OPEN ACCESS

Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences

ISSN 2538-919X

An Investigation into the Well-Being of Nontenured Instructors in a Foundation University's Preparatory School: Exploring the Correlation between Well-Being and Employment Conditions

Buket Kara

Ankara Medipol University, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Teacher Well-being,
Institutional Well-being,
English Language Teachers,
Mixed Methods Research,
Workplace Support and Recognition

ABSTRACT

Teacher well-being has gained increasing attention in educational research, particularly as it relates to the institutional context in which teachers work. This study investigates the institutional well-being of English language instructors employed at the preparatory program of a foundation university in Türkiye. Adopting a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, the research consists of two phases: an initial quantitative phase utilizing the 31-item Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (WWQ), followed by a qualitative phase involving semi-structured focus group interviews. A total of 28 out of 36 instructors participated in the survey, offering insights into various dimensions of workplace well-being, including autonomy, support, recognition, and workload. The findings show that although teachers enjoy teaching and find it meaningful, their well-being is affected by problems in the institution. These include job insecurity, not being involved in decisions, a lack of appreciation, and difficulty maintaining work–life balance. The interviews helped to explain how these challenges influence teachers' motivation and emotional health in their daily work. This research shows that teacher well-being depends not only on emotional factors, but also on the systems and policies in the institution. For better teacher well-being, schools should provide job stability, involve teachers in decisions, and create a more supportive work culture. The study adds to the growing research on teacher well-being and offers suggestions for improving working conditions in language teaching environments.

1. Introduction

Teachers' well-being is central to building learning environments where both teachers and students can thrive. When educators feel appreciated, supported, and emotionally secure, they are better equipped to create classrooms that encourage participation, curiosity, and academic

*Corresponding author's E-mail address: buket.kara@ankaramedipol.edu.tr

Cite this article as:

Kara, B. (2026). An Investigation into the Well-Being of Nontenured Instructors in a Foundation University's Preparatory School: Exploring the Correlation between Well-Being and Employment Conditions. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences, 9*(3): 44-65. https://doi.org/10.33422/jarss.v9i3.1785

© The Author(s). 2026 **Open Access**. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and redistribution in any medium, provided that the original author(s) and source are credited.

growth. Feeling well in their professional roles not only strengthens teachers' performance but also deepens their connections with students and colleagues, fostering a more positive and collaborative atmosphere. In this sense, teachers' well-being generates constructive emotions and attitudes toward the classroom, the course, and the learning process itself, ultimately enhancing motivation (Dewaele & Li, 2020). This link is particularly strong in language education, where teaching relies heavily on emotional awareness, empathy, and continuous interpersonal engagement. For English language teachers, their psychological and professional well-being directly shapes classroom interaction, influences students' emotional states, and impacts the overall effectiveness of language learning.

Conceptually, teacher well-being extends beyond the absence of stress or burnout, encompassing both internal psychological states and the systemic characteristics of the work environment. The present study draws on Seligman's (2011) PERMA model and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) to offer a comprehensive lens for understanding teacher well-being. PERMA identifies five elements of flourishing: Positive emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Achievement while the JD-R framework highlights how workplace demands and resources can either undermine or support these dimensions. High job demands, including excessive workload or job insecurity, may erode well-being, whereas adequate resources such as autonomy, collegial support, and recognition can buffer stress and promote fulfillment. Integrating these perspectives positions teacher well-being as both an individual psychological state and an emergent property of the institutional environment.

Institutional well-being, therefore, can be understood as the set of structural, cultural, and policy features that shape the intensity of demands and availability of resources within an organization. Predictable and fair employment conditions, opportunities for participatory decision-making, collegial cultures, and formal recognition mechanisms can enhance PERMA dimensions, supporting positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and achievement. Conversely, precarious contracts, opaque promotion pathways, and unremunerated workload increase strain and reduce access to resources, thereby undermining teachers' flourishing. The JD-R model underscores the dynamic, bidirectional relationship between institutional structures and psychological outcomes: persistent resource deficits generate stress and disengagement, whereas institutional support fosters resilience and professional fulfillment.

Growing evidence from applied linguistics and educational psychology suggests that teachers' well-being not only affects instructional effectiveness but also shapes motivation, resilience, and retention (Collie, 2021; Gregersen et al., 2023; Mercer & Gregersen, 2020). In the Turkish context, research has similarly underscored the emotional challenges that English language instructors face. Hismanoglu and Ersan (2016), for instance, examined burnout among 230 Turkish EFL instructors and found that levels of emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment varied significantly depending on teaching experience, institution type, income level, and city size. Likewise, Deneme (2021) reported that professional seniority and the degree of support received from colleagues and administrators had a meaningful influence on teachers' burnout levels. Collectively, these findings highlight how both personal and institutional variables shape teachers' emotional well-being and their capacity to cope with professional demands.

Despite this recognition, much of the literature continues to emphasize the individual or emotional dimensions of well-being such as stress, burnout, and job satisfaction while offering limited insight into the institutional conditions that give rise to these experiences. This gap is particularly evident in higher education, and especially in English language teaching (ELT

henceforth), where heavy workloads, emotional labor, and employment instability are common. For example, Mızrak (2019) found out that there is a significant correlation between emotional exhaustion and the workload. Similarly, Onan and Aydın (2024) found out that teachers' occupational exhaustion is closely linked to the workload, suggesting that institutional structures play a central role in shaping teacher well-being.

Despite increasing scholarly interest in teacher well-being, the experiences of non-tenured English language instructors remain underexplored. Especially, non-tenured instructors in foundation universities in Türkiye often navigate short-term contracts, limited participation in decision-making, and minimal professional recognition. These instructors often carry equivalent pedagogical responsibilities to tenured colleagues but with greater employment instability, creating tensions between intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic pressures. In Turkish foundation universities, preparatory school instructors are commonly employed on nine- or twelve-month renewable contracts, yet empirical research examining how these arrangements influence both emotional and institutional well-being is scarce. Such structural realities raise critical questions about how institutional arrangements influence teachers' sense of belonging, fulfillment, and overall well-being.

Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the well-being of non-tenured English language instructors in a preparatory program of a foundation university in Türkiye. By integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence within a theoretically grounded framework, the research seeks to illuminate the complex interplay between institutional context and teacher well-being which is an issue of growing significance for teachers, administrators, and policy-makers in higher education. Preliminary observations suggested signs of stress, dissatisfaction, and burnout among instructors, reinforcing the need to examine the role of institutional practices in shaping professional, emotional, and social dimensions of teacher well-being. Quantitative data were collected using the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (WWQ; Parker & Hyett, 2011) to measure employees' perceptions of organizational respect, employer care, and work–life intrusion which are proximal indicators of institutional well-being. Follow-up qualitative interviews provided nuanced insights into how specific institutional practices, such as contract length, coordinator support, and opportunities for voice, shape instructors' experiences and relate to PERMA dimensions. By framing teacher well-being as both a personal and institutional construct, the study highlights the interconnectedness of individual experiences and organizational ecology.

