Work & Stress, vol. 19, no. 3, 2005, pp. 192–207.
[43] Montgomery A.P., Azuero A., Patrician P.A., “Psychometric properties of Copenhagen Burnout Inventory among nurses”, Research in Nursing & Health, vol. 44, no. 2, 2021, pp. 308–318.
[44] Piperac P., Todorovic J., Terzic-Supic Z., Maksimovic A., Karic S., Pilipovic F., Soldatovic I., “The validity and reliability of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory for examination of burnout among preschool teachers in Serbia”, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, vol. 18, no. 13, 2021, art. 6805.
[45] Bakoğlu Deliorman R., Taştan Boz İ., Yiğit İ., Yıldız S., “Tükenmişliği ölçmede alternatif bir araç: Kopenhag tükenmişlik envanterinin Marmara Üniversitesi akademik personeli üzerine uyarlaması [An alternative tool for measuring burnout: Adaptation of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory for Marmara University academic staff]”, Yönetim Dergisi, vol. 20, no. 63, 2009, pp. 77–98.
[46] The jamovi project, “jamovi (Version 2.7) [Computer software]”, 2025, https://www.jamovi.org.
[47] R Core Team, “R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Version 4.5) [Computer software]”, Vienna, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2025, https://www.R-project.org/.
[48] Gallucci M., Jentschke S., “SEMLj: jamovi SEM analysis (Version 0.6.0) [Computer software]”, 2021, https://semlj.github.io/.
[49] Braun V., Clarke V., “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, Qualitative Research in Psychology, vol. 3, no. 2, 2006, pp. 77–101.
[50] Braun V., Clarke V., “Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis”, Qualitative Psychology, vol. 9, no. 1, 2022, pp. 3–26.

[51] Dreer B., “On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: A systematic review of research”, Frontiers in Psychology, vol. 14, 2023, art. 1205179.
[52] Nadlifah K., Setiawan S., Munir A., “Positive psychology to flourish professional well-being: A qualitative study of Indonesian English teachers’ perspective”, JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), vol. 8, no. 1, 2023.
[53] Ebrahimi V., Zarei A.A., Esfandiari R., “Workplace well-being and flourishing in Iranian EFL teachers: A mixed-methods study based on PERMA model”, Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, vol. 18, no. 1, 2026, pp. 19–42.
[54] İlya A., “Factors affecting Turkish EFL teachers’ level of burnout: A quantitative study”, Journal of Pedagogical Research, vol. 7, no. 1, 2023, pp. 142–153.
[55] Yukselir C., Ozer O., “Investigating the interplay between English language teachers’ autonomy, well-being and efficacy”, Issues in Educational Research, vol. 32, no. 4, 2022, pp. 1643–1657.
[56] Uçmaz Ş., “Language teachers’ well-being from the complex dynamic systems theory perspective: A retrodictive qualitative modeling approach”, Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition, vol. 12, no. 1, 2026, pp. 1–26.
[57] Hismanoglu M., Ersan Y., “Investigating Turkish EFL teachers’ burnout levels in relation to demographic variables”, Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World, vol. 6, no. 4, 2016, pp. 21–31.
[58] Demirel E.E., Cephe P.T., “Looking into burnout levels among English language instructors”, Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, vol. 11, no. 1, 2015, pp. 1–14.
[59] Goetze J., “Exploring the role of individual psychological and work-related contextual factors in language teachers’ well-being”, Language Teaching Research, 2025, advance online publication.
[60] Ryan R.M., Deci E.L., “On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being”, Annual Review of Psychology, vol. 52, 2001, pp. 141–166.
[61] Mugabekazi J.C., Hui X., “Perspectives of Rwandan primary school principals and teachers on the role of school leadership in promoting teacher well-being”, Discover Education, vol. 5, 2026, art. 290.
[62] Babic S., Mercer S., Mairitsch A., Gruber J., Hempkin K., “Language teacher wellbeing in the workplace”, Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition, vol. 8, no. 1, 2022, pp. 11–34.
[63] Onan A.M., Aydın S., “Well-being, burnout, and teaching anxiety among EFL teachers”, Journal of Language Research, vol. 8, no. 1, 2024, pp. 17–35.
[64] Mercer S., “An agenda for well-being in ELT: An ecological perspective”, ELT Journal, vol. 75, no. 1, 2021, pp. 14–21.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Descriptive Statistics for the CBI and PERMA Scores

Scale	Subscale/Dimension	n	Missing	M	SD	Mdn	Min	Max
CBI	Personal Burnout	54	10	2.90	0.95	2.83	1.17	5.00
	Work-Related Burnout	54	10	2.90	0.93	2.86	1.14	5.00
	Student-Related Burnout	54	10	2.89	0.93	2.67	1.00	4.83
PERMA	Positive Emotions	50	14	7.24	1.53	7.50	1.33	10.00
	Engagement	50	14	7.65	1.46	8.00	3.67	10.00
	Relationships	50	14	7.52	1.58	7.67	1.67	10.00
	Meaning	50	14	7.43	1.52	7.67	1.33	10.00
	Accomplishment	50	14	7.66	1.11	7.67	5.67	9.67
	Health	50	14	7.41	1.87	7.67	3.00	10.00
	Negative Emotions	50	14	5.17	1.75	5.17	2.00	8.33
	Loneliness	50	14	4.22	2.59	4.00	0.00	10.00
	Total Well-Being	50	14	7.50	1.23	7.57	2.81	9.75

Note. n = valid responses; Missing = missing responses; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Mdn = median; Min = minimum; Max = maximum.

Table S2. Spearman’s rho Correlations Among the CBI and PERMA Scores

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. PB	—											
2. WRB	.877**	—										
3. SRB	.580**	.729**	—									

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
4. PE	-.606**	-.537**	-.29	—								
5. ENG	-.420**	-.463**	-.24	.752**	—							
6. REL	-.419**	-.470**	-.25	.699**	.511**	—						
7. MEA	-.558**	-.544**	-.28	.707**	.660**	.650**	—					
8. ACC	-.382*	-.407**	-.20	.553**	.617**	.313*	.667**	—				
9. HEA	-.549**	-.467**	-.29	.737**	.505**	.686**	.578**	.425**	—			
10. NE	.578**	.481**	.20	-.518**	-.22	-.377**	-.414**	-.14	-.371**	—		
11. LON	.26	.27	.29	-.23	.06	-.19	-.20	.01	-.115	.517**	—	
12. TWB	-.545**	-.560**	-.31	.893**	.857**	.765**	.888**	.707**	.697**	-.383**	-.13	—

Note. PB = Personal Burnout; WRB = Work-Related Burnout; SRB = Student-Related Burnout; PE = Positive Emotions; ENG = Engagement; REL = Relationships; MEA = Meaning; ACC = Accomplishment; HEA = Health; NE = Negative Emotions; LON = Loneliness; TWB = Total Well-Being. *p < .05. **p < .01.