



**T.C.  
PAMUKKALE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ  
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI  
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI  
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**A STUDY ON PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' MOTIVATIONS  
FOR CHOOSING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT  
AND THEIR BURNOUT LEVELS**

**Onat KÜÇÜK**

**DENİZLİ-2020**

**T.R.**  
**PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY**  
**THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**  
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM**  
**MASTER OF ARTS THESIS**

**A STUDY ON PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS’  
MOTIVATIONS FOR CHOOSING ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
TEACHING DEPARTMENT AND THEIR BURNOUT LEVELS**

**Onat KÜÇÜK**

**Supervisor**

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağla ATMACA**

## JÜRİ ÜYELERİ ONAY SAYFASI

Bu çalışma, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı'nda jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

İmza

Başkan: Prof. Dr. Demet YAYLI

Üye: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağla ATMACA (Danışman)

Üye: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fatih GÜNGÖR

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun ...../...../.....  
tarih ve ...../..... sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa BULUŞ  
Enstitü Müdürü

## ETİK BEYANNAMESİ

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nün yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında; tez içindeki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi; görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu; başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda ilgili eserlere bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu; atıfta bulunduğum eserlerin tümünü kaynak olarak gösterdiğimi; kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı; bu tezin herhangi bir bölümünü bu üniversitede veya başka bir üniversitede başka bir tez çalışması olarak sunmadığımı beyan ederim.



Onat KÜÇÜK

## **DEDICATION**

**To my grandfather who was always a father to me and  
my grandmother who was a second mother to me**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to all the people who have not refrained from offering their help whenever I needed and without whose encouragement and support I could not have finished this thesis.

First of all, I would like to express my most whole-hearted thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağla ATMACA for her constant encouragement throughout the whole process, giving constructive feedback all the time and offering help whenever needed. I am particularly indebted to her for being more than a supervisor and for being a warmhearted person. Without her contribution and encouragement, this thesis would not be an amazing and salutary experience for me.

Secondly, I owe special thanks to my thesis committee members, Prof. Dr. Demet YAYLI and Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatih GÜNGÖR for their invaluable feedback to improve the qualities of this study substantially and contribution to my thesis and academic identity. It is evidentiary that they considered this study as if it was their own study and showed an unexampled interest in it.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Murat BALKIS for helping me for the data analysis and giving suggestions throughout the data analysis process and beyond. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Turan PAKER, Assist. Prof. Dr. Selami OK, Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar KARAHAN and Lecturer Ramazan Alparslan GÖKÇEN from Pamukkale University, and Prof. Dr. Ümit Deniz TURAN, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali MERÇ, Assist. Prof. Dr. Gonca SUBAŞI, Assist. Prof. Dr. Selma KARA, Lecturer Neslihan EKMEKÇİ, Lecturer Neslihan AYDEMİR and R.A. Tuncay KARALIK from Anadolu University for their invaluable efforts to help gathering the data and sparing their valuable times for me.

I owe a special thanks to my wife Elif Ceren KÜÇÜK who always supported me and helped me to write my thesis in terms of both emotional support and physical efforts. I am also greatly indebted to my friend Büşra Nur SÖYLEMEZ who has done everything for me until now and helped me in this process, and all the friends who supported, encouraged and helped me in the writing of this thesis.

My heartfelt thanks go to my mother Meral SEZENLER who raised me and brought me to these days, heartened me all the time and never hesitated to help me when needed and throughout the thesis writing process. I am also grateful to my grandfather Hüseyin SEZENLER, who passed away in my M.A. years, for being a father to me since I was a child and being proud of his grandson and Meliha SEZENLER for being a second mother to me since my childhood and encouraging me all the time.

Finally, many thanks go to the students at the ELT Department of Anadolu University and Pamukkale University for their participation in this study.

## ÖZET

### İngilizce Öğretmeni Adaylarının İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünü Seçme Motivasyonları ve Tükenmişlik Seviyeleri Üzerine Bir Çalışma

KÜÇÜK, Onat

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağla ATMACA

Temmuz, 2020, 164 sayfa

Bir insanın ömrü boyunca çalışacağı kariyeri seçmesi özellikle bu kişi İngilizce öğretmeni olmak istiyorsa bir bireyin hayatındaki en önemli kararlardan biridir. İngilizce öğretmenleri geleceğin evrensel iletişim kurucularını yetiştirdikleri önemli bir role sahiptir. Bu yüzden İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının gelecekteki kariyerlerine hazırlanmak için İngiliz Öğretmenliği bölümünü seçme motivasyonlarının incelenmesi gerekmektedir çünkü idealleri ve güçlü motivasyonları olan öğretmenler bu idealleri ve güçlü motivasyonları geleceğin öğretmenleri, akademisyenleri, doktorları, mühendisleri, programcıları veya finansçıları olacak öğrencilerine aşılayabilirler. Bu öğretmenlerin motivasyonlarının yanı sıra gelecekteki İngilizce öğretmenlerinin eğitim ve öğretimini etkileyen diğer önemli bir etken de zorluklar, stres ve bu öğretmen adaylarının İngilizce öğretmeye başlamadan bile tükenmişliğine sebep olabilecek diğer olumsuz etkenlerdir. Bu yönden hem İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümünü seçme motivasyonlarına hem de onların tükenmişlik seviyelerine odaklanan bir çalışma İngiliz dili eğitimi alanındaki gittikçe büyüyen literatür açısından önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümünü seçme motivasyonlarını, İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının bu bölümü seçme motivasyonları bakımından özellikle sınıfları olmak üzere demografik özellikleri arasındaki farkı, İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının öğrenci tükenmişliği bakımından demografik özellikleri arasındaki farkı ve İngilizce öğretmenliği mesleğini seçme motivasyonları ve öğrenci tükenmişliği arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Bu çalışmanın katılımcıları Türkiye'deki iki farklı üniversiteden ve farklı sınıflardan 470 İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencisidir. Bu çalışmada daha derin bir anlayış kazanmak, bu olgular hakkında daha genellenebilir sonuçlar çıkarmak ve üçgenlemenin avantajlarından

faydalanmak için hem nicel hem de nitel yöntemler kullanılmıştır. Verinin toplanması için katılımcılara bir kişisel bilgi formu, Subaşı tarafından 2010'da geliştirilmiş bir motivasyon anketi, Schaufeli ve diğerleri tarafından 2002'de geliştirilmiş Maslach Tükenmişlik Envanteri – Öğrenci Formu ve Yazılı Mülakat Protokolü uygulanmıştır. Bu enstrümanlarla toplanan veriler nicel analiz için SPSS 22'de analiz edilmiştir ve nitel veriler özetsel içerik analiziyle analiz edilmiştir. Bu verilerden elde edilen bulgular katılımcıların en sık görülen motivasyonlarının içsel motivasyonlar olduğunu göstermiştir. Katılımcıların yüksek seviyede öğrenci tükenmişliği yaşadıkları bulunmuştur ve ikinci ve üçüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin diğer sınıflardan daha fazla duygusal tükenmişliğe sahip olduğu bulunmuştur. Sınıflar arasında duyarsızlaşma ve mesleki yetersizlik açısından bir farklılığa rastlanmamıştır. Diğer bir bulgu da başlangıç motivasyonları ve öğrenci tükenmişliği arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bulgulara ve sonuçlara ek olarak başlangıç motivasyonları ve öğrenci tükenmişliği bakımından analiz edilen her bir demografik özellik çalışmada sunulmuştur. Bunun yanı sıra Yazılı Mülakat Protokolü'nün analizinden çıkan birkaç ek bulgu ve sonuç da ilerideki bölümlerde sunulmuştur. İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümleri için birkaç çıkarım yapılmıştır ve ileri araştırma önerileri yapılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kariyer seçimi, öğrenci tükenmişliği, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, motivasyon, tükenmişlik, öğretmen adayları.



## **ABSTRACT**

### **A Study on Pre-Service English Teachers' Motivations for Choosing English Language Teaching Department and Their Burnout Levels**

KÜÇÜK, Onat

M.A Thesis in Department of English Language Teaching

Thesis Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Çağla ATMACA

July, 2020, 164 pages

Choosing a career to pursue for the rest of one's life is one of the most important choices in an individual's life, especially when an individual wants to become an English teacher. English teachers have an essential role which is training the universal communicators of the future. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the pre-service English teachers' motivations for choosing English Language Teaching major as the preparation for their future careers because teachers with ideals and strong motivations would engrain these ideals and motivations in their students who will be the future teachers, academicians, doctors, engineers, developers, or financiers. Beside the motivations of these teachers, another crucial factor affecting the education and training quality of the future English language teachers is the difficulties, stress and other negative factors which may lead to these pre-service teachers' burnout even before they start teaching English. Thus, a study focusing on both pre-service English teachers' motivations for choosing English language teaching profession and their burnout levels is essential in the perspective of growing literature in the field of English language teaching. The purpose of this study is to investigate the pre-service English teachers' motivations for choosing English language teaching department, the difference between the pre-service English language teachers' demographic features, especially their grades, in terms of their motivations to choose this department, the difference between the pre-service English teachers' demographic features in terms of student burnout, and the relationship between motivations for choosing English language teaching profession and student burnout. The participants of this study were 470 pre-service teachers of English language from two different universities in Turkey and from different grades. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized in this study in order to gain a deeper understanding, draw more generalizable conclusions about these phenomena and take

advantage of the triangulation. For collecting data, a personal information form, a questionnaire of motivation developed by Subaşı in 2010, Maslach Burnout Inventory – Student Survey developed by Schaufeli et al. in 2002 and a Written Interview Protocol were applied to the participating pre-service teachers. The data gathered from these instruments were analyzed on SPSS 22 for quantitative findings, and the qualitative data was analyzed with summative content analysis. The findings from these data showed that the participating pre-service English teachers’ most frequent motivations were intrinsic motivations. The participating students were found to experience high level of student burnout and the sophomores and juniors were found to have higher emotional exhaustion than the other grades. There was not found any difference between the grades regarding cynicism and professional inefficacy. Another finding pointed out that there is a negative relation between initial motivations and student burnout. In addition to these findings and conclusions, each demographic feature analyzed in terms of initial motivations and student burnout was presented in this study. Besides, some additional findings and conclusions gathered from the analysis of the Written Interview Protocol were also presented in the next chapters. Some implications for the English language teaching departments were also suggested and some more further research suggestions were made.

Keywords: Career choice, student burnout, English Language Teaching, motivation, burnout, pre-service teachers.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ONAY FORMU .....	iii
ETİK BEYANNAMESİ .....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
ÖZET .....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES .....	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xviii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.2. Aim of the Study .....	3
1.3. Significance of the Study .....	4
1.4. Limitations of the Study.....	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	9
2.1. Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers’ Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career .....	9
2.2. Studies on Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers’ Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career .....	11
2.3. Studies on Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers’ Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career in Turkey .....	14
2.4. Burnout.....	16
2.5. Student Burnout .....	18
2.6. Studies on Student Burnout.....	19
2.7. Studies on Student Burnout in Turkey .....	22
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	24
3.1. Research Design.....	24
3.2. Universe and Participants.....	26
3.3. Data Collection Tools .....	31
3.4. Data Collection Procedures.....	33
3.5. Data Analysis Procedures .....	35
3.5.1. Quantitative Data Analysis Procedures .....	36
3.5.2. Qualitative Data Analysis Procedures .....	38

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS .....	40
4.1. Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department.....	40
4.1.1. Quantitative Analysis Results.....	40
4.1.2. Qualitative Analysis Results.....	43
4.2. Results for the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivation for Choosing English Language Teaching Profession .....	46
4.2.1. Quantitative Analysis Results.....	46
4.2.2. Qualitative Analysis Results.....	47
4.3. Results for Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade .....	49
4.3.1. Quantitative Analysis Results.....	49
4.3.2. Qualitative Analysis Results.....	51
4.4. Results for the Relationship between the ELT Student’s Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Their Burnout Levels .....	54
4.5. Results for the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department.....	55
4.5.1. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Genders .....	55
4.5.2. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Ages .....	56
4.5.3. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Graduated High School Types .....	58
4.5.4. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Weekly Lesson Hours.....	61
4.5.5. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their GPAs.....	63
4.5.6. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Participants’ Reasons to Choose ELT Department .....	65
4.5.7. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Perspectives about the Suitability of the Department .....	66

4.5.8. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Teaching Experience .....	68
4.6. Results for the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Burnout Levels.....	71
4.6.1. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Genders .....	72
4.6.2. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Ages .....	73
4.6.3. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types .....	75
4.6.4. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Weekly Lesson Hours .....	79
4.6.5. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' GPA .....	81
4.6.6. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department .....	82
4.6.7. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Perspectives of Suitability .....	84
4.6.8. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience .....	87
4.7. Additional Results for the Participants' Burnout Levels and WIP Answers .....	90
4.7.1. Results for the Burnout Levels of the Participants .....	90
4.7.2. Results for the Fifth Question of the WIP .....	90
4.7.3. Results for the Sixth Question of the WIP .....	93
4.7.4. Results for the Seventh Question of the WIP .....	94
4.7.5. Results for the Eighth Question of the WIP .....	96
4.7.6. Results for the Ninth Question of the WIP .....	98
4.7.7. Results for the Tenth Question of the WIP .....	99
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	104
5.1. Discussion and Conclusion of the Most Frequent Motivations for the ELT Students to Choose ELT Department .....	104
5.2. Discussion and Conclusion of the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department.....	107

5.3. Discussion and Conclusion of the Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade .....	109
5.4. Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the ELT Student’s Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Burnout Levels.....	110
5.5. Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department .....	111
5.6. Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Burnout Levels .....	114
5.7. Discussion and Conclusion of the Additional Results from the WIP .....	119
5.8. Overall Conclusions and Implications .....	122
REFERENCES .....	126
APPENDICES .....	137
Appendix 1. Survey of Motivations for Choosing Teaching Profession and Student Burnout for English Teacher Candidates .....	137
Appendix 2. Correspondance of Permission for the Use of QoM.....	145
CURRICULUM VITAE (CV).....	146

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. <i>Participants' Universities</i> .....	26
Table 3.2. <i>Participants' Grades</i> .....	26
Table 3.3. <i>Participants' Genders</i> .....	27
Table 3.4. <i>Participants' Age</i> .....	27
Table 3.5. <i>Participants' Graduated High School Types</i> .....	27
Table 3.6. <i>Participants' Lesson Hours</i> .....	28
Table 3.7. <i>Participants' GPAs</i> .....	28
Table 3.8. <i>Participants' Reasons for Choosing Teaching Career</i> .....	29
Table 3.9. <i>Participants Suitability to ELT Department</i> .....	29
Table 3.10. <i>Participants' Teaching Experience</i> .....	30
Table 3.11. <i>Participants' Teaching Experience Duration</i> .....	30
Table 3.12. <i>Data Collection Timeline</i> .....	35
Table 3.13. <i>Skewness and Kurtosis Levels of the Dependent Variable</i> .....	36
Table 4.1. <i>Quantitative Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department</i> .....	41
Table 4.2. <i>Qualitative Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department</i> .....	43
Table 4.3. <i>Quantitative Results for the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivation for Choosing English Language Teaching Profession</i> ..	46
Table 4.4. <i>Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Freshmen</i> .....	47
Table 4.5. <i>Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Sophomores</i> .....	47
Table 4.6. <i>Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Juniors</i>	47
Table 4.7. <i>Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Seniors</i>	48
Table 4.8. <i>Quantitative Results for Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade</i> .....	49
Table 4.9. <i>Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Freshmen</i> .....	51
Table 4.10. <i>Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Sophomores</i> .....	51
Table 4.11. <i>Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Juniors</i> .....	52
Table 4.12. <i>Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Seniors</i> .....	52

Table 4.13. <i>Results for the Relationship between the ELT Student's Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Their Burnout Levels</i> .....	54
Table 4.14. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Genders</i> .....	55
Table 4.15. <i>Results for the Relationship between Age Groups and the Motivations to Choose ELT Department</i> .....	56
Table 4.16. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Graduated High School Types</i> .....	58
Table 4.17. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Weekly Lesson Hours</i> .....	61
Table 4.18. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their GPAs</i> .....	63
Table 4.19. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department</i> .....	65
Table 4.20. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Perspectives about the Suitability of the Department</i> .....	66
Table 4.21. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Teaching Experience</i> .....	68
Table 4.22. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Genders</i> .....	72
Table 4.23. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Ages</i> .....	73
Table 4.24. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types</i> .....	75
Table 4.25. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Weekly Lesson Hours</i> .....	79
Table 4.26. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' GPA</i> .....	81
Table 4.27. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department</i> .....	83
Table 4.28. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Perspectives of Suitability</i> .....	84



Table 4.29. <i>Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience</i> .....	87
Table 4.30. <i>Mean Scores of the Participants' Burnout Levels</i> .....	90
Table 4.31. <i>Results for the Reasons of the Burnout in the ELT Department</i> .....	91
Table 4.32. <i>Results for the Instructors' Attitudes Towards the Burnout</i> .....	93
Table 4.33. <i>Results for Motivation and Burnout to Continue Further Education</i> .....	94
Table 4.34. <i>Results for Feelings of the Participants Towards Morning / Afternoon / Evening Classes</i> .....	96
Table 4.35. <i>Results for the Effective Participation of the Participants</i> .....	98

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

- ANOVA – Analysis of Variance
- AÜ – Anadolu Üniversitesi (Anadolu University)
- GPA – Grade Point Average
- EFL – English as a Foreign Language
- ELT – English Language Teaching
- ELTT – English Language Teacher Training
- EP – European Profile
- EPOSTL – European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages
- FIT-Choice – Factors Influencing Teaching Choice
- IUD – Internet Use Disorder
- KPSS – Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı (Civil Personnel Selection Examination)
- M.A. – Master of Arts
- MBI – Maslach Burnout Inventory
- MBI-HSS – Maslach Burnout Inventory – Human Service Survey
- MBI-ES – Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey
- MBI-GS – Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey
- MBI-SS – Maslach Burnout Inventory – Student Survey
- ÖSYM – Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi (Student Selection and Placement Center)
- PAÜ – Pamukkale Üniversitesi (Anadolu University)
- Ph.D. – Doctor of Philosophy
- QoM – Questionnaire of Motivations
- SSI – Student Stress Inventory
- SPSS – Statistical Program for Social Sciences
- URAP – University Ranking by Academic Performance
- U.S. – United States
- WIP – Written Interview Protocol

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Teaching profession is no doubt one of the most respected and important professions because teachers are the “human engineers” and the architects of the upcoming generation of the society as they have the mission to shape the personality and the mentality of their students (Putkiewicz & Witkomirska, 2003). As the great leader of Turkish Republic M. K. Atatürk said: “Teachers! You, devoted teachers and educators of the republic, will raise the new generation. And, the new generation will be your masterpiece”, teachers are the ones who shape a country’s fate and future. Thus, teachers are the essential figures of a nation and the way they are trained gains a great importance in this sense in that an incompetent teacher would barely contribute to the future of a country while a highly competent teacher would make a huge difference in the society. At this point, it is crystal clear that teacher training is of much importance and there is a real need to investigate the quality of teacher training programs at universities.