1.1 Background

Well-being is a vital component of life and has become a widely discussed topic in recent years. While Ashford et al. (2006) conceptualized well-being as "a person's emotional and psychological capacity to cope with demands across time, circumstance, and setting" (p. 530), Van Petegem et al. (2005) described it as a positive emotional state reflecting a sense of balance between the individual and their environment. Similarly, Dodge et al. (2012) emphasize the role of internal and external resources such as mental, interpersonal, and physical that allow individuals to manage and recover from life's challenges. Taken together, these perspectives underscore that well-being is both a personal and relational construct, dynamic in nature, and deeply connected to the contexts in which people live and work. Given its multidimensional nature, the concept of well-being has garnered particular attention in professional settings, especially in the field of education. In recent years, the well-being of teachers has gained increasing attention due to its significant impact on their professional performance. Teacher well-being, in this regard encompasses a sense of purpose, enjoyment, and fulfillment that emerges through interaction and collaboration with others (Acton & Glasgow, 2015). A strong

sense of well-being among teachers is associated with greater job satisfaction, professional commitment, teaching quality, and perceived self-efficacy (Day & Gu, 2014; Onan & Aydın, 2024). As awareness of its importance has grown, numerous studies have started to explore how language teachers across different contexts experience well-being (Gregersen et al., 2023; Hofstadler et al., 2021). Evidence suggests that educators who report higher levels of well-being are more likely to thrive in their professional roles (Mercer & Gregersen, 2020). These teachers also tend to be more dedicated, better prepared for classroom challenges, and able to maintain positive and productive interactions with their students (Kiltz et al., 2020). Among the many factors that shape teacher well-being, the institutional environment stands out as particularly influential. Elements such as institutional policies, the style of leadership, collegial support, how workloads are managed, and the overall organizational culture play a crucial role in shaping teachers' daily experiences.

Recent research suggests that organisational support can function as an important resource for teachers experiencing demanding working conditions, with greater support associated with lower burnout and emotional exhaustion (Granziera & Evans, 2026; Karacabey et al., 2025). Similarly, studies focusing on institution-level dynamics have found that leadership practices and collegial relationships significantly affect the well-being of expatriate teachers, especially in contexts where social isolation or performance pressures are common (Tang et al., 2020). In a comprehensive review, Collie (2021) emphasized that characteristics of school climate such as mutual trust, opportunities for collaboration, and effective leadership tend to be stronger predictors of teacher well-being than personal traits. Focusing on European settings, Aldrup et al. (2020) also demonstrated that both school climate and opportunities for job crafting play a major role in shaping the emotional experiences and job satisfaction of educators.

These findings altogether highlight the significant role of institutional structures and cultures play in either fostering or diminishing teachers' emotional well-being and professional resilience. In order to better capture the multifaceted nature of teacher well-being, especially within institutional contexts, researchers have designed various instruments that measure both emotional and environmental aspects. Several of these tools focus on the emotional experiences teachers have at work, such as feelings of joy, anxiety, enthusiasm, or stress. Some well-known examples include the Affective Well-Being at Work Scale (Daniels, 2000; Russell & Daniels, 2018), the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) (Van Katwyk et al., 2000), and Warr's Job-Related Affective Well-Being Measure (Warr, 1990).

Other instruments adopt a broader framework, evaluating well-being through dimensions like interpersonal connections, sense of purpose, involvement, and opportunities for personal growth. The Index of Psychological Well-Being at Work (Dagenais-Desmarais & Savoie, 2012) and the Employee Well-Being Scale (Zheng et al., 2015) are notable examples of such comprehensive tools. The Thriving at Work Scale, developed by Porath et al. (2012), focuses on indicators such as vitality, continuous learning, and overall flourishing within the workplace. Additionally, other scales have been created to assess perceptions of workplace environments, including factors like organizational respect, recognition, and the balance between professional and personal life. These include the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (WWQ) (Parker & Hyett, 2011) and the NIOSH Worker Well-Being Questionnaire (Chari et al., 2026). This study adopts the WWQ by Parker and Hyett (2011) as it offers a more targeted and relevant framework for examining well-being in the workplace. The Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (Parker & Hyett, 2011), used in this study, measures key factors such as organizational respect, work satisfaction, perceived support, and the intrusion of work into personal life. Prior studies (Dagenais-Desmarais & Savoie, 2012; Daniels, 2000; Van Katwyk et al., 2000) suggest that well-being is influenced not only by emotional states but also by autonomy, job security, and recognition. Contractual status has

emerged as a significant variable in multiple studies, showing that part-time and temporary teachers often report lower well-being due to limited stability and institutional investment.

By integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches, this study adds to existing research by contextualizing these findings within a specific institutional setting.

For this, study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the current state of well-being among nontenured ELT instructors in a foundation university's preparatory school?
2. To what extent do employment conditions (e.g., contract length, job security) influence components of well-being as defined by the PERMA model?
3. How do instructors perceive the support (or lack thereof) from the institution in relation to their professional and personal well-being?

1.2 Significance of the Study

Well-being is not only essential for teachers' personal and professional fulfillment but also critical for student learning outcomes, collaboration, and institutional development. Research shows that teachers with higher well-being are more motivated, productive, and committed to their institutions. In contrast, low well-being is associated with burnout, absenteeism, and turnover. This study is significant as it focuses on a group often overlooked in well-being studies: non-tenured English language instructors working in foundation universities under varying contract types. The results provide valuable insights for administrators and policymakers aiming to improve working conditions and institutional support structures.

2. Method

This is a mixed-methods sequential explanatory study consisting of two phases: quantitative first (WWQ Survey) and an exploratory qualitative follow-up (semi-structured interviews). Mixed method is preferred because it can exploit the benefits of both methods and help gather more thorough insights (Creswell, 2008). The logic of this two-stage approach was to first obtain a generalizable statistical picture of the instructors' well-being using a standardized questionnaire. Following this, the qualitative interviews provided a deeper, contextual understanding of why those statistical scores occurred. This mixed approach ensures that the findings are both broadly measurable and richly interpreted, offering comprehensive insight into the complex relationship between institutional conditions and instructor well-being.

2.1 Setting

The study was conducted at a foundation university prep school employing 36 English language instructors. A total of 28 teachers participated in the survey phase. Participants varied in terms of gender, years of experience, and contract type (full-time, part-time with 9 month or 12-month contracts). The institution is a relatively young foundation university that was established only five years ago. It offers a mix of %100 English, %30 English, and Turkish-medium academic programs. The preparatory school operates with a single-level system, and the academic year is divided into four modular tracks, each lasting eight weeks. After each module, student groups are reshuffled, although not based on proficiency levels. All students start at A1 level, aiming to reach B2 by the end of the academic year. The institutional context plays a significant role in shaping instructors' well-being. Although the program employs a relatively large staff, only two instructors -those in coordinator roles- hold full-time positions. The rest are primarily on nine-month contracts, leading to a sense of professional instability,

especially during the summer when many are not paid. This employment structure was identified as a contributing factor to emotional strain and job insecurity among participants. The institution promotes a relatively positive work-life balance by limiting instructors' responsibilities to teaching hours, allowing them to leave campus after their lessons. Additionally, instructors pursuing graduate education often receive flexible scheduling, which can support their personal and professional development. However, despite these favorable conditions, the lack of institutional support systems for professional growth and well-being remains a significant concern, especially for instructors on temporary contracts.

2.2 Participants

Frequency (n) and percentage (%) distributions of participants' responses regarding their socio-demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants by Socio-Demographic Characteristics (n = 28)

Characteristics	Subcategory	n	%
Gender	Female	21	75.0
	Male	7	25.0
Highest Level of Education Completed	Bachelor's Degree (BA)	16	57.1
	Master's Degree (MA)	11	39.3
	PhD	1	3.6
Total Years of Teaching Experience	0–3 years	12	42.9
	4–10 years	11	39.3
	More than 10 years	5	17.9
Employment Status at This Institution	1 year	11	39.3
	2 years	10	35.7
	3 years	5	17.9
	4 years and more	2	7.1

As shown in Table 1, the majority of the participants were female (75.0%, n = 21), while male participants accounted for 25.0% (n = 7). In terms of education level, more than half of the participants held a bachelor's degree (57.1%, n = 16), followed by 39.3% (n = 11) with a master's degree, and only one participant (3.6%) had completed a PhD. When teaching experience was considered, 42.9% (n = 12) had 0–3 years of experience, 39.3% (n = 11) had 4–10 years, and 17.9% (n = 5) reported having more than 10 years of teaching experience. Regarding employment duration at the current institution, 39.3% of participants (n = 11) had been employed for 1 year, 35.7% (n = 10) for 2 years, 17.9% (n = 5) for 3 years, and 7.1% (n = 2) had been working there for 4 years or more. These results indicate a relatively young and early-career professional sample, with most participants having less than 10 years of teaching experience and limited institutional tenure.

2.3 Data Collection

The questionnaire used in this study is 31-item Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire developed by Parker and Hyett (2011). This instrument was chosen for its targeted focus on

institutional and organizational aspects of well-being. All questions are presented in random order and focus on four main areas related to workplace well-being. These areas are work satisfaction, organizational respect for the employee, employer care, and how much work interferes with personal life. The questions aim to help us understand how teachers feel about their work; if they enjoy it, feel connected to it, find it meaningful, or if it allows for personal growth and balance. Some items look at whether teachers feel respected and fairly treated by their institution, if they trust the leadership, and if their values align with the workplace. Others explore how supportive and caring the employer is, such as whether teachers feel heard and understood when facing challenges. Finally, the questionnaire asks about how much work spills over into personal time, causing stress, pressure, or difficulty in relaxing. Participants respond to each item based on their current experience, using a 5-point scale where 0 means not at all and 4 means extremely true. The scores are later grouped and interpreted as low, medium, or high, based on the original scoring guidelines provided by the developers of the tool. Survey data were collected anonymously via an online questionnaire.

The qualitative phase of the study was conducted after the quantitative data had been collected and analyzed. A voluntary sampling approach was used, and three instructors (n = 3) from the same institution agreed to participate. Each participant took part in an individual semi-structured interview, conducted separately. The interviews were designed to explore instructors' experiences of workplace well-being in more depth and to shed light on patterns that emerged from the survey data. Due to the small number of participants, the qualitative component was intentionally framed as exploratory. Rather than aiming for saturation or broad generalization, this phase sought to provide illustrative and contextual insights that could help interpret and enrich the quantitative findings by drawing on instructors' own accounts of their workplace experiences. To support the credibility of the qualitative analysis, a systematic coding process was followed, and an audit trail was maintained to document analytical decisions. Illustrative excerpts from the interviews were used to support the themes identified, ensuring that interpretations remained closely tied to the data.

The researcher works as a deputy director at the institution where the study took place. While this role helped the researcher understand the institutional context and instructors' working conditions, it also raised the possibility of power-related influence and response bias. Some participants may have felt uncomfortable sharing negative opinions, even though confidentiality was emphasized. To reduce these risks, participation in both the survey and interview phases was completely voluntary. The researcher did not have a direct supervisory role over the interview participants. Survey responses were collected anonymously, and interview participants were informed that their identities would not be revealed in any part of the study. Interviews were conducted individually, and participants were encouraged to speak openly about both positive and negative aspects of their experiences. During the qualitative analysis, the researcher remained aware of how personal familiarity with the institution might influence interpretation. Notes were kept throughout the analysis process to reflect on decisions and emerging interpretations. These measures were taken to support ethical practice and to strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings.

2.4 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from an authorized ethics committee before data collection began. All stages of the research were conducted in accordance with established ethical principles for research involving human participants. Participants were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, as well as their right to participate voluntarily, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Participation was entirely

voluntary, and no incentives were offered. Survey responses were collected anonymously, and interview participants were informed that their identities would not be disclosed. With participants' permission, interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim. Any identifying information was removed during transcription and analysis, and the data were handled in an anonymized form throughout the study. No personal or sensitive information was recorded or shared at any stage of the research process, and confidentiality was always maintained.

2.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Qualitative data from interviews was coded and thematically analyzed to identify recurrent themes, institutional challenges, and sources of support. All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 25.0 software. Descriptive statistics were presented as frequency (n), percentage (%), mean, standard deviation (SD), minimum, and maximum values. The normality assumption of the Workplace Well-being Scales was tested by examining skewness and kurtosis coefficients, and based on these results, parametric test methods were preferred (Table 2). In order to determine whether group scores of the variables differed according to personal information, "independent samples t-test" was used for comparisons involving two groups, and ANOVA was used for comparisons involving three or more groups, provided that the variables met the normal distribution assumption. Post hoc tests were conducted to identify group differences following parametric tests, and group means were analyzed using the Tukey HSD method, a parametric multiple comparison test. In all analyses, statistical significance was evaluated at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Scales

Scale	n	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's Alpha
Workplace Well-being	28	82,96	18,32	-,38	-,48	0,935
Job Satisfaction	28	28,25	7,50	-,69	,49	0,911
Organizational Respect Toward the Employee	28	18,25	6,51	-,39	-,60	0,942
Feeling That the Employer Cares	28	20,75	6,03	-,79	-,07	0,949
Work's Intrusion into Private Life	28	15,71	3,44	-,30	,33	0,942

Participants' scores on the scales used in the study were examined using descriptive statistics. The findings are presented in Table 2. According to Table 2, the mean score for the Workplace Well-being scale was 82.96 (SD = 18.32), with a high internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .935). The Job Satisfaction scale had a mean score of 28.25 (SD = 7.50), and its internal consistency was also high (α = .911).