Besides the general teacher training, there are many branches in the training of teachers as Bachelor degree in our country. English language teaching, which is gradually gaining traction in pedagogical studies, is one of the most salient branches because language education seems to have been an unsolvable problem for years in our country, which has been criticized (Atmaca, 2016; British Council & Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı-TEPAV, 2013). This problem may be the result of the policies of the government, the teachers themselves, the teacher training programs or the students who choose English Language Teaching (ELT) programs as their Bachelors. The input of ELT departments, students, are an intriguing part of foreign language teaching. Because when they become the output of their departments, they will have the chance to be an idol for their students; thus, the new generation have the opportunity to cater for the communication worldwide, which is gaining an essential role in the stage of economics, commerce, education, politics and media (British Council, 2013). Therefore, an English teacher should have unshakeable motivations and a strong will to continue to brighten the minds and broaden the horizons of students. All in all, there is a need to have a close look into the motivations of ELT students and their experiences which may cause them to feel burned out. This way, there is a chance to find a solution for the problem with the quality of the language teaching in the future.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

In Turkey, students take a highly important test when they finish their high school education. Then, the students who think that they have the talent, aptitude or affection in foreign languages tend to choose ELT departments (Subaşı, 2010). Most of the time, these students do not have an idea what they are into and about to do; however, teaching career should be planned carefully and in detail (Krecic & Grmek, 2005). Pre-service teachers' motivations to teach are considered to be an important factor in educating qualified teachers (Subaşı, 2010). Further, the variable success and engagement of the ELT students in their courses could be related to their motivation towards their career, and/or the reason why they chose teaching (Dowson & McInerney, 2003). In this regard, the motivations of the pre-service English teachers become a crucial topic to investigate. Moreover, when the related literature is examined, there seems to be an insufficient number of studies on pre-service English language teachers' motivations for choosing ELT Department to the knowledge of the researcher, and as stated by Heinz (2015), a considerable amount of studies conducted on pre-service English language teachers were quantitative studies, researchers collected their data from only one institution in these studies, and they lack the diversity of demographic groupings. Therefore, a study which fills these gaps would be of importance for the development of present literature.

ELT students choose ELT department with various motivations and expectations (Hayes, 2008; Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Subaşı, 2010). As Erakman (2015) stated in her study, they start their training with a burst of fresh energy and strong motivations which makes them study hard in order to succeed. Yet, they may have a tendency to slow down, lose their motivations and feel mentally, physically and psychologically exhausted over time. As a result, they may lose their initial motivation to complete their assignments, lose their attention on courses or choose not to attend the lessons. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to shed light on the burnout levels of pre-service English language teachers. In addition, there are some gaps in the literature which investigate pre-service teachers' burnout levels (Guglielmi & Tatrow, 1998), and there are not enough research studies which investigate the level of student burnout in ELT department while there are a number of studies on student burnout when the related literature is reviewed.

The reasons for pre-service English language teachers to choose ELT department and the level of student burnout in ELT are separately attractive issues because pre-service English language teachers choose their department with certain motivations and idealistic ideas; however, they may lose their interest towards their department and even consider

dropping off. The reason for the decrease in their initial motivations may be due to student burnout. Therefore, there is a need for investigating this relationship between these variables (Goddard, & O'Brien, 2007; McLean, Taylor, & Jimenez, 2019). Moreover, as the related literature is examined, it can be seen that most of the studies investigated the relationship between motivations for choosing teaching career and student burnout (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Goddard & O'Brien, 2007; König & Rothland, 2012; McLean et al., 2019), but not the relationship between ELT students' motivations for choosing ELT department and their burnout levels. Therefore, it seems necessary to melt them in a pot and make a study which investigates the relationship between the motivations and the burnout levels of ELT students for the development of the growing literature in the ELT field. As regarded in Hayes (2008), the low number of research studies seems surprising when the number of teachers and their reasons to choose teaching are considered. Beside this, when the lack of research on student burnout in ELT is taken into account, this study would probably contribute much to the literature in the English Language Teacher Training (ELTT).

## **1.2 Aim of the Study**

ELT programs at universities are responsible for training new English teachers and improving the quality of their pre-service teacher training. In order to find ways for improving this quality, a study on the process of ELTT is needed from the beginning to the process itself. Therefore, a study which will reveal and investigate the motivations of ELT students to choose ELT department in addition to their burnout levels would make a contribution to the improvement in the ELT field in terms of quality of pre-service English teacher training, raising awareness among ELT students or the ones who want to choose ELT department about their motivations and student burnout, gathering stakeholders' attention on these concepts, and filling the gaps in the literature which are mentioned in the previous chapter. To realize these goals, the current study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the most frequent motivation for the participating ELT students to choose ELT Department?
2. Are there any significant differences among grades of the ELT students about their motivation for choosing teaching profession?
3. Are there any significant differences among the ELT students about the levels of student burnout in terms of their grades?

4. Is there a relationship between the motivation of ELT students for choosing English language teaching profession and their levels of student burnout?
5. Is there a relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their motivations for choosing ELT Department?

Are there any relationships between the motivations of ELT students to choose ELT Department and ...

- 5.1. their genders
- 5.2. their ages
- 5.3. the high school they graduated from
- 5.4. the lesson hours they take a week
- 5.5. GPAs
- 5.6. their reasons to choose ELT Department
- 5.7. their opinion about the suitability of the ELT Department
- 5.8. their teaching experience

6. Is there a relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their level of student burnout?

Are there any relationships between the levels of ELT students' burnout and ...

- 6.1. their genders
- 6.2. their ages
- 6.3. the high school they graduated from
- 6.4. the lesson hours they take a week
- 6.5. GPAs
- 6.6. their reasons to choose ELT Department
- 6.7. their opinion about the suitability of the ELT Department
- 6.8. their teaching experience

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

Individuals' initial motivations for starting a new profession or an education are a determining factor in their future endeavors in that field. Hence, it would be essential to investigate the motivations of ELT students for choosing this department. Because with this study, a more in-depth vision to the inner worlds of the ELT students could be gained. Besides, when the lack of studies which focus on motivations of ELT students for choosing this profession was taken into account (Hayes, 2008), a study combining both motivations to choose teaching profession and student burnout would be much beneficial.

In addition to the motivations of individuals to choose a certain profession, the emotions they experience, psychological processes they have gone through and physical facilities they are given throughout their education are considered to be of importance in the perspectives of individuals towards their profession, which will be an almost-life-long value of their lives (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). However, even the fresh members of a profession may have some burnout issues before they start their job. An enormous number of studies have been conducted upon burnout (Freudenberger, 1974; Hu & Schaufeli, 2009; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 2001; Pines, 1993; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005). Yet, the term student burnout still holds its warmth and continues to be a hot topic which requires research. When the literature on student burnout is reviewed, there appears to be lots of studies in different contexts (Baş & Yıldırım, 2012; Cushman & West, 2006; Lingard, Yip, Rowlinson, & Kvan, 2007; McCarthy, Pretty, & Catano, 1990; Morgan & de Bruin, 2010; Schaufeli, Martinez, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002; Weckwerth & Flynn, 2006; Yang & Farn, 2005; Yıldırım & Ergene, 2003). However, to the knowledge of the researcher, it seems that there are only a few quantitative studies focusing only on student burnout in ELT department (Dirghangi, 2019; Hue & Lau, 2015; Igbokwe et al., 2019). Therefore, there is a need to shed light on ELT students' burnout levels and conduct a mixed-method study on students' burnout levels for more comprehensive results.

Another significance of the current study is that even though there are some studies investigating certain demographic features and their relationship with motivations for choosing a career and student burnout, the present study focuses on different demographic features which have not been investigated before and together with both career motivations and student burnout. To give some sound examples, there are some studies which focus on the relationships between grade, gender, age, GPA and motivations (Erten, 2014; Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Manuel & Hughes, 2006; Rots, Aelterman, & Devos, 2013; Sinclair, Dowson, & McInerney, 2006; Subaşı, 2010). However, there have not been encountered any study investigating the relationships between graduated high school types, weekly lesson hours, thereasons for choosing a department, suitability perspective towards the chosen department, and teaching experience among pre-service teachers, and motivations for choosing teaching career. Moreover, there have been found some studies which investigate the relationships between grade, gender, age, weekly lesson hours, GPA, teaching experience and student burnout (Abouserie, 1994; Bobek, 2010; Bozgün & Akın Kösterelioğlu, 2018; Bush, 1969; Gold, 2012; Hancock, 1999; Jacobs & Dodd, 2003; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Morgan & de Bruin, 2010; Santen, Holt, Kemp, & Hemphill, 2010;

Sumpter, 1995; Willcock, Daly, Tennant, & Allard, 2004). Nevertheless, there have not been found any studies focusing on the relationships between graduated high school types, reasons for choosing a department, suitability perspective towards the chosen department and student burnout. Hence, this study was expected to contribute to the literature by focusing on these relationships between the uninvestigated demographic features and both motivations for choosing the ELT department and student burnout.

Lastly, there were some studies investigating the relationship between motivations for choosing teaching as a career (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Goddard & O'Brien, 2007; König & Rothland, 2012; McLean et al., 2019). However, these researchers suggest future studies focusing on pre-service teachers' experiences and their perspectives about the reasons for burnout (McLean et al., 2019), and they requested future studies to confirm the results of the former studies (Goddard & O'Brien, 2007). Moreover, the aforementioned studies focused on the teachers in general, and the researcher has not encountered any study aiming to find out the relationship between motivations for choosing the ELT department and student burnout. By investigating the gap between these variables, this study aimed to contribute to the growing literature in pre-service English teacher education.

To sum up, there are still gaps in the studies conducted on ELT students. These gaps are the motivations of these students for choosing this department and these students' levels of burnout, more specifically, the relationships between certain demographic features and both motivations for ELT department and student burnout. To fill these gaps a study investigating these features is a need and this study has the aim to meet this need and shed light on the aforementioned variables and relationships for contributing to the ELT field. Moreover, this study may hopefully become a guide to the individuals who want to choose ELT major for their career preparation and raise a degree of awareness about student burnout. Hence, this study is important in the sense that it will provide information and insight about these aforementioned issues.

#### **1.4. Limitations of the Study**

The researcher had to go to two cities which are different from the city where the researcher lived and had to reach as many participants as possible in these cities. Therefore, the researcher had to count on his own network, the lecturers and professors who were willing to help. Thus, several limitations may be observed in this study despite all the invaluable efforts of the lecturers and professors in both universities.



The first limitation of the study could be the length of the data collection tool which was 8-page-long including the cover page. The reason for the data collection tool to be so long was that the font of the questions and items were really big enough for the participating students to see the items and read them clearly. The aim here was to make it easier to read and increase the reliability and validity of the tool. Moreover, the Written Interview Protocol (WIP) part covered two pages because the researcher wanted to give a large space for the participating students to write their views freely and comfortably. This way more information was gathered via the WIP. However, these features of the data collection tool may have made it seem too long for the participating students to fill. On the contrary, a great deal of participating students filled the data collection tool since the students were encouraged with some little gifts, data gatherers' positive attitudes and some additional points on their courses which were given by one of the lecturers. However, the additional points might have created some negative impact since social desirability or the desire to please the class teacher can be another problem in the answers given in the instruments, which is another limitation of the study.

The data were gathered from only two universities of different regions in Turkey. In this regard, the results of the study may not reflect the whole universe, that is, the findings may not be generalized to other settings due to context-bound differences. As a conclusion, a study which investigates several universities from different regions of Turkey or even from different countries would be contributory.

Another limitation of this study was the sampling method. The sample of the study was gathered through convenience sampling method as the researcher's network, opportunities and time was limited. Thus, the sample of the study was chosen among the most accessible population (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Hence, a study with a larger sample gathered with random sampling methods and from a larger accessible population would give more generalizable results and conclusions (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Another limitation of this study was the way the data were gathered. Only a survey and a WIP were used in this study to gather data from the participants. To develop a more reliable and valid data collection way, observations forms or teacher/student diaries could have been used. Further, the views of teacher educators could have been consulted. Also, data were gathered synchronically and there was no intervention in the data gathering process. Therefore, this study lacks the features of a longitudinal study or an experimental study. Hence, a study including these features would have a stronger impact on the context.

The last limitation can be regarded as the +10 points given by one of the lecturers to 146 participants. These points were not promised to the other participants because the lecturer who gave these points granted these points with her own initiative while the others did not. Since there are social desirability issues, the participants may have answered the items in a specific way. So, they may have displayed more favorable attitudes while giving answers in their written responses. These might have created some negative impact since social desirability or the desire to please the class teacher can be another problem in the answers given in the instruments. In addition to the adverse effects of the social desirability issues, the other students who did not get any additional points to their course scores could have been less motivated to fill in the survey if they heard this detail from the participants from the other classes.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the theoretical knowledge about motivations for choosing the ELT department and student burnout in the relevant literature. Firstly, the theoretical background of the motivations for choosing the ELT department will be presented both in general terms and in Turkish context. Next, the theoretical knowledge regarding the burnout including burnout in general terms, teacher burnout and student burnout will be presented. Finally, relevant studies about student burnout in Turkey will be given.

### **2.1 Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers' Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career**

Career choice is one of the most essential parts of the human life since it could determine the course of the rest of a person's life, a country's fate or the future of the world. In this regard, teachers have the role of determining the future of their students, country and the world (Chuan & Atputhasamy, 2001). Therefore, their motivations for choosing teaching as a career constitutes an important point in a nation's and the world's future since teachers are the gardeners who can grow hundreds and thousands of flowers in educational gardens (Su, Hawkins, Huang, & Zhao, 2001). If a gardener is motivated enough, there will be thousands of beautiful flowers who absorb carbon dioxide and provide oxygen for the living creatures. If that gardener does not like the flowers or gardening, the flowers will not amaze the neighbors with their beauty or will not even bloom. More specifically, teachers are bridge makers who constructs the connection between the former and the future generations. Therefore, their motivations are of much importance since the fate of the next generation, their country and the world is in their hands. A teacher with no reasons to become a teacher cannot be expected to motivate and prepare his or her students for the life ahead of them.

When people are choosing a career, they wonder if they can be successful in a career, or whether this career will meet their needs and expectations (Harms & Knobloch, 2005). Their career choice decision is also influenced by information they collect from the environment (Butler & Shibaz, 2008). There are different suggestions on the definition of the career choices from different researchers. For instance, Maslow (1954) claimed that individuals choose a profession for initially meeting their unmet and lower-level needs, then they try to meet the higher-level needs in Maslow's needs theory. This leads them to enter a career in which they have the experience of meeting the higher-level needs. According to Bandura (1997), people choose a profession when they think that they can be successful in

that profession in self-efficacy theory which states that as individuals' belief in their self-efficacy increases, they tend to become more interested in their career options and show a better performance at their educational lives. On career choice, Bass (1985), on the other hand, focused on the leadership behavior which motivates leaders and followers. This happens by three possible ways which are raising the followers' consciousness level about the specified and idealized goals, transcending the followers' self-interest into the teams' interests, and leading followers to their higher-level needs.

Although teaching has its rewards, it is definitely a difficult profession because of the low financial profit, heavy work load, others' perception of monotonous life and work of a teacher, students' attitude towards the teacher, which may refrain the people who consider teaching as a career path or make teachers drop out their profession (Barmby, 2006; Brownell, Smith, McNellis, & Lenk, 1995). In spite of these issues with teaching profession, people somehow choose this profession. The literature suggests various reasons for choosing teaching profession such as the desire to work with young students, status of a teacher in the society, desire to help one's country or other people, the thought that it is easy to enroll in teacher education programs, intellectual reasons, families', acquaintances' or teachers' guidance or influence, satisfaction from interactions with people, and the opportunity for life-long learning (Sinclair et al., 2006; Subaşı, 2010; Watt & Richardson, 2008).