The Organizational Respect Toward the Employee scale had a mean score of 18.25 (SD = 6.51), with a Cronbach's alpha of .942, indicating excellent reliability. Similarly, the Feeling That the Employer Cares scale yielded a mean of 20.75 (SD = 6.03), and a Cronbach's alpha value of .949.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Survey Items

Item	Mean	SD
1. Is your work fulfilling?	3.07	0.72
2. Do your daily work activities give you a sense of direction and meaning?	2.89	0.96
3. Does your work bring a sense of satisfaction?	3.07	0.77
4. Does your work increase your sense of self-worth?	3.07	0.94
5. Does your job allow you to recraft your job to suit your strengths?	2.82	0.94
6. Does your work make you feel that, as a person, you are flourishing?	2.68	1.22
7. Do you feel capable and effective in your work on a day-to-day basis?	2.96	0.88
8. Does your work offer challenges to advance your skills?	2.79	1.07
9. Do you feel you have some level of independence at work?	2.54	1.00
10. Do you feel personally connected to your organization's values?	2.36	1.39
11. In general terms, do you trust the senior people in your organization?	2.68	1.16
12. Do you believe in the principles by which your organization operates?	2.50	1.07
13. Do you feel content with the way your organization treats its employees?	2.79	1.07
14. Do you feel that your organization respects the staff?	2.82	1.22
15. How satisfied are you with your organization's value system?	2.46	1.10
16. Compared with your organization's "ideal values," to what degree are actual work values positive?	2.71	0.90
17. Do people at your work believe in the worth of the organization?	2.29	1.01
18. At a difficult time, would your boss be willing to lend an ear?	3.11	0.92
19. Is your boss caring?	3.11	0.79
20. Do you feel that your boss is empathic and understanding about your work concerns?	2.96	0.84
21. Does your boss treat you as you would like to be treated?	3.07	1.12
22. Does your boss shoulder some of your worries about work?	2.96	1.10
23. Do you feel your transactions with your boss are, in general, positive?	3.14	0.89
24. Do you believe that your employer cares about his or her staff's well-being?	2.39	1.17
25. Does your work eat into your private life?	1.86	1.01
26. Do you feel stressed in organizing your work time to meet demands?	2.07	1.02
27. Do you feel excessively pressured at work to meet targets?	2.64	0.91
28. After work, do you find it hard to wind down?	2.18	1.09
29. Do you find yourself thinking negatively about work outside of work hours?	2.04	1.04
30. Do you feel that you can separate yourself easily from your work when you leave for the day?	1.79	1.10
31. Does your work impact negatively on your self-esteem?	3.14	0.71

Lastly, the Work's Intrusion into Private Life scale, measured with a larger sample (N = 28), had a mean of 15.71 (SD = 3.44), and a high internal consistency (α = .942).

Skewness and kurtosis values for all scales ranged between ±1, indicating that the data met the assumption of normal distribution, and thus parametric tests were appropriate for subsequent analyses.

Descriptive statistics were calculated to evaluate participants' responses to each of the 31 items assessing workplace well-being, organizational respect, supervisor support, and work–life balance. The findings, presented in Table 3, reveal varying perceptions across different aspects of the work environment.

Overall, the items with the highest mean scores were: "Do you feel your transactions with your boss are, in general, positive?" (M = 3.14, SD = 0.89), "Does your work impact negatively on your self-esteem?" (M = 3.14, SD = 0.71), and "Is your boss caring?" (M = 3.11, SD = 0.79). These results indicate that participants generally perceive positive relationships with their supervisors, but also suggest concerns regarding how work may affect self-esteem. Items related to job satisfaction and personal effectiveness also received relatively high scores, such as: "Is your work fulfilling?" (M = 3.07, SD = 0.72), "Does your work bring a sense of satisfaction?" (M = 3.07, SD = 0.77) and "Does your work increase your sense of self-worth?" (M = 3.07, SD = 0.94). On the other hand, the lowest mean scores were observed for items reflecting work–life conflict, such as: "Do you feel that you can separate yourself easily from your work when you leave for the day?" (M = 1.79, SD = 1.10), "Does your work eat into your private life?" (M = 1.86, SD = 1.01) and "Do you find yourself thinking negatively about work outside of work hours?" (M = 2.04, SD = 1.04).

These findings suggest that while participants are generally satisfied with certain aspects of their job and relationships with supervisors, work-related stress and spillovers into personal life remain areas of concern. These patterns highlight the importance of developing strategies that promote work–life balance and emotional well-being in organizational settings.

3. Results

In this section, the results of the analyses conducted in line with the research questions are presented, and the findings are interpreted.

3.1 Findings of Quantitative Data

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the scale scores of participants based on gender. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of Scale Scores by Gender

Subcategory	Gender	n	Mean ± SD	t	p	Cohen's d
Workplace Well-being	Female	21	84.57 ± 19.03	0.798	0.432	0.35
	Male	7	78.14 ± 16.38			
Job Satisfaction	Female	21	29.00 ± 7.75	0.914	0.369	0.40
	Male	7	26.00 ± 6.71			
Organizational Respect Toward the Employee	Female	21	18.90 ± 6.69	0.919	0.367	0.40
	Male	7	16.29 ± 5.99			
Feeling That the Employer Cares	Female	21	20.90 ± 6.42	0.231	0.819	0.10

Subcategory	Gender	n	Mean ± SD	t	p	Cohen's d
	Male	7	20.29 ± 5.09			
Work's Intrusion into Private Life	Female	21	15.76 ± 3.55	0.124	0.902	0.05
	Male	7	15.57 ± 3.36			

An independent samples t-test was implemented to examine whether there were statistically substantial differences in mean scores across the five workplace-related scales according to participants' gender. The results showed that none of the differences between male and female participants were statistically significant ($p > .05$ for all comparisons). Effect size estimates further suggested that gender-related differences were small to negligible across all dimensions.

Specifically, females reported a slightly higher mean score in Workplace Well-being ($M = 84.57$, $SD = 19.03$) compared to males ($M = 78.14$, $SD = 16.38$), but this difference was not significant, $t(26) = 0.798$, $p = .432$, and the associated effect size was small ($d = 0.35$). Similarly, females scored higher on Job Satisfaction ($M = 29.00$, $SD = 7.75$) than males ($M = 26.00$, $SD = 6.71$), but again, the difference was not statistically significant, $t(26) = 0.914$, $p = .369$, with a small effect size ($d = 0.40$).

For the Organizational Respect Toward the Employee scale, females ($M = 18.90$, $SD = 6.69$) reported slightly higher levels than males ($M = 16.29$, $SD = 5.99$), with $t(26) = 0.919$, $p = .367$, and the effect size was small ($d = 0.40$). In the Feeling That the Employer Cares scale, the means were nearly identical (female: $M = 20.90$; male: $M = 20.29$), and the difference was non-significant, $t(26) = 0.231$, $p = .819$, and a trivial effect size ($d = 0.10$). Lastly, there was no significant gender difference in the Work's Intrusion into Private Life scores, $t(26) = 0.124$, $p = .902$, with a negligible effect size ($d = 0.05$).

Overall, these findings suggest that participants' gender did not significantly affect their levels of workplace well-being, satisfaction, or their perceptions of organizational support and work-life balance.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether participants' scores on workplace-related scales differed significantly based on their education level (Bachelor's degree vs. Master's degree). The results are presented below in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of Scale Scores by Education Level

Subcategory	Education Level	n	Mean ± SD	t	p	Cohen's d
Workplace Well-being	BA	16	79.63 ± 18.48	1.312	0.201	0.51
	MA	11	89.00 ± 17.88			
Job Satisfaction	BA	16	26.94 ± 7.18	0.937	0.357	0.37
	MA	11	29.73 ± 8.19			
Organizational Respect Toward the Employee	BA	16	17.63 ± 6.50	0.860	0.398	0.34
	MA	11	19.82 ± 6.52			
Feeling That the Employer Cares	BA	16	20.19 ± 5.44	1.234	0.229	0.48
	MA	11	22.82 ± 5.44			
Work's Intrusion into Private Life	BA	16	14.88 ± 4.05	1.234	0.197	0.51

Subcategory	Education Level	n	Mean ± SD	t	p	Cohen's d
	MA	11	16.64 ± 2.06			

Although participants with a Master's degree consistently scored higher than those with a Bachelor's degree across all five scales, none of these differences were statistically significant ($p > .05$ for all). Effect size estimates, however, suggested small to moderate practical differences between the two groups.

Specifically, instructors with a master's degree reported higher Workplace Well-being (M = 89.00, SD = 17.88) than those with a bachelor's degree (M = 79.63, SD = 18.48); however, this difference was not statistically significant, $t(25) = -1.312$, $p = .201$, with a medium effect size ($d = 0.51$). Similarly, master's degree holders scored slightly higher on Job Satisfaction (M = 29.73, SD = 8.19) than bachelor's degree holders (M = 26.94, SD = 7.18), though the difference was non-significant, $t(25) = -0.937$, $p = .357$, and associated with a small effect size ($d = 0.37$). For Organizational Respect Toward The Employee, instructors with a Master's degree (M = 19.82, SD = 6.52) again reported higher scores than those with a Bachelor's degree (M = 17.63, SD = 6.50); however, the difference was not statistically significant, $t(25) = -0.860$, $p = .398$, with a small effect size ($d = 0.34$). Perceptions of Employer Care followed a similar pattern, with Master's degree holders reporting higher scores (M = 22.82, SD = 5.44) than Bachelor's degree holders (M = 20.19, SD = 5.44), though this difference did not reach statistical significance, $t(25) = -1.234$, $p = .229$, and demonstrated a small-to-moderate effect size ($d = 0.48$).

Finally, instructors with a Master's degree also reported higher levels of Work's Intrusion into Private Life (M = 16.64, SD = 2.06) compared to those with a Bachelor's degree (M = 14.88, SD = 4.05); however, this difference was not statistically significant, $t(25) = -1.324$, $p = .197$, despite a medium effect size ($d = 0.51$).

Overall, while education level was not a statistically significant predictor of workplace well-being outcomes in this sample, the observed effect sizes suggest that differences associated with educational attainment may be practically meaningful and warrant further investigation with larger samples.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether participants' scores on five workplace-related scales differed based on their total years of teaching experience. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of Scale Scores by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Scale	Teaching Experience	n	Mean ± SD	f	p	η^2p	Significant Difference
Workplace Well-being	0–3 years	12	85.58 ± 15.92	1.828	.182	.13	
	4–10 years	11	86.36 ± 15.82				
	More than 10 years	5	69.20 ± 25.58				
Job Satisfaction	0–3 years	12	29.00 ± 5.26	3.570	.043	.22	4–10 yrs > 10 yrs (p = .044)
	4–10 years	11	30.73 ± 6.15				
	More than 10 years	5	21.00 ± 11.16				

Scale	Teaching Experience	n	Mean ± SD	f	p	η²p	Significant Difference
Organizational Respect Toward the Employee	0–3 years	12	19.25 ± 4.27	3.934	.033	.24	4–10 yrs > 10 yrs (p = .037)
	4–10 years	11	20.18 ± 5.53				
	More than 10 years	5	11.60 ± 9.56				
Feeling That the Employer Cares	0–3 years	12	21.75 ± 5.46	0.414	.665	.03	
	4–10 years	11	20.55 ± 5.82				
	More than 10 years	5	18.80 ± 8.41				
Work's Intrusion into Private Life	0–3 years	12	15.58 ± 3.29	1.251	.303	.09	
	4–10 years	11	14.91 ± 3.48				
	More than 10 years	5	17.80 ± 3.56				

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed statistically significant differences across teaching experience groups for Job Satisfaction, $F(2, 25) = 3.570$, $p = .043$, $\eta^2p = .22$, and Organizational Respect Toward the Employee, $F(2, 25) = 3.934$, $p = .033$, $\eta^2p = .24$. According to established benchmarks (Cohen, 1988; Richardson, 2011), both effect sizes can be interpreted as large, indicating practically meaningful differences between teaching experience groups. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD test indicated that instructors with 4–10 years of teaching experience reported significantly higher job satisfaction ($M = 30.73$, $SD = 6.15$) than those with more than 10 years of experience ($M = 21.00$, $SD = 11.16$), $p = .044$. Similarly, instructors in the 4–10 year experience group reported significantly higher levels of organizational respect toward the employee ($M = 20.18$, $SD = 5.53$) compared to those with more than 10 years of experience ($M = 11.60$, $SD = 9.56$), $p = .037$. No statistically significant differences were observed across teaching experience groups for Workplace Well-being, $F(2, 25) = 1.828$, $p = .182$, $\eta^2p = .13$; Feeling That the Employer Cares, $F(2, 25) = 0.414$, $p = .665$, $\eta^2p = .03$; or Work's Intrusion into Private Life, $F(2, 25) = 1.251$, $p = .303$, $\eta^2p = .09$. Effect sizes for these dimensions ranged from small to moderate, suggesting limited practical differences among experience groups.

The findings indicate that instructors in the mid-career stage (4–10 years) tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction and perceived organizational respect compared to their more experienced counterparts. Although these results should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size in the most experienced group, the observed effect sizes suggest that career stage may play an important role in shaping instructors' workplace perceptions.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether participants' scores on five workplace-related scales differed according to their years of teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted (1 year, 2 years, and more than 3 years). The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of Scale Scores by Total Years of Teaching in the Institution

Scale	Teaching Experience	n	Mean ± SD	f	p	η²p
Workplace Well-being	1 year	11	85.18 ± 17.24	0.127	.882	.01
	2 years	10	81.80 ± 16.81			
	3 years and more	7	81.14 ± 24.00			

Scale	Teaching Experience	n	Mean ± SD	f	p	η^2p
Job Satisfaction	1 year	11	29.00 ± 7.01	0.128	.880	.01
	2 years	10	27.30 ± 6.96			
	3 years and more	7	28.43 ± 9.78			
Organizational Respect Toward the Employee	1 year	11	18.45 ± 6.17	0.017	.983	<.01
	2 years	10	18.30 ± 5.85			
	3 years and more	7	17.86 ± 8.71			
Feeling That the Employer Cares	1 year	11	22.55 ± 4.01	1.422	.260	.10
	2 years	10	20.90 ± 5.36			
	3 years and more	7	17.71 ± 8.77			
Work's Intrusion into Private Life	1 year	11	15.18 ± 4.98	0.795	.463	.06
	2 years	10	15.30 ± 1.89			

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether instructors' scores differed according to years of teaching experience at the institution (1 year, 2 years, and 3 years or more). The results indicated that none of the differences across the three experience groups were statistically significant for any of the five scales examined. Effect size estimates (partial eta squared, η^2p) were uniformly small, suggesting negligible practical differences among groups (Cohen, 1988; Richardson, 2011).