The important categorizations for the motivations for choosing teaching profession were made by several researchers. Huberman (1993), for example, classified the motivations to choose teaching into three categories namely active, passive and material, each including different sub-categories. Active motivations included sub categories such as contact with young learners, affection towards a certain subject while the passive ones were about the obligation to choose the department and the inability to leave it for some reasons. Material motivations consisted of sub-categories such as becoming financially independent, good working conditions, job security. Barmby (2006), on the other hand, categorized the motivations of pre-service teachers as altruistic reasons which regard teaching as an important job, desire to help young learners and society improve; intrinsic reasons consisting of the activities in the profession which can be exemplified with the activity of teaching young learners and the interest and expertise in subject matter; and extrinsic reasons covering the aspects such as long holidays, level of pay and status in a society. Similar to Barmby's study, Warin, Maddock, Pell and Hargreaves (2006) stated the reasons for choosing teaching profession by pre-service teachers as extrinsic rewards which cover financial income, holidays, status and prestige in the society and intrinsic rewards including love for young

learners, enjoyment for interaction with people and interest in the subject matter. The research on this area shows that the reasons for career choices of the teachers differ from each other and it was stated that there is a need for a sound theory related to the pre-service teachers' reasons for choosing teaching profession.

## **2.2 Studies on Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers' Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career**

Numerous studies have been conducted on teachers' motivations for choosing this profession. These studies broadened our knowledge about these motivations. The studies focusing on teacher motivations tried to explore the motivations of pre-service teachers to become teachers. For example, Brown (1992), as an earlier study, aimed firstly to order the 108 Jamaican pre-service teachers' reasons for choosing to teach. Secondly, she compared these orders of reasons for teaching with those of 170 Eastern Caribbean pre-service teachers'. Her last aim was to examine how these motivations can be implemented in teacher education programs. She found that the first reason for becoming a teacher was the love and desire to help children, the second was to improve the society and the third one was lack of available jobs. Moreover, she suggested that new courses such as how to teach young learners or methods about how to deal with teenagers' discipline problems whose syllabus was determined by students can be formed.

In another study by King (1993), 41 African American, Caribbean American and African in-service teachers' reasons for choosing the teaching profession were examined. The reasons were found to be from the most popular to the least as follows: working with young learners, perspective of suitability for teaching, for helping to improve the society, freedom for creativity, helping students from different backgrounds and with various needs, intellectual challenge provided by teaching, and desirable time for vacations. Contrarily, the least popular motivations were found to be the status of teachers, the need for teachers, good salary and acquaintances that guide them for teaching profession. At the end of the study, renovations on the teacher education programs such as courses and programs to encourage the candidate teachers to become teachers and sending social workers to persuade these candidates to become teachers to the colleges; and renovations on the syllabus such as collaboration with community organizations and activities which can provide the teachers with experiences and lives of their students were suggested.

There were also some studies examining pre-service English language teachers' motivations for becoming an English teacher. One of these studies belongs to Kyriacou and

Kobori (1998) whose aim was to explore the motivations of the 226 English as a foreign language (EFL) learners who want to become teachers of English and 95 pre-service English language teachers from two different universities in Slovenia. The results showed that global language feature of English, the importance of a foreign language in professions, English for further education were the most frequent motivations for choosing the ELT department among the EFL learners. Further, the most frequent motivations for university students who wanted to become English teachers were enjoyment from the subject, importance of English worldwide, the will to help young learners and the varied work pattern of the job.

In another study focusing on pre-service teacher's point of departure for becoming teachers and their predictions about the meaning of these points, Younger, Brindley, Pedder and Hagger (2004) examined 36 secondary trainee teachers in their training year from different departments: English, mathematics and science. As a result of this study, the participants were found to think that teachers contribute to society and they have the motivation to be a role model for their students. The pre-service teachers were also found to be strongly motivated and their major motivation was the affection towards the subject matter which is a moralistic motivation rather than a materialistic one.

Malmberg (2006) conducted two studies on Finnish pre-service teachers' professional motivations and their goal-orientation. In one of the studies, which was conducted on 230 participants from different departments of Abo University in Finland such as foreign language teaching, primary school teaching, and special education, it was found that mastery goals predict intrinsic motivations and intrinsic motivations predict university entrance score while achievement in secondary school predicts the goals related with performance, and performance goals predicts extrinsic motivations. In the second study, which was conducted on 114 pre-service students from the same university but different departments, it was found that intrinsic motivations determine goals for mastery and extrinsic motivations determine goals for performance and avoidance. It is concluded in the study that pre-service teachers' mastery goals facilitate professional motivations.

In another study, Hayes (2008) focused on exploring the motivation and conditions of seven Thai teachers who teach English. The results showed that all the participants were actively motivated and only two teachers had both active motivations and material motivations, which means that they love the subject matter and are confident in their ability to teach, and are affected by their acquaintances that teaching had job security at the same time. It was suggested at the end of the study that there is a need for further research about motivations and implementing these motivations in ELT contexts.

Watt et al. (2012) collected six previous studies and compared the results implied in these studies which were conducted with the usage of FIT-Choice scale, a scale that measures the factors leading the individuals who want to choose teaching. The first study was conducted in Turkey on 1577 freshmen from secondary, primary and early childhood strands, second on 257 American and 542 Chinese freshmen from secondary and elementary strands, third in Netherlands on 151 pre-service secondary teachers who were in a one-year degree program, fourth in Croatia on 374 freshmen from primary school teaching department of three universities, fifth on 1287 German pre-service teachers from different grades of elementary and secondary strands of five different universities, and sixth in Switzerland on 483 Vocational Education and Training teachers taking in-service teacher education. The findings of the first study showed that science-related (biology, chemistry, physics, medicine, science and technology, mathematics and information technology) pre-service teachers had a higher level of fallback career, a category in the FIT-Choice scale, which is a career chosen as a substitute career or a career chosen when the primary career choice is not reachable or achievable, and displayed lower teaching motivations than the pre-service teachers of other subjects such as social sciences, Turkish language and literature, geography, French language and English language. The second study demonstrated that the U.S. pre-service teachers had higher motivations in terms of social values, teaching abilities, intrinsic values, and previous teaching and learning experiences while the Chinese participants had higher level of fallback career. In the third study, it was found that social influences and teaching ability motivations were more important than the other motivations such as ability to teach, opportunity to work with children, previous teaching and learning experiences, and sparing time for their families. In the fourth study, it was found that personality traits predicted intrinsic motivations, extrinsic motivations predicted motivation for teaching ability, and interpersonal extrinsic motivations and agreeableness predicted social motivations. In the fifth one, intrinsic motivations were found to be positively correlated with general pedagogical knowledge while extrinsic motivations were negatively correlated with it. However, extrinsic motivations were positively correlated with positive effects on gains from learning while intrinsic ones did not. The last study showed that the participants who were not teachers before and wanted to leave their own job to become a teacher switched to teaching because teaching is socially meaningful, and has good working conditions.

In a recent study, Bergmark, Lundström, Manderstedt and Palo (2018) aimed to identify Swiss pre-service teachers' perspectives about teaching profession and motivations

for choosing teaching career. The participants were 259 Swiss pre-service teachers from primary school education, middle school education, and upper secondary school education departments. The results indicated that the pre-service teachers' perspectives about teaching profession and motivations for choosing teaching profession were closely related. In addition, their intrinsic and altruistic motivations were more frequent than the extrinsic motivations.

### **2.3 Studies on Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers' Motivations for Choosing Teaching as a Career in Turkey**

A person's career choice depends on personal and social experiences including experiences from childhood, personal and professional goals, the values a person believes, and the guidance of the family, acquaintances and the society since one's profession is seen as a part of a person's personal identity (Brown, 1992; Harms & Knobloch, 2005; Shively, 1992). As discussed in previous studies, understanding EFL pre-service teachers' concerns about their career choice are important because it is a well-known fact that every pre-service teacher brings into his/her teacher training program a personal teaching schema which refers to an individualized value system about teaching and learning (Boz & Boz, 2008). Therefore, a literature review will give more information for gaining a deeper understanding about the Turkish context of motivations for teaching career.

Several researchers conducted research on Turkish pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing teaching career. One of these studies is Boz and Boz's (2008) study in which they investigated 12 senior prospective chemistry and 26 fifth-grade pre-service prospective mathematics teachers' reasons for choosing teaching profession. They found that the primal reasons for these students' career choice were their love for teaching, positive influence and attitude of their teachers and love towards subject matter. In addition to these, some pre-service teachers stated that they chose this profession due to job satisfaction, teachers' contribution to society and obligation to choose teaching caused by the university entrance exam scores.

Subaşı (2010) developed a questionnaire for measuring the motivations of pre-service English language teachers. Before developing such a questionnaire, she examined the pre-service English language teachers' motivations for choosing the English language teaching (ELT) profession. The participants were 642 pre-service English language teachers from all grades at Anadolu University. She found in her study that the motivations of the pre-service teachers for choosing to teach were highly related with intrinsic reasons.



Moreover, it was found that the most frequent intrinsic motivations were talent, interest and challenge creativity. Altruistic reasons were also found to be popular among the participants with the betterment of society, improving educational system, and working with young learners. For extrinsic reasons the most popular category was found to be the advantages of speaking English.

Kılınç, Watt and Richardson (2012) conducted a research study on motivations and perceptions of 1577 first-year candidate teachers from 23 different departments in Turkey. They discovered that altruistic social utility values and job security were the primary reasons for choosing teaching career. It was also found that science-related pre-service teachers whose subject areas were biology, chemistry, physics, medicine, science and technology, mathematics and information technology had lower motivations than the other first-year pre-service teachers from 17 different departments such as early childhood, social sciences, geography, English language or music, and the majority of them chose teaching profession as a result of their university entrance exams scores.

In another study, Yüce, Şahin, Koçer and Kana (2013) examined the career motivations of 283 freshmen and sophomore pre-service teachers of Turkish Language Teaching Department. They found that extrinsic and altruistic motivations were higher than the intrinsic ones. It was also found that females tended to have altruistic, intrinsic, and influence-based extrinsic motivations while males chose teaching profession with extrinsic and mercenary-based motivation and more females chose teaching career as their first career choice than males. Another finding from this study was that pre-service teachers desire a challenging, long-term, and fulfilling career.

In their study, Balyer and Özcan (2014) aimed to determine pre-service teachers' reasons for choosing teaching profession. They conducted this study with 1410 pre-service teachers from seven different universities in Turkey, four different grades and eight different departments namely Primary School Teaching, Science and Technology Teaching, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Pre-School Teaching, Social Sciences Teaching, Turkish Teaching, Religious Studies and Ethics Education, and Mathematics Teaching. They found out that most of the pre-service teachers from poor (1000 Turkish Liras and less: 29.7%, 1001-1500 Turkish Liras: 19.1%) and lower educated (fathers: 52.7%, mothers: 72.7%) families chose teaching profession. Also, the women preferred teaching profession for working with children, which is categorized as altruistic-intrinsic reasons while the men chose it for its salary, which is an extrinsic reason.

In a more recent study, Avcı Akçalı (2017) aimed to identify the motivations and self-efficacy beliefs of Turkish pre-service teachers of history in terms of both teaching profession in general and the history teaching profession specifically. The participants were 40 history teaching pre-service teachers from two different universities and seniors. It was found out in the study that the participants' self-efficacy beliefs and motivations for teaching history were higher than their motivations for choosing teaching profession and their generic self-efficacy beliefs. Another finding from this study was that there was a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and the participants' motivations for choosing teaching profession.

### **2.3 Burnout**

Individuals get a certain amount of training throughout the world for getting a job and strive for a good education and job. As mentioned in the previous parts, they have different reasons and motivations for choosing these professions. Yet, although they love their job and they have high interests in their job initially, they may lose some of these interests after some time and start to complain about their jobs and neglect their responsibilities over the course of their working span. The reason for this lack of interest and neglect may be burnout.

Burnout was described by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as “a syndrome consisting of emotional exhaustion, cynicism and personal inefficacy” which people mostly dealing with other humans suffer. Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) described burnout as “a persistent, negative, work-related state of mind in ‘normal individuals’ that is primarily characterized by exhaustion; a sense of reduced effectiveness, decreased motivation, and the development of dysfunctional attitudes and behaviors at work” (p. 36). According to Maslach et al. (2001), burnout is a sign of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced professional efficacy at work. It is also defined as “the feeling of being overwhelmed due to high demands and stressors” (Jacobs & Dodd, 2003, p. 299).

As described by Maslach and Jackson (1981), burnout has three different dimensions namely exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. They define exhaustion as exhausted feelings which are emotionally extended over a long time. Maslach et al. (2001) state that exhaustion is the most observable dimension of burnout and refers to feeling physically and emotionally consumed, and being overextended. Furthermore, cynicism or depersonalization is seen as the social context of burnout and refers to negative, senseless or distant feelings towards work (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). It shows up with development

of negative attitudes (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). An individual experiencing depersonalization can view other individuals as objects (Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996). Moreover, another dimension of the burnout, professional efficacy or reduced personal accomplishment is defined by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as an individual's tendency to perceive himself or herself in a negative way and be dissatisfied with his or her own success, which may cause a decline in the perception of personal accomplishment.

According to Freudenberger (1974), people tend to feel burned out when they idealize their work. Pines (1993) adds to this by explaining that high motivation and involvement in the initial state of a work may result in burnout and this burnout is often found among individuals with high motivation. People are more motivated for their jobs and devote their time and effort to their job more in the beginning (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). However, when they feel the effects of burnout, they tend to lose their excitement and idealism for their job and start to feel less interested in their works (Dworkin, Saha, & Hill, 2003).

Burnout is not a contemporary phenomenon because much literature dates back to the 1970s and in the former literature it was validated as a universal and timeless feature of the human condition although it was considered as a social phenomenon more than an academic subject in the beginning (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993; Maslach et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). The earlier scholarly articles appeared in Freudenberger (1974) and Maslach (1976, as cited in Maslach et al., 2001). In these articles, the concept of burnout was portrayed and demonstrated as a response to the working environment. After these earlier articles, in Freudenberger and Richelson (1980), Freudenberger expressed his exhaustion and burnout, and he realized that he was exposed to exhaustion, anger, feeling of guilt and depression caused by burnout. In this early period, another researcher, Maslach (1993) examined the emotional arousal individuals experience at work and the strategies they utilize to cope with this emotional arousal. It was found in this study that the arousal and strategies affect a person's identity and attitude. Thereby, Maslach is known as the banner-bearer of the social-psychological concept of burnout which focuses on the interpersonal, social and organizational factors causing burnout although the first individual to conceptualize the idea of burnout as a mental disorder was Freudenberger (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980; Schaufeli, 2003).

With the beginning of pragmatic and constructive studies on burnout, the empirical side of the burnout concept started to thrive in the 1980s and several instruments were developed in order to measure burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach &

Jackson, 1986) was one of the most remarkable instruments (Maslach et al., 2001; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). With the development of such an instrument, more discoveries in the concept of burnout were done and the relationship between people's thoughts and burnout were examined (Maslach et al., 2001; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). After these developments, researchers started to conduct studies in different professions or non-professions than the ones which were studied before. Therefore, another version of MBI emerged for these studies namely, the Maslach Burnout Inventory – Human Service Survey (MBI-HSS) (Maslach & Jackson, 1996), the Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey (MBI-ES) (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996), the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996), and the Maslach Burnout Inventory – Student Survey (MBI-SS) (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

## **2.4 Student Burnout**

As can be implied from the name of the MBI-ES, there have been done numerous research studies on teachers' or school personnel's burnout (Chang, Rand, & Strunk, 2000; Chambel & Curren, 2005; Farber & Miller, 1981; Fimian, Fastenau, Tashner, & Cross, 1989; Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Rudow, 1999; Smylie, 1999; Tatar & Horenczyk, 2003; Woodrum, 2005). However, a more recent branch of the burnout in professions is student burnout. In the aforementioned studies on teachers and school personnel, it was also stated that school environment, and the problems in this environment could affect students and as a result of these problems, they may experience burnout. In addition, according to Schaufeli and Taris (2005) and Hu and Schaufeli (2009), as students work in an organizational structure which requires certain compulsory activities to be performed, these activities can be considered as a job. This makes students an object of burnout and this type of burnout is called student burnout (Meier & Schmeck, 1985).

Student burnout is defined as a syndrome which occurs among students and is caused by exhaustion as a result of study demands, cynical attitude towards a student's major or studies, and the thought of not being sufficient for studies (Meier & Schmeck, 1985; Schaufeli et al., 2002). As students have certain duties and responsibilities to carry out, being a student can be considered a profession. Further, they are usually expected to attain high scores in the course of their educational life and study constantly in order to achieve these high scores in the tests they try to pass. They are also reminded that they are expected to be successful and they have to study by their teachers and families (Yıldırım & Ergene, 2003). Under these pressures and extreme demands, it would not be difficult to anticipate that they

may experience burnout. Therefore, they may tend to have reduced motivation towards courses, not want to attend classes and even drop out of school (McCarthy et al., 1990; Yang & Farn, 2005).

Student burnout is also a case for the university students and they may refer their years at university as a period of stress (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981). The reasons for burnout in university students may differ from each other. Therefore, several research studies were conducted to explore these reasons (Cushman & West, 2006; Dyrbye, Thomas, & Shanafelt, 2005; Moffat, McConnachie, Ross, & Morrison, 2004; Pines et al., 1981; Weckwerth & Flynn, 2006). Different reasons were found by these researchers namely, friendship issues, academic workload, academic pressure, difficulty of adapting to a new educational environment, monetary problems, rivalry among peers, love affairs, problems caused by school management, and trouble managing time.

## **2.5 Studies on Student Burnout**

The reasons for student burnout were summarized in the previous part. As student burnout is a phenomenon which cannot be neglected, many researchers conducted studies on different students from different contexts. In this section, some of these related studies will be summarized.

In an earlier study on student burnout, Fimian et al. (1989) presented a cross-validation of the Student Stress Inventory (SSI) and MBI. They conducted this study on 311 gifted and talented students. They found that stress and burnout are in relation with each other for these students. Moreover, the findings showed that stress and burnout are also related to mental, physical and emotional exhaustion experienced in the classroom environment. In addition, it was found out that high tedium levels and low school quality may lead to a greater risk of classroom stress and then, student burnout.

In another study, McCarthy et al. (1990) examined whether psychological sense of community was a reason for student burnout. They conducted the study on 360 undergraduate university students and utilized different measures such as the Sense of Community Index, the Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Meier Burnout Assessment. The findings demonstrated that as the sense of community increases, experience of burnout decreases. It was also found that there is a relationship between the participants' grade point averages (GPA) and burnout levels. However, there was not any implication about whether burnout causes low academic success or low academic success predicts burnout. On the other hand, it was explained that burnout causes students to dropout their education.

In another study, Abouserie (1994) investigated the sources and levels of stress and their relationship with the locus of control and self-esteem. The participants were sophomores. The findings indicated that examination and its results were the strongest cause for the student's stress, and the other stressor was found to be studying for exams. It was also found that in academic and life stress, females were more stressed than males. Another result of the study was that students who have external beliefs are more vulnerable to stress than the ones who have internal beliefs.

Jacobs and Dodd (2003) aimed to explore the relationship between personality and social support, and burnout, and they examined the workload as a factor of burnout. The participants of this study were undergraduate university students who took at least one psychology course before. The findings suggested that personality strongly predicted burnout. Negative temperament caused burnout while positive temperament was positively correlated with professional efficacy. On the other hand, disinhibition was found to fail to predict burnout which was not supported by the former study by Huebner and Mills (1994) in which disinhibition predicted burnout. Besides, social support was found to be related to lower chance of burnout. Another finding from this study was that the perceived workload of a student was related to burnout while objective workload was not. Moreover, extracurricular activities were found to be helpful for avoiding or getting over student burnout. Another interesting finding from this study was that as the students' GPA increased, their exhaustion level decreased.

Moffat et al. (2004) investigated the prevalence of psychological disorders, sources of stress and mechanism to cope these factors. The study was conducted on freshmen medical students. It was found that there was a relationship between stressors and medical training rather than personal problems. It was also found that if students get enough feedback and guidance, and learning resources were provided, student stress may reduce. The findings also showed that educational and pastoral intervention in terms of strategies to cope with stress can be beneficial for reducing the students' stress levels.

Another study on medical students was conducted by Dyrbye et al. (2005). They reviewed the manifestations and causes of student's distress and its adverse personal and professional results. The findings of the revision showed that students' distress could cause impaired academic performance, cynicism, academic dishonesty, substance abuse, and even suicide. They also suggested some ideas to medical schools and medical educators for reducing student distress such as creating a nurturing learning environment, identifying and

assisting struggling students, teaching skills for stress management and promoting self-awareness, and helping students promote personal health.

Cushman and West (2006) examined the precipitators of student burnout and aimed to shed light on the communication behaviors precipitating or promoting stress and burnout in students. The participants in this study were 354 university students who took the introductory communication course consisting of cross-section of majors from different departments and all grades. They found out that students consider stress as a natural part of being in school and teachers are one of the factors of student burnout. They also made some suggestions for decreasing potential student burnout. They suggested instructors to check the students periodically if they have the symptoms of burnout.

In another study, Li, Song and Guo (2009) aimed to examine the relationship between undergraduate students' learning burnout and social support as well as locus of control and adolescent stressors. They utilized different types of data collection instruments such as Learning Burnout Inventory, Social Support Evaluation Inventory, Locus of Control Inventory, and Academic Stressors Inventory and applied these to 260 randomly-selected university students. The findings showed that there is a correlation between social support, locus of control and academic stressors and learning burnout. It was found that as social support increased, the burnout decreased, and as locus of control and academic stress increased, burnout increased. Other findings were that academic stress affects learning burnout directly and locus of control indirectly. Therefore, locus of control was found to be a mediator between academic stressors and learning burnout.

In a study conducted in 2011, Parker and Salmela-Aro compared and contrasted four theoretical frameworks by Golembiewski (1989), Leiter (1989), Lee and Ashforth (1993), and Taris, Le Blanc, Schaufeli and Schreurs (2005) in terms of school burnout. They reached several results in that the findings demonstrated that school burnout is consistent over time and cynicism and exhaustion predicts feelings of insufficiency. Other results were that there were not found any longitudinal relationship between exhaustion and depersonalization.

Kim, Jee, Lee, An and Lee (2017) investigated relationships between social support and three dimensions of student burnout in their meta-analytic study. They examined 19 relevant studies and draw several conclusions in the related topic. They found that as the social support drops, student burnout level increases, and school and teacher support were found to be the strongest social support type which affects student burnout followed by the support from parents and peers. Moreover, social support was found to be related with professional efficacy more than exhaustion and cynicism.

In a more recent study, Paterka-Bonetta, Sindermann, Sha, Zhou and Montag (2019) examined the relationship between depression and Internet Use Disorder (IUD) and the relationship between burnout and IUD. The participants were 133 German and 133 Chinese college students from Ulm University in Germany and University of Electronic Science and Technology of China in Chengdu, China. The findings showed that Chinese students had higher burnout scores in MBI exhaustion and depersonalization, and IUD scores than the German students; however, their depression scores were lower. Further, there was found a positive correlation between burnout and IUD for all the participants, which means that as burnout scores increase, the IUD scores also increase. It was concluded in this study that there is a relationship between burnout and depression and IUD regardless of nation.

### **2.6 Studies on Student Burnout in Turkey**

In an earlier study on student burnout in Turkey, Gdk et al. (2005) aimed to evaluate the intern medical students' burnout and sociological features which may be related with each other. They utilized MBI and applied it to 276 intern medical students in a university in Ankara. The findings demonstrated that the medical students who could not be able to graduate from their faculty had high burnout score. Furthermore, the medical students who were content with their training in their last year were found to be less burned out than the ones who were not satisfied with it. They also suggested to improve the training in the last year and working conditions.

In another study by Balkıs, Duru, Buluř and Duru (2011), prevalence of burnout among pre-service teachers, their demographic features and academic success were investigated. The participants were 487 undergraduate students from different departments of Education Faculty at Pamukkale University. MBI-SS was utilized in this study. 17% of the pre-service teachers were found to have a high burnout level while 60.4% were found to have a moderate level of burnout. In addition, male pre-service teachers were found to have a higher burnout level than the female pre-service teachers. Besides, it was found that freshmen and sophomores had lower level of burnout than the juniors and seniors. Another finding from this study was that as students' burnout levels increased, their academic success decreased. As a summary of this study, it was stated that pre-service teachers who had a higher level of burnout were found to be the ones who were male, sophomore or junior and had low academic success.

In another study, apri, zkendir, zkurt and Karakuř (2012) examined the relationship between university students' self-efficacy beliefs, life satisfaction and burnout



levels. The participants were 354 undergraduate university students from different departments at Mersin University and they filled Life Satisfaction Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale and MBI-SS. A relationship was found between life satisfaction and student burnout, which points out that as life satisfaction increases, burnout decreases.

In his study, Balkıs (2013) investigated the relationship between students' academic procrastination, academic success and burnout. He applied MBI-SS and Aitken Procrastination Inventory to 323 undergraduate university students from different departments of Education Faculty at Pamukkale University such as psychological counseling and guidance, science education, early childhood education, elementary education, and social studies education. The findings showed that as academic procrastination goes higher, all dimensions of the student burnout go higher. In addition, academic procrastination predicted all the dimensions of student burnout. Another finding from the study was that the more students have academic success the lower academic procrastination and burnout they have.

In her thesis, Erakman (2015) investigated English preparatory program students' burnout levels, relationship between the dimensions of burnout and the common metaphors used by Turkish EFL students to define burnout during their education in preparatory program. The participants were 54 Turkish EFL students at intermediate level. The results indicated that the participants had high levels of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and low level of professional efficacy. Moreover, it was found out that cynicism level increased as the level of emotional exhaustion increased; yet, a relationship was not found between cynicism and professional efficacy. The metaphors collected from the participants such as fruits, sports, season and meals, which were used to define English language and lessons, were also found to support the burnout levels of the participants.

In a recent study, Bozgün and Akin Kösterelioğlu (2018) aimed to determine if pre-service teachers' anxiety towards finding a job can predict burnout. The participants were 350 pre-service teachers from Amasya University and they were applied MBI-SS and Occupational Anxiety Scale for Teacher Candidates. The results showed that the participants had moderate burnout and occupational anxiety levels. Moreover, no significant relationship was found between gender, age, and family income and burnout and occupational anxiety. Another finding was that the participants' occupational anxiety predicted the participants' burnout levels.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this part of the thesis, information about the research design, the setting and the participants, data collection tools and data analysis procedure of the study will be mentioned.

### 3.1. Research Design

This study aims to find the most frequently occurring motivations for ELT students to choose an ELT program, differences among the grades of ELT students in terms of their motivations for choosing the ELT major and student burnout levels, relationship between the motivations and the student burnout levels and the relationship between demographic characteristics, motivations and student burnout. A survey including a questionnaire which gathers data about motivations of ELT student for choosing English teaching profession (QoM, see Appendix 1), Maslach's Burnout Inventory – Student Survey (MBI-SS, see Appendix 1) which is a scale that evaluates the burnout level of the students and a Written Interview Protocol (WIP, see Appendix 1) which has qualitative questions about motivations and burnout of the students were used in order to conduct this study, and find answers to the research questions mentioned above. The study has an explanatory research design (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003; Dörnyei, 2007) aiming to describe the current state of ELT students' motivations for choosing ELT department and English teaching profession and the burnout levels of these students, and proceeds with the explanations for the reasons of this burnout. Besides, this study is a concurrent mixed-method study (Creswell et al., 2003; Dörnyei, 2007) as quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed in order to take advantage of triangulation and get more reliable conclusions.

The population of this study includes ELT students of all grades from two different universities in two different regions of Turkey. The sample of the study was gathered via convenience sampling in two metropolitan cities in Turkey. The survey mentioned above was applied to the participants from different universities, cities and grades. The reason for choosing two different universities from different regions was to increase the generalizability of the results. All grades of students from freshmen to seniors were included in the study since the aim was to make the changes visible from grade to grade in terms of motivations and burnout levels.

When the participants were found with the help of lecturers and convinced to participate in the study, they were given a survey including QoM, MBI-SS and WIP. All of

the participating pre-service English teachers have signed the cover page of the survey in order to show that they were willing to participate in the study and they were informed about the aim of the study. Then, the participants were first asked to fill in the QoM, a quantitative data collection tool. Next, the participants were requested to fill in another quantitative data collection tool, MBI-SS. After the QoM and MBI-SS were implemented, the participating ELT students were given a written interview form (WIP) which consists of questions about their motivations for choosing English language teaching profession and their possible student burnout. This structured qualitative data collection tool was developed in light of a study related to student burnout and motivations (Erakman, 2015; Subaşı, 2010) and it was revised by the researcher's mentor and the researcher. The language of the survey was English because of the linguistic proficiency of the participants. Moreover, the original languages of the data collection tools were English and the researcher did not prefer to decrease the reliability of these tools by translating them into Turkish.

The quantitative data from QoM and MBI-SS were analyzed via Statistical Program for Social Sciences 22 (SPSS 22) with frequency tables and percentage tables while the qualitative data were analyzed with summative content analysis method (Creswell et al., 2003; Creswell, 2007). The results of the QoM and MBI-SS were compared to see the difference between diverse groups of participants. With the guidance of the gathered data, English language teacher training system and current state of the ELT students in this system were analyzed. Furthermore, several suggestions were given in order to update and improve the English language teaching system and its input and output, students.

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods were combined to make more generalizable implications and to gain a more in-depth insight on this topic. As a result, the study takes the advantage of methodological triangulation mixing both the numerical and non-numerical data (Creswell et al., 2003). These procedures were applied because the aim of the researcher was to make numbers prove the validity and reliability of the words and words vice versa. For instance, the tables of motivations or burnout levels which will be given in the next chapters will be followed by the answers given to the questions in WIP to support the tables and these data will be exemplified with the help of comments written by the participants in the WIP followed by the frequency and percentage tables about the participant comments. This way, the numerical data and non-numerical data will support and witness each other.

The process of the study started in the beginning of October, 2019 and it took nine months to finish, so the process ended at the end of May, 2020. Further information regarding

the time and setting of the study will be given in the Data Collection Procedure and Process section.

### 3.2. Universe and Participants

The universe of the study comprises ELT students in Turkey. The sample of the study was taken among freshman, sophomore, junior and senior ELT students from two different universities in Turkey, namely Anadolu University, which is well-known, highly-preferred and successful, and Pamukkale University, which is a promising and gradually developing university (University Ranking by Academic Performance [URAP], 2019). In the next section, the demographic features of participants such as universities, grades, genders, ages, graduated high school types, weekly lesson hours, GPAs, reasons for choosing the ELT department, suitability perspectives, teaching experience and duration of teaching experience will be presented. The following tables demonstrate the valid data gathered for each demographic feature. Further, if any missing or controversial data were detected, the information and explanation regarding these data were presented under the related tables.

Table 3.1. *Participants' Universities*

University	Frequency	Percent
Anadolu University	189	40.2
Pamukkale University	281	59.8
Total	470	100

Table 3.1 demonstrates the distribution of the participants' universities. The participants were gathered from Anadolu University and Pamukkale University. The number of participants from Anadolu University was 189 (40.2%) while there were 281 (59.8%) participating students from Pamukkale University.

Table 3.2. *Participants' Grades*

Grade	Frequency	Percent
Freshmen	157	33.4
Sophomores	107	22.8
Juniors	115	24.5
Seniors	91	19.4
Total	470	100

Table 3.2 shows the distribution among the grades of the participants. There were 470 participants in total and 157 (33.4%) of them were freshmen, 107 (22.8%) were sophomores, 115 (24.5%) were juniors, and the number of the seniors were 91 (19.4%).

Table 3.3. *Participants' Genders*

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	295	62.8
Male	172	36.6
Total	470	100

The gender distribution of the participants is shown in Table 3.3. Out of 470 valid participants, 295 (62.8%) participants were female while 172 (36.6%) of them were male. It is seen that females constitute the majority among all the participants.

Table 3.4. *Participants' Ages*

Age	Frequency	Percent
17-18	80	17.1
19-20	205	43.8
21-22	134	28.6
23-24	24	5.1
25-26	10	2.1
27+	15	3.2
Total	468	100

Table 3.4 demonstrates the age distribution of the participants. 80 (17.0%) were between 17-18, 205 (43.6%) were 19-20 and 134 (28.6%) were 21-22 while the participants of 23-24 age group were 24 (5.1%), 25-26 were 10 (2.1%) and the participants aged 27 and above were 15 (3.2%). It can be said that the majority of the participants were aged between 17 and 22. Moreover, 19-20 age group forms the majority of the age distribution (N: 205, 43.6%). As can be seen in Table 3.4, the total number of the participants is 468 for this frequency table. The reason for this is that two participants did not answer this question.

Table 3.5. *Participants' Graduated High School Types*

High School Type	Frequency	Percent
Anatolian High School	366	78.4
Anatolian Teacher Training High School	32	6.9
Anatolian Vocational High School	3	0.6
Vocational High School	26	5.6
Super High School	3	0.6
Other	37	7.9
Total	467	100

Table 3.5 demonstrates the distribution of graduated high school types of the participants. 366 (78.4%) participants graduated from Anatolian high schools, 32 (6.9%) graduated from Anatolian teacher training high schools, three (0.6%) from Anatolian vocational high schools, 26 (5.6%) from vocational high schools, three (0.6%) from super high schools. Thirty-seven (7.9%) participants graduated from other types of high schools

such as religious vocational high schools, open plan high schools, sciences high schools and social sciences high schools or high schools abroad. It is clear that the majority of the participants graduated from Anatolian high schools ( $n$ : 153, 81.4%). There were three missing answers among the participants for the graduated high school types.