For Workplace Well-being, mean scores were similar across groups (1 year: M = 85.18, SD = 17.24; 2 years: M = 81.80, SD = 16.81; 3 years and more: M = 81.14, SD = 24.00), and the overall group difference was not statistically significant, $F(2, 25) = 0.127$, $p = .882$, $\eta^2p = .01$, indicating a negligible effect. Likewise, Job Satisfaction scores were highly comparable across experience levels (Ms ranged from 27.30 to 29.00), with no significant group difference, $F(2, 25) = 0.128$, $p = .880$, $\eta^2p = .01$.

For Organizational Respect Toward the Employee, mean scores showed minimal variation across groups (1 year: M = 18.45, SD = 6.17; 2 years: M = 18.30, SD = 5.85; 3 years and more: M = 17.86, SD = 8.71), and the ANOVA result was not significant, $F(2, 25) = 0.017$, $p = .983$, $\eta^2p < .01$, indicating a negligible effect size.

Similarly, Feeling That the Employer Cares did not differ significantly across teaching experience groups, $F(2, 25) = 1.422$, $p = .260$, $\eta^2p = .10$. Although instructors with one year of experience reported somewhat higher mean scores (M = 22.55, SD = 4.01) compared to those with three years or more (M = 17.71, SD = 8.77), the effect size fell within the small-to-moderate range and did not indicate a statistically meaningful group separation.

Finally, no significant differences were observed for Work's Intrusion into Private Life, $F(2, 25) = 0.795$, $p = .463$, $\eta^2p = .06$. Mean scores were broadly comparable across experience groups (1 year: M = 15.18, SD = 4.98; 2 years: M = 15.30, SD = 1.89; 3 years and more: M = 17.14, SD = 1.86), reflecting a small effect size.

All in all, the consistently non-significant results and small effect sizes suggest that length of service at the institution did not meaningfully differentiate instructors' perceptions of workplace well-being, job satisfaction, organizational respect, perceived employer care, or work–life balance within this sample.

3.2 Findings of Qualitative Data

To deepen the insights gained from the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire, qualitative data from three semi-structured interviews were examined using thematic analysis, following the six-phase framework developed by Braun and Clarke (2006). An inductive approach guided the process, allowing patterns and themes to emerge directly from the participants' accounts rather than from predefined categories or theoretical assumptions (Patton, 1990). This data-driven method made it possible to capture instructors' genuine experiences and perceptions related to their professional well-being. The combination of a systematic yet flexible analytic process enabled the researcher to identify recurring ideas and construct meaningful themes that reflected how institutional factors shaped teachers' sense of satisfaction, support, and stability.

In line with Braun and Clarke's model, the analysis began with familiarization, repeated reading of the transcribed interviews to gain an overall sense of the data. During the initial coding stage, meaningful segments were identified and labelled, focusing on recurring expressions related to satisfaction, recognition, and job security. These codes were then grouped into broader themes that represented shared experiences across participants. In the reviewing phase, overlapping or weak categories were refined to ensure internal coherence and distinctiveness. The defining and naming phase involved clarifying the essence of each theme and how it contributed to understanding instructor well-being. Finally, the themes were organized and reported with illustrative excerpts to reflect both individual voices and collective insights.

This analytic process led to the identification of five main themes shaping instructors' perceptions of their well-being:

1. Meaning and Satisfaction in Teaching,
2. Institutional Trust and Recognition,
3. Coordinator Support,
4. Contractual Uncertainty and Emotional Strain, and
5. Work–Life Balance and Coping Mechanisms.

The example below illustrates how the coding evolved into a theme. In the familiarization and coding phases, Teacher A's statement, *"When I see my students improving, I feel I'm doing something that truly matters"* was initially coded as *sense of purpose* and *student progress as motivation*. These codes were later merged under the theme Meaning and Satisfaction in Teaching, capturing how intrinsic rewards from classroom interaction sustain teachers despite institutional challenges.

Applying Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis provided a structured pathway from raw interview data to meaningful interpretation, ensuring that the themes reflected participants' authentic experiences while remaining analytically rigorous. The following subsections present each theme in detail, supported by direct excerpts from participants to illustrate the patterns identified through this process.

3.2.1 Meaning and Satisfaction in Teaching

All three participants expressed a general sense of satisfaction with the core teaching aspect of their roles. Positive student interactions emerged as a primary motivator. Teachers frequently associated daily fulfillment with student engagement and observable progress. For instance, Teacher A emphasized the rewarding nature of contributing to students' development, while Teacher C highlighted the enjoyment derived from interpersonal relationships with students

and colleagues. Similarly, Teacher B described how the classroom atmosphere and student motivation shaped her daily experience, stating that a positive class "makes [her] happy that day."

Participants also expressed that their roles allowed them to apply and develop their skills. All three felt that teaching provided space for creativity, especially in lesson planning and material production. This intrinsic engagement with teaching appeared to buffer other institutional shortcomings to some degree.

3.2.2 Institutional Trust and Recognition

Despite professional satisfaction in the classroom, instructors varied in their perceptions of institutional fairness and recognition. Teacher A explicitly stated a broken promise regarding a full-time position, leading to feelings of disrespect and distrust. She also noted a lack of awareness about institutional values, which contributed to a sense of disconnection. In contrast, Teacher C felt more positively, indicating general alignment with the school's goals and a sense of appreciation, albeit with room for improvement. Teacher B's perspective sat between these two positions. While she acknowledged respectful treatment and a sense of collegial equity, she expressed ambiguity regarding individual recognition. Group acknowledgments were appreciated, but individual efforts often went unnoticed. Overall, institutional respect was more keenly felt in horizontal (peer) relationships than in vertical (administrative) structures.

3.2.3 Coordinator Support

A recurring theme across all interviews was the perceived approachability and helpfulness of coordinators. All three participants reported feeling comfortable raising concerns with their coordinators. Teacher A shared a personal example where a coordinator quickly stepped in to cover a lesson during a family emergency. Teacher B highlighted the contrast between her current supportive coordinators and previous negative managerial experiences at other institutions, noting that the current environment made her "feel secure." Teacher C also affirmed receiving guidance when needed. However, there were subtle differences in perceived depth of understanding. While Teachers A and C believed coordinators were aware of day-to-day challenges, Teacher B was less certain. This points to a potential gap between interpersonal support and structural awareness of workload realities.