Table 3.6. *Participants' Lesson Hours*

Lesson Hours	Frequency	Percent
0-10	36	7.8
11-20	260	56.3
21-30	148	32.0
31-40	15	3.2
41-45	3	0.6
Total	462	100

The frequency and the percentage of the participants' weekly lesson hours are given in Table 3.6. The majority of the participants take between 11 and 20 hours in a week with the frequency of 260 (56.3%). This majority is followed by 21-30 hours whose frequency is 148 (32.0%). Thirty-six (7.8%) of the participants take 0 to 10 hours of lesson in a week while 15 (3.2%) take 31-40 hours and three (0.6%) 41-45. Eight participants did not answer this question in the personal information form.

Table 3.7. *Participants' GPAs*

GPA	Frequency	Percent
No GPA	166	37.1
1.01-2.00	15	3.3
2.01-3.00	134	29.9
3.01-4.00	133	29.7
Total	448	100

Table 3.7 shows the frequency and the percentage of participants' grade point averages (GPAs). It is obvious from Table 3.7 that 166 (37.1%) of the students have no GPA which means they have not got their grades on their transcripts yet, so they are most probably the freshmen who have not got their transcripts for the first semester. The number of participants whose GPA is between 1.01 and 2.00 is 15 (3.3%). 134 (29.9%) participant's GPA was between 2.01 and 3.00 and the number of most successful students was 133 with the percentage of 29.7. As can be implied from Table 3.7, most of the participants have not got any GPAs yet. In Table 3.2, the number of the freshmen is 157 and in Table 3.7, the number of the participants with no GPA is 166. When this case is examined, it is noticed that eight freshmen did not answer this question in the personal information form probably thinking that this would mean to the researcher that they did not have any GPA yet.

Moreover, nine sophomores, six juniors and two seniors also marked no GPA box in the personal information form. The reason for this misconception might be because these participants did not want to mention their GPAs for this study, or because they have thought that this question asks about their GPA for the term in which the data collection tool was applied, or they were exchange students from other Turkish or foreign universities and not able to get their accreditation for their former education. There were also 22 missing answers. The reason for these missing answers might be because of the fact these participants had no GPA yet and preferred not to mark this question in the personal information form, or they did not notice the no GPA box.

*Table 3.8. Participants' Reasons for Choosing Teaching Career*

Reason	Frequency	Percent
I wanted to	393	84.3
My family wanted me to	26	5.6
Other	47	10.1
Total	466	100

Table 3.8 demonstrates the main reasons of participants for choosing ELT as their major. 393 (84.3%) of the participants chose ELT department because they wanted to choose it while 26 (5.6%) chose it because their family wanted them to choose it. Forty-seven (10.1%) chose it with other reasons (their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives, acquaintances, physical or emotional reasons) in their minds. For example, their university entrance exam points were enough for ELT department or ELT was the best options among the others, or their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives, and acquaintances directed them to this department, or they have other physical or emotional reasons leading them to this career. Four participants did not answer the related question in the personal information form.

*Table 3.9. Participants Suitability to ELT Department*

Suitability	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	15	3.2
Not suitable	15	3.2
Neither suitable nor not suitable	86	18.3
Suitable	240	51.2
Very suitable	113	24.1
Total	469	100

Participants' attitudes towards ELT department are demonstrated in Table 3.9. In this question, the participants were asked if they find ELT department suitable for themselves. 15 (3.2%) students answered not at all, 15 (3.2%) not suitable, 86 (18.3%) of them answered

neither suitable nor not suitable, 240 (51.2%) answered suitable and 113 (24.1%) very suitable. As a conclusion, a major part of the participants found ELT major suitable for themselves. One student did not answer the related question in the personal information form.

Table 3.10. *Participants' Teaching Experience*

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percent
Yes	231	49.4
No	237	50.6
Total	468	100

In Table 3.10, the frequency and the percentage of the answers given to the question *Have you ever taught English?* are demonstrated. As can be seen in Table 3.10, 231 (49.4%) ELT students out of 468 taught English for a certain time while 237 (50.6%) have not taught English at all. Two participants did not answer the related question. The length of the participants' experience will be given in the next table.

Table 3.11. *Participants' Teaching Experience Duration*

Time of Experience	Frequency	Percent
Said No	232	49.7
0-6 months	163	34.9
7-12 months	23	4.9
1-2 years	19	4.1
2-3 years	8	1.7
4-5 years	6	1.3
6+ years	16	3.4
Total	467	100

In Table 3.11, the teaching experience length of the participants is shown. The part of Said No has already been shown in the previous section as No and in this part, it means the participants who chose that option is considered unexperienced in teaching. Thus, if Said No is not mentioned in this part, it is seen that 163 (34.9%) participants had from zero to six months of experience in teaching. Twenty-three (4.9%) participants had 7-12 months of experience and there were 19 (4.1%) participants who had 1-2 years of teaching experience. There were eight (1.7%) participants with 2-3 years of experience, six (1.3%) with 4-5 years of experience being the least frequent, and 16 (3.4%) had more than six years of teaching experience. As it can be seen in the Table 3.11, most of the ELT students had no experience in teaching and the ones with experience had mostly 0-6 months of teaching experience. Three participants did not answer this question. An interesting point in Table 3.11 is that there are 232 participants who were reported to say No for the *Have you ever taught English?*



question. However, in Table 3.10, there are 237 participants who said No to this question. The reason for this inconsistency is caused by the fact that six participants both answered the *Have you ever taught English?* question as No and chose 0-6 months box in the last question.

### 3.3 Data Collection Tools

As mentioned shortly in the Research Design part, various data collection tools were used through the course of the study in order to benefit from the reliability and validity of the triangulation procedure. Therefore, three different data collection tools were utilized to find answers to eight different research questions and sub-questions.

First of all, the literary background was examined in hope of finding a reliable and valid data collection tool for gathering data about the motivations of the ELT students for choosing ELT as their major. After examining the relevant literature, a data collection tool with these characteristics was found. The referred data collection tool was a questionnaire, developed by Subaşı (2010), which gathers data about motivations of ELT students for choosing English teaching profession (QoM, see Appendix 1). The researcher contacted the creator of this data collection tool and asked her permission to use her questionnaire and use her help giving out the whole survey to the participants. Thankfully, she accepted the request.

The QoM was not enough itself for answering all the research questions. Thus, a data collection tool for gathering data about the burnout levels of the ELT students was also required. After a detailed search, a popular burnout inventory, Maslach Burnout Inventory – Student Survey (MBI-SS, see Appendix 1) whose original form was developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) was reached, and it was integrated into the survey that would be given to the participants. As a result of the reliability analysis on the collected data, Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.972 ( $n$ : 470) for QoM and 0.911 ( $n$ : 470) for MBI-SS.

The QoM and MBI-SS were only quantitative data collection tools and qualitative data were needed for numbers and words to witness each other. As a result, a Written Interview Protocol (WIP, see Appendix 1) was developed by the researcher with the help of his mentor and with some inspiration from Erakman's (2015) semi-structured qualitative data collection tool. With the addition of WIP, a survey was formed to be handed out to the participants. However, these data collection tools would still not be enough for answering all the research questions.

The research questions included some curiosity about the demographic features of the participants. For this reason, a personal information page was formed which is inspired

by the personal information form that Atmaca (2016) used before. As a conclusion, the data collection tool was almost prepared. Yet, it still needed a letter of consent and a cover page (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

At the end of the preparation process, an 8-page-long survey was formed. The survey included a cover page with a letter of consent which will be signed for voluntary participation. There was also information about the content and the context of the study and the researcher.

The second page of the survey consisted of some personal information questions which have been revealed in the Setting and Participants section. The participants were separated into various groups in terms of their grades, ages, GPAs and so on with the help of these questions. This part was meant to answer the last two research questions and their sub-questions.

After the personal information part, QoM was present covering three following pages of the survey. The reason for this questionnaire to cover these pages was the effort to make the inscription more readable and to increase the reliability of the data collection tool. In this part, the participants were given 85 statements such as *I can make the society I live in develop more easily since I know English* and were asked to choose an option between Strongly disagree to Strongly agree to demonstrate their agreement with the statement. These options were numbered from 1 to 5 referring respectively from strongly disagree to strongly agree. More clearly, among these anchors, 1 stood for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for neither agree nor disagree, 4 for agree and 5 for strongly agree. The aim of this questionnaire was to answer the first, second, third and partly sixth and seventh research questions.

The next part of the survey was the MBI-SS. This inventory included three categories, namely exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. The exhaustion section comprised five statements such as *I feel emotionally drained by my studies.* and *I feel burned out from my studies.* Cynicism section has four questions such as *I doubt the significance of my studies.* and the professional efficacy section included six questions such as *In my opinion, I am a good student.* which, as it is seen, focuses on the positive side of the participants, which was later reversed for providing convenience with the other negative dimensions before the data analyses. The participants were required to choose an option between 0 to 6. The numbers stood for the frequency of the emotions which the statements included. More clearly, number 0 meant never, 1 was for a few times per year, 2 for once a month, 3 for a few times a month, 4 once a week, 5 a few times per week and 6 stood for

every day. The aim of this inventory was to answer the fourth, fifth and partially sixth and eighth research questions.

The last part of the survey was the WIP. It included 10 questions which required free writing. This part covered two pages to allow the participants to write their thoughts freely without any borders and to increase the reliability and validity of the data collection tool. The structure and the questions of the WIP was inspired by the semi-structured interview prepared by Erakman (2015). Some of the questions were taken and adapted from this interview and the others were written according to the nature of the study and the data intended to be gathered. The aim of the written interview protocol was to support the quantitative data gathered from the participants who filled QoM and MBI-SS. This way a more reliable and valid results could be inferred from the whole study. The first question of this tool required the participants to write their top five reasons to choose ELT department and these answers were examined for emerging categories and themes. In addition, the answers given to the questions in the WIP were assorted under four different categories, namely positive, negative, ambivalent and irrelevant. Lastly, there were some questions which required short answers such as yes or no. These answers were categorized as yes, no and irrelevant. The important answers emerging from this tool were given as examples in the next chapter.

All of these questionnaires, inventories and interviews were gathered together in a single survey format. A survey including each of these individual data collection tools was formed. The survey was applied to the participants from two different universities. Information about the application procedure and process was mentioned in the next section.

### **3.4 Data Collection Procedures**

As mentioned in the previous section, a survey was formed with the integration of different types of data collection tools. This single survey was handed out to the participants from Anadolu University and Pamukkale University. The sample of the study, as aforementioned, was each grade of the ELT departments of these universities and the sample was gathered through convenience sampling (Creswell, 2003; Fraenkel et al., 2012).

To give out the surveys, the researcher contacted some of the lecturers in ELT departments of Anadolu and Pamukkale Universities and requested their help. The lecturers did not turn down the researcher and stated that they would help. The researcher first went to Pamukkale University on 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2019 to have a face-to-face conversation with the lecturers and his mentor for reaching the participants. Some of the surveys were delivered

to the lecturers who were contacted before and the researcher found some time to apply the survey to one of the groups who was composed of mostly freshmen. For the other survey applications, the researchers relied on the lecturers who are professionals and researchers in ELT field.

After, in metaphorical terms, the expedition to the Pamukkale University, the researcher went to Anadolu University with the purpose of conveying the surveys to the lecturers and with the help of the lecturers to the participants. Therefore, the researcher arrived in Eskişehir on 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2019. The reason for the relatively long time between these expeditions is that the researcher works at an institution with strict policies; thus, making it not easy to take off-days for the research. Anyways, the researcher reached the lecturers at Anadolu University and as appointed before handed the surveys to the lecturers who would deliver the surveys to the participants. Again, the researcher had to count on the lecturers at Anadolu University who are researchers and professionals in ELT field.

The time period for gathering the data was not determined randomly. It was determined according to the most effective time for the participants to give clear answers to the survey. Thus, the surveys were delivered after the participants' mid-term exams and before their final exams in the first semester. The reason for choosing this time period is that the freshmen just started their training at a university and they required some time to get accustomed to the mechanics of the university and educational life. Furthermore, the seniors just started their School Experience courses, which requires the candidate teachers to teach English in various schools. Hence, the aim here was to wait until they get a grasp of what is happening around them and what teaching really is. Another variable in the time of the study is that it was conducted in the first term of the year. It was conducted in the first semester because it was the time when the freshmen, their thoughts and their motivations were really fresh and they probably did not experience any adverse effects stemming from the educational and university life, which can affect their burnout levels. Additionally, the pre-service teachers were just beginning their journey into teaching in the first term of the year and they were newly facing the sophistication of the teaching profession. Moreover, the freshmen could have felt the relief of finishing their first semester, which could have lowered the effects of their student burnout levels if they had been requested to fill in the survey at the end of the semester. On the other hand, they would have taken both their mid-term exams and final exams, which could have increased their burnout levels more than only taking their mid-term exams. This way it would be easier to see the effects of the teaching on burnout in a fresh start in the profession.

The lecturers who were in charge of handing out the surveys were given a time period until the end of the first semester. They either handed out the surveys in a classroom time or give them for the participants to fill up at home / dormitory if they do not have time to allow for the participants to fill the surveys in the lesson time and have too much course schedule to complete. One of the lecturers preferred to give out the surveys online.

The process of handing out and collecting the surveys at Anadolu University and Pamukkale Universities ended in the beginning of the January, 2020. The reason for the data collection process to take so long is that the lecturers in both universities had hard time catching up with the course schedules and did not have enough time to give out and collect the surveys due to this reason. Moreover, they wanted to provide a plausible and free time and space for the participants to fill the surveys in order to raise the reliability.

When the process of survey application is over, the researcher went to both cities to collect all the surveys filled by the participants. The data collection process can be seen in Table 3.12. Next, the surveys were started to be analyzed. The analysis procedure and process of the data collected from the participants will be explained in the next section.

Table 3.12 *Data Collection Timeline*

<b>Event</b>	<b>Time</b>
Surveys were handed to the lecturers at Pamukkale University	22.11.2019
Surveys were handed to the lecturers at Anadolu University	05.12.2019
Filled surveys from Anadolu University were collected back	30.12.2019
Filled surveys from Pamukkale University were collected back	12.01.2020

### **3.5 Data Analysis Procedures**

Quantitative data were collected by applying QoM and MBI-SS, and the data were analyzed with the statistical procedures and with the help of SPSS 22. The researcher collected the qualitative data with a Written Interview Protocol (WIP), which is an example of structured interview (Creswell, 2007). It formed the qualitative side of the research. Therefore, this study has a concurrent mixed-method research design which takes the advantage of the combination of words and numbers triangulating the data to gather the results from various sources and make more reliable analyses with the collection of all the data collection tools as a single data collection tool (Creswell et al., 2003; Dörnyei, 2007).

As the study has a concurrent mixed-method research design, various means were utilized for analyzing numerical and textual data by integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis methods together (Nunan & Bailey, 2009). Furthermore, the relevant literature and

findings related to data analysis were examined in order to keep the important points in check and avoid irrelevant results. Both procedures and processes will be given under two titles.

### 3.5.1 Quantitative Data Analysis Procedures

The data were gathered from ELT students of two different universities in Turkey within a 2-month time period. The quantitative data from QoM and MBI-SS were analyzed via SPSS 22. The researcher required some help in order to analyze the data, so expert opinion was consulted to analyze the quantitative data from QoM and MBI-SS. Each research question requiring quantitative analysis was analyzed with a variety of different tools on SPSS 22.

Before the analysis of quantitative data, some transformations in the data needed to be done for further analysis. For example, for the analysis regarding the second research question, mean score of the all the items in the QoM was calculated, and for the analysis of the research questions related to student burnout, sums of each burnout category were calculated on SPSS 22. The related information on how these transformations were conducted will be presented in the next paragraph in detail. After these transformations, the distribution of the data was examined. The results regarding the skewness and kurtosis levels of the dependent variables are given in Table 3.13.

Table 3.13. *Skewness and Kurtosis Levels of the Dependent Variables*

Dependent Variables	N	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
MEANM	470	-1.079	0.113	2.918	0.225
SUMBE	469	-0.216	0.113	-0.838	0.225
SUMBC	468	0.379	0.113	-0.988	0.225
SUMBPE	469	0.668	0.113	0.577	0.229
Valid	468				

In Table 3.13, MEANM refers to the mean score of each participant's answers to QoM items. SUMBE, SUMBC and SUMBPE refers to the sum of each participant's answers to each category in MBI-SS, namely and respectively exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. The reason for the difference between the type of these variables (mean score and sum) is that the analysis of motivations for choosing ELT department required the mean scores of the items in the QoM while the analysis of student burnout levels required the sums of each category in the MBI-SS. The skewness level of the mean score of the motivations was found to be -1.079 and the kurtosis level was 2.918. The skewness level of the sum of the exhaustion category in MBI-SS was -0.216 and kurtosis was -0.838. For cynicism, the

skewness level was 0.379 and kurtosis was -0.988. For professional inefficacy category, the skewness level was 0.668 and kurtosis was 0.577. When these levels were scanned, the skewness levels for sums of exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy demonstrated normal distribution while skewness of the mean score of the motivation items deviated a little from normality (Bulmer, 1979). Yet, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the acceptable limits for the skewness were mentioned between +1.5 and -1.5 while the acceptable skewness range was suggested as between +2.0 and -2.0 by several researchers (Field, 2009; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014; Trochim & Donnelly, 2006). Moreover, little deviations from +1 and -1 range are not stated to produce substantively different results from the data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Thus, the mean scores of motivations and the sums of exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy were analyzed with parametric tests.