3.2.4 Contractual Uncertainty and Emotional Strain

Contract type and job security emerged as significant stressors affecting emotional well-being and long-term motivation. Both Teacher A and Teacher B, despite enjoying the act of teaching, expressed anxiety about job continuity. Teacher A, on a 12-month contract, stated that "anything can happen anytime," while Teacher B noted that her 9-month contract made it difficult to plan her future and undermined her sense of belonging. Interestingly, Teacher C, who had recently transitioned to a 12-month contract, reflected that this change improved her motivation and emotional stability. She explicitly stated that the extended contract gave her greater peace of mind compared to the previous year. This suggests that longer contracts may serve as a protective factor in maintaining teacher well-being.

3.2.5 Work-Life Balance and Coping Mechanisms

While none of the instructors reported extreme burnout, they all described some level of work spillover into personal life, particularly due to lesson preparation and materials development. Teacher B noted that planning for multi-book lessons often intruded on evenings and

weekends. Teacher C similarly acknowledged that busy weeks sometimes interfered with personal time, though she actively employed strategies to maintain balance. In contrast, Teacher A, who worked half-days, did not report negative effects on her personal time, though she still advocated for institutional support measures like social events or wellness activities. Both Teacher B and Teacher C expressed interest in institutional interventions that could support stress management.

Participants identified actionable institutional changes that could enhance their well-being. Chief among them were more secure, longer-term contracts and more frequent, individualized recognition. Teacher A specifically requested a transition to full-time status. Teacher B emphasized the need for the institution to examine factors influencing job satisfaction and to create a more inclusive environment. Teacher C recommended opportunities for instructors to voice ideas, as well as more structured support systems. All three cited strong student relationships and collegiality as sustaining forces. These findings suggest that while intrinsic motivation and peer support play a central role in teacher resilience, institutional actions, particularly around contracts, recognition, and participatory decision-making, could significantly improve overall well-being.

4. Discussion

The findings of this mixed-methods study provide insight into the institutional conditions shaping the well-being of non-tenured English language instructors working in a preparatory school context. By combining quantitative data from the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire with qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews, the study offers a detailed picture of how instructors experience their work under conditions of contractual insecurity. Viewed through the lenses of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model and the PERMA framework, the findings highlight the complex ways in which institutional structures interact with personal motivation to influence well-being.

One major theme across both data sets was the role of intrinsic motivation. Survey results indicated moderate to high levels of job satisfaction and generally positive relationships with coordinators, while interview data revealed that instructors often derive meaning and fulfillment from student interaction and the creative aspects of teaching. These experiences align with the Positive Emotion, Engagement, and Meaning components of the PERMA model and reflect the intrinsic rewards commonly associated with educational work (Porath et al., 2012; Warr, 1990). However, the findings also suggest that intrinsic motivation alone is insufficient to sustain long-term well-being when institutional resources are limited. Feelings of instability, lack of recognition, and weak alignment with institutional values were frequently reported, echoing earlier research linking such conditions to emotional strain and burnout (Dagenais-Desmarais & Savoie, 2012; Daniels, 2000). From a JD-R perspective, this imbalance points to a context in which job demands outweigh available resources, increasing the risk of reduced well-being despite high personal commitment.

Job security emerged as a central concern, particularly in relation to contract type. Instructors employed on nine-month or annually renewed contracts described ongoing uncertainty about their professional future and difficulty engaging in long-term planning. This finding is consistent with Zheng et al. (2015), who highlight the psychological costs of employment insecurity. Notably, even instructors holding twelve-month contracts expressed a sense of impermanence, suggesting that perceived instability may stem not only from contract length but also from broader organizational practices. Within the JD-R framework, this uncertainty functions as a chronic job demand, while from a PERMA perspective it undermines Meaning

and Accomplishment, as instructors struggle to see themselves as stable and valued members of the institution.

Support from coordinators and institutional leadership was identified as an important protective factor. Most participants described coordinators as approachable and empathetic, which appeared to buffer some of the stress associated with workload and insecurity. Such interpersonal support can be understood as a key job resource within the JD-R model and aligns with the Relationships component of PERMA. At the same time, interview data suggested a gap between emotional support and structural influence. While coordinators were often perceived as allies, their limited authority to address systemic issues such as workload distribution or job continuity reduced the long-term impact of this support. This distinction highlights the difference between relational resources and institutional resources, both of which are necessary for sustainable well-being.

Work–life balance also emerged as a significant issue. Although survey scores suggested relatively manageable levels of work intrusion into private life, interview accounts revealed that teaching-related tasks frequently extended beyond working hours, particularly in relation to lesson preparation and assessment. These findings support previous research identifying the spillover of academic work into personal time as a persistent challenge for educators (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). Within the JD-R framework, this spillover represents an ongoing job demand, while from a PERMA perspective it may limit Positive Emotion and Engagement by reducing opportunities for rest and recovery. The burden appeared especially pronounced among instructors with heavier teaching loads or limited preparation time during working hours.

All in all, the findings suggest that while personal resilience, collegial relationships, and intrinsic motivation contribute positively to instructors' well-being, they cannot fully compensate for institutional shortcomings. Well-being appears to depend largely on the balance between job demands and resources, as well as on the extent to which workplace practices support the core PERMA components of positive emotion, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. Strengthening collegial ties and fostering a more collaborative environment may offer partial support; however, as Sak (2025) notes, sustainable well-being also requires organizational conditions that recognize teachers' contributions and encourage shared self-care practices. These results underscore the need for institutions to address both structural and relational aspects of work in order to support instructors' long-term well-being.

5. Conclusion

This study set out to explore the well-being of non-tenured instructors in a foundation university's preparatory program, with particular attention to how institutional factors such as contract type, perceived support, and organizational culture shape their professional experiences. The results reveal that while many instructors find intrinsic satisfaction in teaching, this is frequently undermined by structural challenges-chiefly job insecurity, inconsistent recognition, and insufficient work–life boundaries. The combination of survey data and interview narratives underscores the importance of attending not only to the emotional and interpersonal aspects of teacher well-being but also to the systemic conditions that sustain or erode it. Contractual stability, meaningful inclusion in institutional decision-making, and clear channels for recognition and feedback are crucial for creating a healthier and more sustainable work environment.

5.1 Implications

The findings of this research highlight several key actions that institutions can take to enhance the well-being of non-tenured instructors. A major concern emerging from both the survey and interview data was job insecurity resulting from short-term or annually renewed contracts. Many instructors reported that the uncertainty surrounding their employment made it difficult to plan ahead and weakened their sense of belonging within the institution. Providing longer-term or more predictable contracts could help reduce this anxiety and promote a stronger feeling of stability and institutional trust.

Another area requiring attention is recognition. While some participants felt generally appreciated, others noted that their individual efforts often went unnoticed. Teachers need to be heard and recognized so that they can be given small yet meaningful tasks to accomplish and receive praise for their efforts. This sense of acknowledgment helps them feel included and visible in the workplace because, concerning reduced personal accomplishment, people tend to lose confidence and motivation and eventually face intense self-criticism and emotional exhaustion (Soleimani & Bolourchi, 2021). Developing consistent and visible recognition practices -beyond general group acknowledgments- could therefore strengthen teachers' motivation and engagement.