After the analysis of the normality in the distribution, the analysis for the first research question was done on SPSS 22. The first question was about the most frequent motivation for ELT students to choose ELT department. For the analysis of the data answering the first question, frequency tables for each item in the QoM were drawn on SPSS 22 by clicking analyze on the top tab, then descriptive statistic and finally frequencies. Each frequency table showed the number of agree-disagree answers for each item.

After the most frequent motivations were analyzed, the mean score of all the items in the QoM for each participant was calculated in order to take a step for the analysis for the second question. This was done with transform, compute variable and by typing the items on the screen with mean code on SPSS. The second question was related to the grades of the ELT students and their motivations. For the analysis related to this question, one-way ANOVA was applied to the mean score of the motivations. This was done by following analyze, compare means, one-way ANOVA on SPSS. A post hoc test including Tukey and Tukey's *b* assumptions was chosen in the menu.

The next question required one-way ANOVA test. The question was about the effect and level of burnout and grades of the ELT students. One-way ANOVA required the calculation of the sums of the MBI-SS categories on SPSS. These sums were calculated through a similar way with the process followed in the second question. The whole process was the same except for typing sum instead of mean on the screen. Then, the sum of the professional efficacy dimension was reversed for reaching the inefficacy scores, which would be in line with the other negative dimensions. Therefore, professional efficacy refers to participants' professional reduced efficacy levels in this study. Next, these sums were put

into one-way ANOVA test with the same settings as the ones used in the analysis for the second question.

For the fourth question, which is about the relationship between the motivations of the ELT students and their student burnout level, a Pearson's  $r$  correlation test was utilized. For the purpose of analyzing the data, the mean scores of the motivations calculated before and the sums of burnout level categories computed beforehand were analyzed in terms of correlations among each other. This was done by choosing the "analyze" menu on the top, then "correlate and bivariate" under the analyze menu on SPSS 22. Then, mean score of motivations and sums of each burnout category were added to the variables list in the window which comes after choosing bivariate and the analysis was done on SPSS 22.

The fifth question required an analysis of the demographics of the participants and their motivations for choosing ELT department. This analysis needed the application of one-way ANOVA with post hoc analysis including Tukey and Tukey's  $b$  alpha tests to the data gathered from the participants. This test was applied to mean score of the motivation items and the groups such as grade, age, graduated high school types, lesson hours, main reasons, suitability and so on were evaluated in terms of their motivations for choosing ELT department.

Lastly, the final question was related to the relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their burnout levels. A similar kind of analysis was applied to the data. Yet, this time, the concentration was on student burnout instead of student motivations for choosing ELT department. The rest of the test was the same for the analysis.

### **3.5.2 Qualitative Data Analysis Procedures**

The aim of the study was also to find out the motivations and burnout experiences of the ELT students. The WIP was utilized to gather qualitative data in the course of the study. For the analysis of the WIP, a summative content analysis was applied. Content analysis is a qualitative research method by which written texts are analyzed by counting particular words, phrases, or grammatical structures and classifying them into certain categories (Dörnyei, 2007; Fraenkel et al., 2012). In more general terms, it can be described as the systematic inspection of a certain data for discover patterns, themes, or biases (Leedy & Ormrod, 2014). In educational contexts, it can be utilized to analyze documents (Cohen & Manion, 1989). Thus, it can also be utilized to analyze interviews by coding and categorizing the themes emerging from these texts (Glaser & Strauss, 1980; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Summative approach to the qualitative content analysis requires the identification and



quantification of the content in a text in order to understand the underlying meaning of the analyzed content. Following the identification and quantification of the content, the words and keywords were counted for summative content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

For the analysis of the interview data gathered for this study, a taxonomy of the themes and categories emerging from the qualitative data was tried to be built depending on the participants' comments. Yet, the researcher moved back and forth because of the iterative nature of the analysis of the interview items. The comments made by the participants were analyzed by comparing the comments against each other to detect differences and similarities among these answers in case a new category or a new theme emerges due to repetitive nature of the textual data analysis. After all the qualitative data were analyzed, the existing categories and themes which emerged from the first analysis were revised one more time three weeks later for constructing the intra-rater reliability. Some keywords and themes underlying the participants' comments were extracted from the WIP and some comments were highlighted to be used later for the exemplification of the emerging themes in the thesis. The most related comments of the participants were presented as examples without any linguistic and grammatical correction for not distorting the nature of the data. The answers to each question were categorized according to the nature of the questions. These categorizations were formed for each answer of each participant. Then, the frequencies and percentages of the answers to every question were estimated and analyzed. The researcher did all the coding, categorization and interpretation processes on the emerging themes by himself. After these processes, expert opinion and feedback on the coding and categorization was gathered by consulting the researcher's mentor and a final shape to the coding, categorization and interpretation was given according to the expert opinion. The interviews were transcribed and coded manually, then through iterative reading, the connections between the codes were identified. The main emerging themes were further divided into categories. The results for these analyses will be given in the next chapter in a supporting role to the quantitative results.

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The findings reached after the analysis are given in this part. As the nature of the study required eight research questions to be answered, the answers to each question will be shown in this part under eight different categories for each question. Under each category, there will first be given the quantitative analysis results regarding the question examined in the data analysis process. For the presentation of mean differences, the abbreviation of mean difference, *md*, was used and for the presentation of significance levels, *p* letter was used. Besides, *r* in the 6<sup>th</sup> part stands for the Pearson's *r* value.

The findings from qualitative branch of the survey will be given to support the quantitative findings after the quantitative results are given. The results from the qualitative analysis will be given for and in accordance with the required data gathered from the WIP. Since each research question requires different questions or question combinations, supportive ideas and results from different questions in the WIP will be given after the quantitative results.

### 4.1 Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department

This section mentions about the results implied for the first research question. The first research question was *What is the most frequent motivation for the participant ELT students to choose ELT Department?* This question required the analysis of the data from both universities in general by melting them into one pot. The results regarding the first research question were gathered from the QoM and the first question of the WIP which asks the five most important reasons for choosing ELT Department. Further, for a better understanding, the results will be demonstrated in tables for visualization.

#### 4.1.1 Quantitative Analysis Results

Since the analysis of the motivations for choosing the ELT department requires too many detailed tables for each item in the QoM, the data were displayed in a more practical way. Thus, as the motivation items had five options to choose and this question requires the most frequent motivation among the ELT students to choose ELT department, only the total frequencies and percentages of the options *agree* and *strongly agree* together, and the number of the total valid answers will be given in the Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. *Quantitative Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department*

Item Number	Frequency	Percentage	Total Valid Answers
M1	325	69.1	470
M2	376	80.0	470
M3	371	79.1	469
M4	358	76.5	468
M5	351	75.4	466
M6	389	83.5	466
M7	346	73.6	467
M8	308	66.1	466
M9	396	84.6	468
M10	309	66.7	463
M11	354	75.5	469
M12	336	71.9	467
M13	394	83.8	470
M14	439	93.4	470
M15	389	83.5	466
M16	370	78.9	469
M17	428	91.3	469
M18	340	72.3	470
M19	361	76.8	470
M20	232	48.5	468
M21	322	70.5	457
M22	401	85.5	469
M23	441	88.1	470
M24	351	75.0	468
M25	341	73.1	467
M26	374	80.1	469
M27	394	84.0	469
M28	437	93.2	470
M29	419	89.2	470
M30	295	63.0	468
M31	446	95.1	469
M32	419	89.2	470
M33	425	92.4	460
M34	412	88.2	467
M35	428	91.1	470
M36	377	80.5	468
M37	376	80.4	468
M38	387	82.5	469
M39	300	63.9	470
M40	387	82.5	469
M41	375	79.8	470
M42	340	73.0	466
M43	388	83.1	467
M44	172	36.7	468
M45	409	87.7	466
M46	403	85.9	469
M47	413	88.4	467
M48	190	40.3	466
M49	413	88.2	468

(continued)

Table 4.1. *Quantitative Results for the Frequency of Motivations of the ELT Students for Choosing the ELT Department (continued)*

Item Number	Frequency	Percentage	Total Valid Answers
M50	372	79.4	468
M51	419	89.3	469
M52	234	49.9	469
M53	386	82.1	470
M54	415	89.4	464
M55	424	91.0	466
M56	422	91.1	463
M57	368	79.7	462
M58	378	80.7	468
M59	256	54.7	468
M60	430	91.9	468
M61	440	93.8	469
M62	379	81.3	466
M63	421	90.2	467
M64	248	53.1	467
M65	326	70.7	461
M66	366	78.4	467
M67	324	69.7	465
M68	435	95.0	458
M69	407	87.3	466
M70	375	79.9	469
M71	436	93.1	468
M72	425	90.6	469
M73	418	89.1	469
M74	408	86.8	470
M75	438	93.4	469
M76	334	71.4	468
M77	426	90.9	469
M78	303	65.1	465
M79	406	87.0	467
M80	441	94.2	468
M81	271	58.1	466
M82	437	93.8	466
M83	253	54.1	468
M84	403	86.1	468
M85	299	63.9	468

The frequencies and percentages of given answers for all the items in the QoM are demonstrated in Table 4.1. When examined carefully, it is seen that the most popular items for choosing the ELT Department were respectively, from the most popular to the fifth, M31, M68, M80, M61 and M82. 95.1% ( $n$ : 446) of the participants chose agree or strongly agree with the item M31, which is *English is an international language and is spoken everywhere*, 95% ( $n$ : 435) of the participants chose agree or strongly agree with the item M68, which is *Speaking English can provide me with other opportunities*, 94.2% ( $n$ : 441) of the participants chose the item M80 as agree or strongly agree, which is *I want to speak English like my*

native language, 93.8% ( $n$ : 440) checked agree or strongly agree for the item M61, which is *I would like to understand written or spoken texts in English on my own* and 93.8% ( $n$ : 437) agreed or strongly agreed with the item M82, which is *Our country needs a high number of well-educated English language teachers*.

It would give more in depth insight into these motivations to mention the least popular motivation for choosing ELT Department. The least agreed and strongly agreed item in the QoM was M44. 36.7% ( $n$ : 172) of the participants answered this item, which is *Since my childhood, I have always wanted to be an English teacher*, as agree or strongly agree.

#### 4.1.2 Qualitative Analysis Results

As the results show the most popular motivations for choosing ELT Department were mostly due to English being the lingua franca; social, financial or job opportunities; speaking English effectively; comprehension of English or idealistic purposes such as helping the country's future and next generation. This section will demonstrate the results gathered from the first question of WIP so that the differences or similarities between the results from both QoM and WIP can be compared. In the first question of the WIP, the participants were asked to write their five most important reasons for choosing the ELT Department. Moreover, they were required to write their most important motivation in the first place. Since the concern of first question was to find the frequency and percentage of the most popular motivations, analyzing only the first answer on this question was found to be more practical and beneficial with regard to the study. Therefore, a table demonstrating only the frequency and percentage of the answers, which were the most important reasons for choosing ELT Department according to the participants, was drawn to display the results.

Table 4.2. *Qualitative Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department*

Reason to Choose ELT Department	Frequency	Percentage
Interest in the language(s)	94	20.0
Personal ability / talent / characteristics /suitability for ELT	48	10.2
Interest in learning English / other languages	46	9.8
Job opportunities	32	6.8
Dream to learn or teach English / becoming an English teacher	31	6.6
Other people's influence	24	5.1
University entrance exam points	24	5.1
Interest in teaching	22	4.7
To learn and teach English	13	2.8
To learn English / improve language skills	12	2.6

(continued)

Table 4.2 *Qualitative Results for the Most Frequent Motivations for ELT Students to Choose ELT Department (continued)*

Reason to Choose ELT Department	Frequency	Percentage
Interest in ELT Department	9	1.9
To become a(n) (good) English teacher	9	1.9
To become a (good) teacher	9	1.9
To help / change / improve the country	8	1.7
Interest in teaching English	7	1.5
To help / affect young people	7	1.5
For further / lifelong education	6	1.3
Job advantages (holidays, working hours, etc.)	6	1.3
English as Lingua franca / global language / communication language	5	1.1
To go / travel / study abroad	5	1.1
Teaching is easy / relax	5	1.1
Financial advantages	5	1.1
Teaching is a good profession / Social status of teachers	5	1.1
Love for kids	5	1.1
Opportunity to teach kids	4	0.9
For self-improvement	3	0.6
For diploma	2	0.4
For improving self-esteem	1	0.2
For the university itself (Anadolu / Pamukkale)	1	0.2
English promises future	1	0.2
Missing / Irrelevant	21	4.5
TOTAL	470	100

The data implied from the first question of WIP demonstrate the frequency of the motivations from the most frequent to the least in Table 4.2. When the reasons for choosing the ELT Department written by the participants were taken into account, 30 different categories emerged. The results implied in Table 4.2 are supported by the quotes taken from the participants. In order to preserve the reliability and spontaneity of the sentences written by the participants, the sentences are given as they were written by the participants.

The first mostly given reason with the frequency of 94 out of 470 (20%) was about interest in foreign language or languages. Most of the participants wrote the same sentence to show that English language or other languages such as Spanish, Japanese and Russian draws their attention; thus, led them to choose ELT Department: *I love English*. Else, some of the participants gave other details. For example, participants 316, 334, 135 and 310 stated:

*I like speaking English.* (Participants 316 and 334)

*I like English in every way you can think of.* (Participant 135)

*English is fun.* (Participant 310)

They showed their interest in the subject area with these sentences.

The second most popular reason written for the first question of the WIP was about the personal abilities, talents, characteristics or suitability of the participants for ELT Department. The participants addressed that their best subject at high school was English or they have the ability to teach or learn English. Forty-eight (10.2%) participants referred to

their abilities or characteristics as suitable for choosing the ELT Department. For instance, participants 17, 203, 51, 243 and 362 told:

*I am good at English* (Participant 17 and 203)

*I like talking* (Participant 51)

*... Teaching is a suitable occupation for me.* (Participant 243)

*I was better in English than any other lesson in high school.* (Participant 362)

They referred to their characteristics, abilities or talent as suitable for this profession.

The next mostly given answers fall in the interest in learning English or other languages category. The participants who gave answers suitable for this category remarked that they enjoy, loved or still love learning English or other languages such as Spanish, Japanese and Russian. Forty-six (9.8%) of the participants' reason to choose ELT Department was because they have an interest in learning English. They supported their reasons with these sentences:

*I like to learn English since my childhood* (Participant 64)

*I love studying English* (Participant 263)

*I have an interest in learning foreign languages and cultures.* (Participant 397)

They showed their interest in learning and studying English with these sentences.

The job opportunities that ELT Department provides after graduation was the fourth most important reason to choose ELT Department. In Turkey, pre-service English language teachers could have a lot of opportunities when they graduate from ELT Departments. They can be assigned as English teachers in state schools by the government by taking an exam named KPSS (Civil Personnel Selection Examination) (Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi [ÖSYM], 2016). They may work for language schools, private schools, the schools of foreign languages at universities after getting higher-education, or they may even become translators and interpreters. Therefore, it is obvious that they have an opportunity to find a job after graduation. As a result, 32 (6.8%) participants stated these reasons as:

*I can find a job easier in this field* (Participant 14)

*Alternative for translation department* (Participant 171)

*I need a job to live and it was the most guaranteed way to have a job.* (Participant 253)

They asserted that it is easy to find a job when you graduate from ELT department.

Another reason for ELT students to choose ELT Department was their dream of becoming a(n) (English) teacher or learning English mostly from childhood. Thirty-one (6.6%) of the participants asserted that they dreamt of becoming a(n) (English) teacher in the future and most of them had desired to become an English teacher since they were children. About this reason, participants used these sentences:

*Being a teacher is my childhood dream* (Participant 89)

*Becoming an English teacher is my dream* (Participant 121)

*I have wanted to be English Teacher since my childhood.* (Participant 385)

These participants mentioned that they have always wanted to become a teacher.

## 4.2 Results for the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivation for Choosing English Language Teaching Profession

The second question of this study aimed to find out if there were any significant differences among ELT students' motivations for becoming English language teachers. As remembered from the previous chapter, in order to dig up information for this question, one-way ANOVA was applied on the mean score of the QoM items and these data were reinforced with the data gathered from WIP. The results of these analyses are given under two titles namely quantitative and qualitative results from analyses.

### 4.2.1 Quantitative Analysis Results

For the results regarding the differences among each grade of the ELT students in terms of their motivations, a variance test was utilized. The mean differences among grades in terms of motivations for choosing ELT Department were examined. These results were implied from QoM by distilling the mean score of the whole motivations items for each participant. The results are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. *Quantitative Results for the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivation for Choosing English Language Teaching Profession*

Grade 1	Grade 2	Mean Difference	Significance
1st year	2nd year	.08838	.435
	3rd year	.16959*	.018
	4th year	.00027	1.000
2nd year	1st year	-.08838	.435
	3rd year	.08121	.569
	4th year	-.08811	.551
3rd year	1st year	-.16959*	.018
	2nd year	-.08121	.569
	4th year	-.16932	.050
4th year	1st year	-.00027	1.000
	2nd year	.08811	.551
	3rd year	.16932	.050

Table 4.3 shows the mean difference of motivations among each grade of the ELT students. It is seen that there is a positive 0.088 difference with the significance value of



0.435 between the 1<sup>st</sup> grade ELT students and the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students. There is a positive 0.169 difference in terms of motivation mean scores between the freshmen and juniors with the significance level of 0.018 which is out of the confidence interval of 95. Moreover, freshmen motivation mean scores are not very different from the seniors (*md*: 0.00027, *p*: 100). The difference between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students is 0.081 with a significance level of 0.569. There is a negative 8,81% difference between the sophomores and seniors with a significance level of 0.551. The juniors and seniors are -0.169 different from each other in terms of motivations for choosing ELT Department with a significance level of 0.05 which is within the confidence interval.

#### 4.2.2 Qualitative Analysis Results

For supporting the quantitative analysis results, the second question in the WIP was analyzed. The second question in the WIP was *Would you drop off the ELT department and choose a different major if you had the chance? If yes, what major would you choose? Why?* The aim of this question was to see if the participants have the motivation to pursue a career in ELT. The results were drawn in terms of years of the students and shown in Tables 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7.

Table 4.4. *Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Freshmen*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	36	22.9
No	109	69.4
Not sure	8	5.1
Missing / Irrelevant	4	2.5
TOTAL	157	100

Table 4.5. *Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Sophomores*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	41	38.7
No	57	53.8
Not sure	2	1.9
Missing / Irrelevant	6	5.6
TOTAL	106	100

Table 4.6. *Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Juniors*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	43	37.4
No	63	54.8
Not sure	2	1.7
Missing / Irrelevant	7	6.1
TOTAL	115	100

Table 4.7. *Qualitative Results for Motivation to Pursue a Career in ELT for Seniors*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	33.0
No	51	56.0
Not sure	0	0.0
Missing / Irrelevant	10	11.0
TOTAL	91	100

Table 4.4, Table 4.5, Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 indicate if juniors would choose another department if they had the chance. These tables give hints about the motivations for choosing and pursuing ELT career. The participants who answered the second question in the WIP *No* are the ones that still wants to pursue an ELT career or have the motivation to continue in it. Therefore, it could be said that 109 out of 157 (69.4%) freshmen have enough motivation to keep studying in ELT Department. Participant 210 who is a freshmen supported his/her ideas with these words:

*I quit engineering to become an English teacher and ...being an English teachers is my dream and I like learning english. (Participant 210)*

S/he stated that his/her dreams came true by studying this department which is a sign that s/he did not want to drop out. Fifty-seven (53.8%) sophomores out of 106 were willing to go on studying in their department. Participant 92 who is a sophomore supports this answer with these sentences:

*...I realize that I should be an English teacher because this job is very suitable for me and I like learning and teaching new languages. So I would not drop off my department. (Participant 92)*

Participant 92 asserted that s/he was into learning languages and s/he would keep studying in this department. Sixty-three (54.8%) juniors want to pursue a career in ELT and they support this idea as:

*I chose a profession at will. (Participant 332)*

Participant 332 stated that s/he chose this department by his/her own will, so would not probably drop out. Fifty-one (56.0%) senior participants have the motivation to stay in their department. Participant 355 who was a senior said:

*I would never choose any other department than ELT (Participant 355)*

S/he stated that s/he feels good in this department. On the contrary, 36 (22.9%) freshmen, 41 (38.7%) sophomores, 43 (37.4%) juniors and 30 (33.0%) seniors did not want to move on and would change their department if they had the chance. Although each participant who answered this question as *Yes* had different jobs to choose and different reasons for that in their minds, they explained their thoughts with sentences similar to participant 464:

*I'd choose aviation ... Because I'm also interested in aviation. ... I want to see other countries and cultures. ... (Participant 464)*

Participant 464 mentioned that s/he would choose another profession which is in the aviation sector. Furthermore, 8 (5.1%) freshmen, 2 (1.9%) sophomore and 2 (1.7%) juniors were not sure if they wanted to continue their education in ELT Department. Participant 78 expressed this:

*Maybe I would choose psychology ... I'm a good listener. (Participant 78)*

In this comment, Participant 78 states his / her unsureness by using the word *Maybe*.

### 4.3 Results for Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade

As remembered from the first chapter, the 4<sup>th</sup> question was:

4. Is there any significant difference among the ELT students about the effect and level of student burnout in terms of their grade?

In order to find an answer to this research question, the data from MBI-SS and WIP were analyzed. The results are given below.

#### 4.3.1 Quantitative Analysis Results

Analysis of the quantitative data was done through post-hoc analysis on SPSS. The sum of each category in the MBI-SS was estimated for each grade of the ELT students. The mean differences between each grade of the participants are indicated in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8. *Quantitative Results for Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade*

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion		2nd year	-3.78261*	.001
	1st year	3rd year	-2.56978*	.035
		4th year	.81522	.852
		1st year	3.78261*	.001
	2nd year	3rd year	1.21282	.645
		4th year	4.59782*	.000
		1st year	2.56978*	.035
	3rd year	2nd year	-1.21282	.645
		4th year	3.38500*	.010
		1st year	-.81522	.852
	4th year	2nd year	-4.59782*	.000
		3rd year	-3.38500*	.010

(continued)

Table 4.8. *Quantitative Results for Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade (continued)*

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Cynicism		2nd year	-3.27503*	.001
	1st year	3rd year	-1.76377	.173
		4th year	-1.63113	.291
		1st year	3.27503*	.001
	2nd year	3rd year	1.51125	.381
		4th year	1.64389	.356
		1st year	1.76377	.173
	3rd year	2nd year	-1.51125	.381
		4th year	.13264	.999
		1st year	1.63113	.291
	4th year	2nd year	-1.64389	.356
	Professional Efficacy		3rd year	-.13264
		2nd year	-1.43815	.408
1st year		3rd year	-1.48845	.349
		4th year	-.42000	.972
		1st year	1.43815	.408
2nd year		3rd year	-.05030	1.000
		4th year	1.01815	.763
		1st year	1.48845	.349
3rd year		2nd year	.05030	1.000
		4th year	1.06845	.721
		1st year	.42000	.972
4th year		2nd year	-1.01815	.763
	3rd year	-1.06845	.721	

In Table 4.8, quantitative analysis results are demonstrated. It is seen that there is a -3.782 mean difference between the exhaustion levels of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students with a significance level of 0.001 indicating that there is a significant difference between these groups. There is also a significant difference between the freshmen and juniors (*md*: -2.569, *p*: 0.035). On the contrary, there is not a great gap between the exhaustion levels of the freshmen and seniors (*md*: 0.815, *p*: 0.852). Further, there is 1.212 mean difference between the sophomores and juniors with an insignificant distinction (*p*: 0.645). The difference between sophomores and seniors is 4.597 which is a remarkable gap with a very high significance level of 0.000. Lastly, there is a 3.385 mean difference between the juniors and seniors with again a high significance level of 0.010.

When it comes to the cynicism levels of each grade of ELT students, there is -3.275 mean difference between the freshmen and sophomores with a high significance level of 0.001. Freshmen and juniors are different from each other by -1.763 mean score with a significance level of 0.173. Moreover, there is -1.631 difference between the freshmen and

seniors and the significance level is 0.291. Between the 2<sup>nd</sup> graders and 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, there is 1.511 mean difference with a low significance level of 0.381. The juniors and seniors are different from each other with 0.132 mean difference regarding their cynicism levels. The significance level for juniors and seniors is 0.999 which is very low.

In terms of professional efficacy, the freshmen and sophomores are different from each other by -1.438 points with a significance level of 0.408. There is a mean difference of -1.488 between the freshmen and juniors ( $p$ : 0.349). The difference between the freshmen and seniors is -0.420 with a very low significance level of 0.972. In addition, the 2<sup>nd</sup> graders and 3<sup>rd</sup> graders are not very different from each other in terms of professional efficacy ( $md$ : -0.050,  $p$ : 1.000). The mean difference between juniors and seniors is 1.068 with 0.721 significance level.

### 4.3.2 Qualitative Analysis Results

For further analysis in order to support the quantitative results, the third and fourth question in the WIP were examined. The fourth question in the WIP was *Have you ever felt burned out in the ELT department? Why? Please explain and give examples.* The answers given to this question were categorized and analyzed separately for each grade. The results are shown in Tables 4.9, 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12.

Table 4.9. *Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Freshmen*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	39	24.8
No	26	16.6
No information	82	52.2
Missing / Irrelevant	10	6.4
TOTAL	157	100

Table 4.10. *Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Sophomores*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	44	41.1
No	10	9.4
No information	44	41.1
Missing / Irrelevant	9	8.4
TOTAL	106	100

Table 4.11. *Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Juniors*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	69	60.0
No	13	11.3
No information	26	22.6
Missing / Irrelevant	7	6.1
TOTAL	115	100

Table 4.12. *Qualitative Results for Burnout Levels of Seniors*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	43	47.2
No	11	12.1
No information	28	30.8
Missing / Irrelevant	9	9.9
TOTAL	91	100

The frequency and the percentages of the answers given to the fourth question of the WIP were indicated in Table 4.9, Table 4.10, Table 4.11 and Table 4.12. The tables demonstrate that 24.8% ( $n$ : 39) of the freshmen experienced once or still experiencing student burnout while 16.6% ( $n$ : 26) of the freshmen did not feel student burnout. The burnout sufferers give different reasons for their burnout. For example, participants 10 and 210 say:

*... there were times that the assignments made me burned out (Participant 10)*

*I d like english but I don't want to be teacher ... (Participant 210)*

They refer to the choices which get them burned out which were assignments and choosing the wrong department in this case. 52.2% ( $n$ : 82) of the freshmen did not have any idea about what student burnout is. It can be said that the majority of the freshmen did not know much about student burnout.

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> graders, 44 participants out of 106 (41.1%) felt student burnout once or more, and 10 (9.4%) did not experience any burnout. The number of participants who did not have any knowledge regarding the student burnout is the same with the number of the sophomores who felt burned out ( $n$ : 44; 41.1%). Some of the sophomores experiencing the student burnout give their reasons for it. For instance, participants 78, 278 and 280 express their reasons for burnout:

*I feel burned out because of the assignments, they are a lot and I don't even have a time period for myself. (Participant 78)*

*Feeling burned out in ELT department is a part of my weekly routine. I always feel tired during the classes in tuesdays and wednesdays because my classes starts at 8:00 A.M. (Participant 278)*

*... since the beginning of semester, I am dealing with many paperworks, presentations etc. I also took courses from my third year maybe that's why I feel burned out. (Participant 280)*

Participant 78 related his/her burnout to assignment and not having enough time for personal space while Participant 278 related his/her burnout to the early morning classes in this comment and Participant 280 showed paperworks, presentations and the additional courses s/he take as the reasons for burnout.

60% ( $n: 69$ ) of the juniors felt burned out once or more in their lives while 11.3% ( $n: 13$ ) did not. 22.6% ( $n: 26$ ) of the juniors did not know about the student burnout. It can be seen that majority of the juniors experienced the student burnout. They give reasons for their student burnout. For example, participants 134 claims that:

*... the classes are useless and unreasonably hard.* (Participant 134)

This thought that the courses are not useful and the mentioned difficulty seem to make him / her feel burned out. In addition to Participant 134, Participant 135 explains his / her reason for burnout with these words:

*Sometimes. Especially when I write plans for lessons.* (Participant 135)

According to Participant 135's comment, writing lesson plans could cause ELT students to feel burned out. In addition, participant 332 explains his / her burnout with these sentences:

*... during the mid-term control, as we had to prepare every day and some days even for 3 subjects and there was no weerend and not enough sleep. It was tough ...* (Participant 332)

As was explained in this comment, Participant 332 reports that the workload of the department such as preparing for the lessons makes him / her feel burned out. Participant 337 summarizes some reasons for the juniors with these sentences:

*When I first felt it, I was in first grade and one of my teacher gave so much grammer homework both on book and internet. So every week I felt really tired to do them and barely took time to myself. Second one is last year, again one of teacher never liked what I wrote in the exam paper, but actually I wrote everything the way he wants. So, in the last exam I had no hope to have a good grade.*  
(Participant 337)

As can be seen in this comment, Participant 337's reason for burnout was explained with the homework and exams.

Out of 91 seniors, 43 (47.2%) experienced the student burnout and 11 (12.1%) participants stated that they did not get burned out. 30.8% ( $n: 28$ ) of the seniors did not know the meaning of the student burnout. It is seen that the majority of the seniors felt burned out. Yet, not many of them know about the student burnout when compared to the juniors. The seniors state their reasons for burnout as participant 186 and 469 did:

*Sometimes by the amount of work through the end of a year ... we feel burned out.* (Participant 186)  
*I think many things we do in lessons are pointless for me. Also i think some lessons are exist just to waste our time and fill 8 semesters. And masochist, unsymphatic teachers are just make it worse.*  
(Participant 469)

These participants' reasons for the burnout were workload of the ELT department, highly demanding lecturers and the courses which were found to be unnecessary and.

#### 4.4 Results for the Relationship between the ELT Student's Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Their Burnout Levels

The next research question requires the analysis of the relationship between the motivations of the ELT students and their burnout level. For these analyses, the data from both QoM and MBI-SS were examined. The results are shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13. *Results for the Relationship between the ELT Student's Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Their Burnout Levels*

Variable	Values	Motivation	Exhaustion	Cynicism	Professional Efficacy
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	-.233**	-.341**	-.508**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	470	469	468	453
Exhaustion	Pearson Correlation	-.233**	1	.609**	.344**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	469	469	468	453
Cynicism	Pearson Correlation	-.341**	.609**	1	.449**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	468	468	468	453
Professional Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	-.508**	.344**	.449**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	453	453	453	453

\*\**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 4.13 demonstrates the Pearson's  $r$  correlation coefficient between the mean score of motivation and the total sums of the burnout categories. For the ELT students, the motivations to choose ELT department and exhaustion levels are related to each other with  $r$ :  $-.233$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Thus, there is a significant negative relationship between the motivations of the ELT students and their exhaustion level.

In addition to the relationship between the mean score of motivations and exhaustion, the relation between cynicism and motivations is significant at 0.000 which is lower than 0.050 value. The Pearson's  $r$  value is at  $-0.341$ . Therefore, it could be said that there is a negative significant relationship between cynicism and motivations for choosing the ELT department for ELT students.

When it comes to the relationship between motivations for choosing the ELT department and professional efficacy, the relationship between these variables is at  $r$ :  $-0.508$



with a significance level of 0.000 again. This means that there is a significant negative relation between motivations and professional efficacy.

#### **4.5 Results for the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department**

The participants' grade is an important variable for gathering information about the motivations for choosing the ELT Department and the ELT students' burnout levels. However, the examination of the relationships between the rest of demographic features and motivations and burnout levels would provide a more in-depth insight into these variables. Thus, the seventh research question was:

5. Is there any relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their motivations for choosing ELT Department?

This research question brings eight more sub-questions with it. The aims of these sub-questions were to find out the relation between the ELT students' motivations to choose ELT Department and their genders, ages, the high school they graduated from, the lesson hours they take a week, GPAs, their reasons to choose ELT Department, their opinion about their suitability of the ELT Department and their teaching experience. Each of these variables and their relationship with the motivations to choose ELT department are displayed under different sub-titles.

##### **4.5.1 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Genders**

The first demographic feature to be analyzed is the difference between genders regarding motivations to choose the ELT department. For this analysis, a t-test was applied to the gender groups and the mean scores of motivations. The results are shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Genders*

Variables	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Motivation and Gender	3.350	.001	.15047

In Table 4.14, the *t* value, significance value and the mean difference between the males and females are given. Out of five, the mean difference between the females and males in terms of motivation mean score is 0.150 with a significance level of 0.001. Therefore, it

would be correct to say that there is a significant difference between the genders in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department because the females' motivation mean score is 0.150 and higher than the males; thus, making them more motivated for choosing the ELT department than the males.

#### 4.5.2 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Ages

Another demographic feature whose relationship with the motivations was examined is the age groups of the participants. To analyze the difference between these variables, one-way ANOVA was applied to the age groups. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their Ages*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
17-18	19-20	.17634	.052
	21-22	.09343	.723
	23-24	.21743	.351
	25-26	.20521	.784
	27+	.15988	.833
19-20	17-18	-.17634	.052
	21-22	-.08292	.607
	23-24	.04109	.999
	25-26	.02887	1.000
	27+	-.01646	1.000
21-22	17-18	-.09343	.723
	19-20	.08292	.607
	23-24	.12400	.842
	25-26	.11179	.979
	27+	.06645	.995
23-24	17-18	-.21743	.351
	19-20	-.04109	.999
	21-22	-.12400	.842
	25-26	-.01222	1.000
	27+	-.05755	.999
25-26	17-18	-.20521	.784
	19-20	-.02887	1.000
	21-22	-.11179	.979
	23-24	.01222	1.000
	27+	-.04533	1.000
27+	17-18	-.15988	.833
	19-20	.01646	1.000
	21-22	-.06645	.995
	23-24	.05755	.999
	25-26	.04533	1.000

Table 4.15 indicates the difference between each age group in terms of motivations for choosing ELT department. It is seen that there is a 0.176 mean difference between 17-18 age group and 19-20 age group with a significance level of 0.052. Although the significance level is a little above 0.05, it cannot be said that there is a meaningful difference between these age groups in terms of motivations to choose ELT department.

Another implication from the table is that the mean difference between the participants aged 17-18 and 21-22 is 0.093 with a significance level of 0.723. This information shows that there is not a significant difference between the motivations of these groups.

There is 0.217 mean difference between the age groups of 17-18 and 23-24 with a significance level of 0.351. Therefore, it is seen that there is not a significant difference between these age groups.