The data also emphasize the importance of involvement in decision-making. When instructors are invited to share opinions on matters that directly affect their workload, curriculum, or working conditions, they tend to feel more connected to the institution. Feeling heard and included fosters ownership and commitment, which, in turn, enhances morale and collegiality.

Finally, the issue of work–life balance surfaced as another area requiring institutional support. Although some teachers reported managing their schedules effectively, others found that lesson planning and administrative responsibilities frequently encroached on personal time, leading to fatigue and emotional strain. Institutions could address this by offering collaborative planning opportunities, mental health resources, or informal social gatherings that allow staff to decompress and maintain a healthier separation between professional and personal life.

Overall, these findings suggest that institutional well-being is not shaped by a single factor but by a constellation of conditions like stability, appreciation, inclusion, and support. When institutions invest in these dimensions intentionally and consistently, they not only strengthen teachers' well-being but also foster a more sustainable and positive educational environment for everyone.

5.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size in the qualitative phase was limited to three participants, which may not capture the full diversity of experiences within the institution. Since it might restrict the transferability of the findings, the qualitative results should be interpreted as exploratory and illustrative, and future research with larger samples is recommended to further validate and extend these insights. Second, as the researcher also holds a deputy director position, responses may have been influenced by social desirability bias, even in written form. Third, the study is based on a single institutional context, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings or countries.

Future studies may benefit from expanding the participant pool in both phases to include a broader range of instructors across institutions. Longitudinal designs could also help explore how changes in employment policies affect well-being over time. Additionally, comparative research between tenured and non-tenured instructors might yield further insight into how institutional structures influence professional fulfillment and psychological resilience. Finally,

incorporating student perspectives could offer a more holistic view of how teacher well-being indirectly shapes educational outcomes.

References

Acton, R., & Glasgow, P. (2015). Teacher well-being in neoliberal contexts: A review of the literature. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(8), 99-114. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n8.6

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., & Trautwein, U. (2020). Job-related emotional experiences, organizational support, and well-being among teachers: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *112*(5), 1063-1076. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000398

Ashford, J., LeCroy, C. W., & Lortie, K. L. (2006). *Human behavior in the social environment: A multidimensional perspective* (3rd ed.). Thompson.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chari, R., Chang, C.-C., Sauter, S. L., Petrun Sayers, E. L., Huang, W., & Fisher, G. G. (2026). NIOSH worker well-being questionnaire (WellBQ) (Version 2) (DHHS Publication No. 2021-110, revised 06/2026). National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/media/pdfs/2026/06/2021-110_revised062026.pdf

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collie, R. J. (2021). The development of teacher occupational well-being in school: An integrative review. Educational Psychology Review, 33(1), 33-67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09544-4

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.

Dagenais-Desmarais, V., & Savoie, A. (2012). What is psychological well-being, really? A grassroots approach from the organizational sciences. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *13*, 659-684. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9285-3

Daniels, K. (2000). Measures of five aspects of affective well-being at work. *Human Relations*, *53*(2), 275-294.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2014). *Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times.* Routledge.

Deneme, S. (2021). Investigation of the life satisfaction levels of Turkish EFL teachers in terms of several variables. *World Journal of Education*, *11*(3), 11-17. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v11n3p11

Dewaele, J. M., & Li, C. (2020). Emotions in second language acquisition: A critical review and research agenda. *Foreign Language World*, *196*(1), 34-49.

Dodge, R., Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012). The challenge of defining well-being. *International Journal of Well-being*, *2*(3), 222-235. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4

Granziera, H., & Evans, P. (2026). Forms of social support relevant to teachers' wellbeing: A job demands–resources perspective. *Social Psychology of Education, 29*, 95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-026-10265-3

Gregersen, T., Mercer, S., MacIntyre, P., Talbot, K., & Banga, C. A. (2023). Understanding language teacher wellbeing: An ESM study of daily stressors and uplifts. *Language Teaching Research*, *27*(4), 862-883. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820965897

Hismanoglu, M., & Ersan, Y. (2016). Investigating Turkish EFL teachers' burnout levels in relation to demographic variables. *Journal of Educational & Instructional Studies in the World*, *6*(4), 21-31.

Hofstadler, N., Babic, S., Lämmerer, A., Mercer, S., & Oberdorfer, P. (2021). The ecology of CLIL teachers in Austria-an ecological perspective on CLIL teachers' wellbeing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(3), 218-232. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1739050

Karacabey, M. F., Ozkul, R., Polatcan, M., & Bellibas, M. S. (2025). Transformational leadership and teacher burnout in Türkiye: The moderated mediation role of organisational support, teacher resilience and teacher workload. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *54*(5), 1750-1770. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251346087

Kiltz, L., Rinas, R., Daumiller, M., Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., & Jansen, E. P. W. A. (2020). 'When they struggle, I cannot sleep well either': Perceptions and interactions surrounding university student and teacher wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.578378

Mercer, S., & Gregersen, T. (2020). *Teacher wellbeing*. Oxford University Press.

Mızrak, P. (2019). *An exploratory study on the relationship between teacher burnout and teacher self-efficacy among English language instructors*. [Master's thesis, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University].

Onan, A. M., & Aydın, S. (2024). Well-Being, burnout, and teaching anxiety among EFL teachers, *Journal of Language Research*, *8*(1), 17-35. https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1376451

Parker, G. B., & Hyett, M. P. (2011). Measurement of well-being in the workplace: The development of the work well-being questionnaire. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *199*(6), 394-397. https://doi.org/10.1097/nmd.0b013e31821cd3b9

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage Publications.

Porath, C., Spreitzer, G., Gibson, C., & Garnett, F. G. (2012). Thriving at work: Toward its measurement, construct validation, and theoretical refinement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(2), 250-275. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.756

Richardson, J. T. E. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review, 6*(2), 135-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.12.001

Russell, E., & Daniels, K. (2018). Measuring affective well-being at work using short-form scales: Implications for affective structures and participant instructions. *Human Relations*, *71*(11), 1478-1507.

Sak, M. (2025). Language teacher educator wellbeing in online classes: An analytic autoethnography. *European Journal of Education Research Development and Policy*, *60*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70102

Seligman, M. (2011). *Flourish*. Free Press.

Soleimani, M., & Bolourchi, A. (2021). EFL teachers' job satisfaction and burnout in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, *61*, 229-252.

Tang, Y., Wang, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Expatriate EFL teachers' wellbeing in Hong Kong: The roles of school climate, teacher identity, and sense of belonging. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *93*, 103121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103121

Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(2), 219-230. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.219

Van Petegem, K., Creemers, B. P. M., Rossel, Y., & Aelterman, A. (2005). Relationships between teacher characteristics, interpersonal teacher behaviour and teacher wellbeing. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *40*, 34-43.

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of wellbeing and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*(3), 193-210. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x

Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 621-644. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990