The mean difference between 17-18 age group and 25-26 age group is 0.205 with a significance level of 0.784. The significance level and the mean difference indicates that there is not a significant difference between these age groups in terms of their motivations.

There is 0.159 mean difference between 17-18 age group and the participants who are 27 and over with a significance level of 0.833. This means that there is not a significant difference between these two age groups.

Another implication from the table is that the mean difference between the participants aged 19-20 and 21-22 is -0.0829 with a significance level of 0.607. These values show that there is not a meaningful difference between the motivations of these groups.

The mean difference between 19-20 age group and 23-24 age group is 0.041 with a significance level of 0.999. The significance level and the mean difference indicates that there is not a significant difference between these age groups in terms of their motivations. There is 0.028 mean difference between 19-20 age group and the participants who are 25-26 with a significance level of 1.000. This means that the motivation mean scores of these age groups are statistically the same and the difference is not significant.

The mean difference between 19-20 age group and 27+ age group is -0.016 with a significance level of 1.000. The significance level and the mean difference indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference between these age groups.

The mean difference between the participants aged 21-22 and 23-24 is 0.124 with a significance level of 0.842. These values show that there is not a significant difference between the motivations of these groups.

There is 0.111 mean difference between 21-22 age group and the participants who are 25-26 with a significance level of 0.979. This means that the motivation mean scores of these age groups are statistically almost the same which makes the difference insignificant.

There is 0.066 mean difference between the age groups of 21-22 and 27+ with a significance level of 0.995. Therefore, it is seen that there is no significant difference between these age groups.

Another implication from the table is that the mean difference between the participants aged 23-24 and 25-26 is -0.012 with a significance level of 1.000. This information shows that there is statistically no difference between the motivations of these groups.

One more implication from Table 4.15 is that the difference between the age groups of 23-24 and 27+ is -0.057 with a significance level of 0.999. Therefore, it could be said that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The last implication from Table 4.15 is that here is -0.045 mean difference between 25-26 age group and the participants who are 27 or older than 27 with a significance level of 1.000. This means that the motivation mean scores of these age groups are not statistically significant.

#### **4.5.3 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Graduated High School Types**

The next variable to be analyzed together with the motivations for choosing the ELT department is the high school types ELT students graduated from. For the analysis of these variables, the high school types of the participants were applied one-way ANOVA and examined in terms of mean score of the motivations to choose ELT department. The results are shown in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Graduated High School Types*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Anatolian High School	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.07262	.961
	Anatolian Vocational High School	.15166	.994
	General High School	.01672	1.000
	Vocational High School	-.25319	.941
	Other	-.03422	.998

Table 4.16. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Graduated High School Types (continued)*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Anatolian Teacher Training High School	Anatolian High School	-.07262	.961
	Anatolian Vocational High School	.07904	1.000
	General High School	-.05590	.998
	Vocational High School	-.32581	.864
	Other	-.10684	.937
Anatolian Vocational High School	Anatolian High School	-.15166	.994
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-.07904	1.000
	General High School	-.13494	.997
	Vocational High School	-.40486	.901
	Other	-.18588	.987
General High School	Anatolian High School	-.01672	1.000
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.05590	.998
	Anatolian Vocational High School	.13494	.997
	Vocational High School	-.26991	.937
	Other	-.05094	.998
Vocational High School	Anatolian High School	.25319	.941
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.32581	.864
	Anatolian Vocational High School	.40486	.901
	General High School	.26991	.937
	Other	.21897	.972
Other	Anatolian High School	.03422	.998
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.10684	.937
	Anatolian Vocational High School	.18588	.987
	General High School	.05094	.998
	Vocational High School	-.21897	.972

In Table 4.16, the mean differences of the graduated high school types of the participants are displayed in terms of the mean score of the motivations to choose ELT department. Since there was only one ELT student who graduated from a super high school, that participants' graduated high school type was moved to the group of *other* (religious vocational high schools, open plan high schools, science high schools and social sciences high schools or high schools abroad) for the application of this type of analysis. After this modification, the results show that the mean difference of motivations between Anatolian High School graduates and Anatolian Teacher Training High School graduates is 0.072 with a significance level of 0.961 regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

According to Table 4.16, the difference between Anatolian High School graduates and Anatolian Vocational High School is 0.151 with 0.994 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between Anatolian High School and General High School graduates is 0.016 with a significance level of 1.000. These values mean that there is statistically no difference between Anatolian High School and General High School graduates in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is -0.253 mean difference between Anatolian High School graduates and Vocational High School with 0.941 significance level. Thus, it would barely be possible to mention a difference between these groups.

Another implication from Table 4.16 is that there is -0.034 mean difference between Anatolian High School graduates and other types of high school graduates with a significance level of 0.998. It could be said that there is no significant difference between these two groups.

According to Table 4.16, the difference between Anatolian Teacher Training High School graduates and Anatolian Vocational High School is 0.079 with 1.000 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is statistically no difference between these groups.

There is -0.055 mean difference between Anatolian Teacher Training High School graduates and General High School with 0.998 significance level. Thus, it would almost not be possible to mention a difference between these groups.

There is -0.325 mean difference between Anatolian Teacher Training High School graduates and Vocational High School with 0.864 significance level. Thus, there is not much difference between these groups.

The mean difference between Anatolian Teacher Training High School and other high schools' graduates is -0.106 with a significance level of 0.937. These values mean that there is no difference between Anatolian Teacher Training High School and other high schools graduates in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

The mean difference between Anatolian Vocational High School graduates and General High School graduates is -0.134 with a significance level of 0.997 regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is no significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between Anatolian Vocational High School graduates and Vocational High School graduates is -0.404 with a significance level of 0.901 in terms of

the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

According to Table 4.16, the difference between Anatolian Vocational High School graduates and other types of graduated high schools is -0.185 with 0.987 significance level. Therefore, it can be said that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from the table is that there is -0.269 mean difference between General High School graduates and Vocational High School graduates with a significance level of 0.937. It could be said that there is not a significant difference between these two groups.

The mean difference between General High School graduates and other high schools' graduates is -0.050 with a significance level of 0.998. These values mean that there is almost no difference between General High School graduates and other high schools graduates in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is 0.218 mean difference between Vocational High School graduates and other high schools graduates with 0.972 significance level. Thus, there is not much difference between these groups.

#### **4.5.4 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Weekly Lesson Hours**

The next sub-question under the seventh research question is *Is there any relationship between the motivations of ELT students to choose ELT Department and the lesson hours they take a week?* To find and answer to this question the motivation mean scores of the participants and the lesson hours they take a week were applied one-way ANOVA with post hoc analysis. The results are shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Weekly Lesson Hours*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
0-10	11-20	.06984	.922
	21-30	.09984	.789
	31-40	.12779	.905
	41-45	-.36053	.712
	0-10	-.06984	.922
11-20	21-30	.02999	.973
	31-40	.05795	.991
	41-45	-.43037	.521

(continued)

Table 4.17. *Results for the Relationship between the Lesson Hour Load and the Motivations to Choose ELT Department (continued)*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
21-30	0-10	-.09984	.789
	11-20	-.02999	.973
	31-40	.02795	1.000
	41-45	-.46036	.456
31-40	0-10	-.12779	.905
	11-20	-.05795	.991
	21-30	-.02795	1.000
	41-45	-.48832	.479
41-45	0-10	.36053	.712
	11-20	.43037	.521
	21-30	.46036	.456
	31-40	.48832	.479

According to Table 4.17, the mean difference in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department between the participants who take 0-10 hours of lesson a week and the ones who take 11-20 hours a week is 0.069 with a significance level of 0.922. These values show that there is only a low level of difference between these groups in terms of their motivations. However, this difference is not significant.

Table 4.17 shows that there is a mean difference of 0.099 between the participants with 0-10 lesson hours a week and the ones with 21-30 hours with a significance level of 0.789. This result means that there is not a big difference between these groups.

The mean difference between 0-10-hour takers and the participants taking 31-40 lesson hours a week is 0.127 with a significance level of 0.905. Therefore, it can be said that there is not a significant difference between these two groups in terms of their motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is -0.360 mean difference between the participants who take 0-10 lesson hours and those who take 41-45 hours with a significance level at 0.712. These numbers indicate that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

In Table 4.17, the mean difference in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department between the participants who take 11-20 hours of lesson a week and the ones who take 21-30 hours a week is 0.029 with a significance level of 0.973. These values show that there is no significant difference between these groups in terms of their motivation mean scores.

The mean difference between the participants who take 11-20 hours and the participants taking 31-40 lesson hours a week is 0.057 with a significance level of 0.991. Thus, it can be said that there is not a significant difference between these two groups in terms of their motivations for choosing the ELT department.



According to Table 4.17, the mean difference in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department between the participants who take 11-20 hours of lesson a week and the ones who take 41-45 hours a week is -0.430 with a significance level of 0.521. These values show that there is not a significant difference between these groups in terms of their motivations.

There is 0.027 mean difference between the participants who take 21-30 lesson hours and those who take 31-40 hours with a significance level at 1.000. These numbers indicate that there is statistically no difference between these groups.

Table 4.17 demonstrates that there is a mean difference of -0.460 between the participants with 21-30 lesson hours a week and the ones with 41-45 hours with a significance level of 0.456. This result means that there is not a big difference between these groups.

The mean difference between 31-40-hour takers and the participants taking 41-45 lesson hours a week is -0.488 with a significance level of 0.479. Therefore, it can be said that there is not a significant difference between these two groups in terms of their motivations for choosing the ELT department.

#### **4.5.5 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their GPAs**

Another demographic feature which needs analysis with the motivation mean score of the participants is their grade point averages (GPA). To be able to do this analysis, one-way ANOVA with post hoc test was applied to the motivation mean score and the participants' GPA groups. The results are given in Table 4.18.

*Table 4.18. Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Their GPAs*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
No GPA	1.01-2.00	.19028	.450
	2.01-3.00	.08491	.418
	3.01-4.00	.00105	1.000
1.01-2.00	No GPA	-.19028	.450
	2.01-3.00	-.10537	.849
	3.01-4.00	-.18923	.464
2.01-3.00	No GPA	-.08491	.418
	1.01-2.00	.10537	.849
	3.01-4.00	-.08386	.477
3.01-4.00	No GPA	-.00105	1.000
	1.01-2.00	.18923	.464
	2.01-3.00	.08386	.477

There was one more group in the study which was excluded in the course of analysis process. The reason for this exclusion is that 0 to 1.00 group had only one participant, and this participant was a junior. Moreover, it is impossible for a junior to have this GPA since that student would probably be dismissed from the school, or that the participant may have checked the wrong option for this question. Therefore, the exclusion of this data probably increased the reliability of the study. Another point which has to be explained here is that the participants with no GPA are mostly the freshmen because the data collection tool was applied to the participants towards the end of the first semester when the freshmen did not get their first transcripts yet.

Table 4.18 indicates that there is a 0.190 mean difference between the participants with no GPA and the participants with 1.01-2.00 GPA with a significance level of 0.450. From these data, it would be correct to say that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from the Table 4.18 is that the mean difference between the participants who have no GPA and who have 2.01-3.00 GPA is 0.084 with a significance level of 0.418. This result shows that there is not a statistically significant difference between the motivations of these groups.

There is 0.001 mean difference between the participants with no GPA and those who have 3.01-4.00 with a significance level of 1.000. Therefore, it is seen that there is statistically no difference between these age groups.

The mean difference between 1.01-2.00 GPA group and 2.01-3.00 GPA group is -0.105 with a significance level of 0.849. The significance level and the mean difference indicates that there is not a significant difference between these GPA groups in terms of their motivations to choose the ELT department.

There is -0.189 mean difference between the participants who have 1.01-2.00 GPA and the participants who have GPA of 3.01-4.00 with a significance level of 0.464. This means that there is not a significant difference between these two groups.

Another implication from the table is that the mean difference between the participants having GPA between 2.01 and 3.00, and the participants with 3.01-4.00 GPA is -0.083 with a significance level of 0.477. These values show that there is not a significant difference between the motivations of these groups.

#### 4.5.6 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department

The reasons to choose ELT department here focuses on whether the participants chose this department by their own will or with an influence from external sources such as their families, friends or teachers. The analysis of these data was conducted by applying one-way ANOVA with post hoc test to detect the relationship between the reasons to choose the ELT department and the motivations for choosing the ELT department. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
I wanted to	My family wanted me to	.20005	.070
	Other	.50434*	.000
My family wanted me to	I wanted to	-.20005	.070
	Other	.30430*	.015
Other	I wanted to	-.50434*	.000
	My family wanted me to	-.30430*	.015

In Table 4.19, it is seen that the mean difference between the participants who expressed that they themselves wanted to choose the ELT department and the participants who chose the ELT department under the influence of their family is 0.200 with the significance level at 0.070. This result means that there is not a significant difference between these two groups' motivation mean scores.

There is a mean difference of 0.504 between the participants who chose ELT department themselves and the ones who have other reasons (their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives, acquaintances, physical or emotional reasons) influencing them with a significance level of 0.000. This means that there is a meaningful difference between these groups.

The mean difference between the ones who chose ELT department with the influence of their families and the ones with other influences (their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives, acquaintances, physical or emotional reasons) to choose the ELT department is 0.304 with a significance level of 0.015. These values show that there is a significance difference between these groups in terms of their motivations to choose the ELT department.

#### 4.5.7 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Perspectives about the Suitability of the Department

The next demographic feature was about the perspectives of the participants about the suitability of ELT department for themselves. This analysis was done by applying one-way ANOVA with post hoc test to detect the relationship between the participants' suitability perspectives and the motivation mean scores. The results are displayed in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and their Perspectives about the Suitability of the Department*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Not at all	Not suitable	-.28968	.255
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	-.52449*	.000
	Suitable	-.79719*	.000
	Very suitable	-1.06537*	.000
Not suitable	Not at all	.28968	.255
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	-.23481	.204
	Suitable	-.50751*	.000
	Very suitable	-.77568*	.000
Neither suitable nor not suitable	Not at all	.52449*	.000
	Not suitable	.23481	.204
	Suitable	-.27270*	.000
	Very suitable	-.54087*	.000
Suitable	Not at all	.79719*	.000
	Not suitable	.50751*	.000
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	.27270*	.000
	Very suitable	-.26818*	.000
Very suitable	Not at all	1.06537*	.000
	Not suitable	.77568*	.000
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	.54087*	.000
	Suitable	.26818*	.000

Table 4.20 shows the perspectives of the participants about the suitability of the ELT department for themselves. By looking at the table, it could be seen that the mean difference between the ones who do not find the department suitable at all and the ones who do not find the ELT department suitable for themselves is -0.289 and the significance level is at 0.255. These values mean that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The participants who answered this question in the personal information form as not at all have -0.524 mean difference with the participants with the answer neither suitable nor not suitable with a significance level of 0.000. This means that there is a significant difference between these groups in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department.

The mean difference between the ones who do not find the department suitable for themselves at all and the ones who find the department suitable for themselves is -0.797. The significance level for the mean difference between these groups is 0.000 meaning that there is a significant difference between these groups.

There is -1.065 mean difference between the participants who do not find the ELT department suitable for themselves and the participants who find the department very suitable for themselves with a significance level of 0.000. Therefore, it is obvious that there is a significant difference between these two groups in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department.

According to Table 4.20, the mean difference is -0.234 between the participants answering not suitable and the ones with the answer neither suitable nor not suitable with a significance level of 0.204. Thus, it is possible to say that there is not found a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from the table is that there is -0.507 mean difference between the participants who do not find the ELT department suitable for themselves and the participants finding their department suitable for themselves with a significance level of 0.000. This information means that there is a significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between the ones who do not find the department suitable and the ones who find the department very suitable for themselves is -0.775. The significance level for the mean difference between these groups is 0.000 meaning that there is a meaningful difference between these groups.

The participants who answered neither suitable nor not suitable have -0.272 mean difference with the participants with the answer suitable with a significance level of 0.000. This means that there is a significant difference between these groups in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is -0.540 mean difference between the neither suitable nor not suitable group and the participants who find themselves very suitable for their department with a significance level of 0.000. Therefore, it is obvious that there is a significant difference between these two groups in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department.

Another implication from the table is that there is -0.268 mean difference between the participants who find the ELT department suitable for themselves and the participants finding their department very suitable for themselves with a significance level of 0.000. This information means that there is a significant difference between these groups.

#### 4.5.8 Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Teaching Experience

The last variable to be analyzed together with the motivations for choosing the ELT department is the teaching experience of the ELT students. For the analysis of these variables, teaching experiences of the participants were applied one-way ANOVA and examined in terms of mean score of the motivations to choose ELT department. The results are shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Teaching Experience*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Said No	0-6 months	-.14462*	.041
	7-12 months	-.10147	.955
	1-2 years	-.29064	.126
	2-3 years	.26167	.710
	4-5 years	-.08063	1.000
	6+ years	-.14335	.899
	Said No	.14462*	.041
0-6 months	7-12 months	.04315	1.000
	1-2 years	-.14602	.857
	2-3 years	.40629	.200
	4-5 years	.06399	1.000
	6+ years	.00127	1.000
	Said No	.10147	.955
	0-6 months	-.04315	1.000
7-12 months	1-2 years	-.18918	.849
	2-3 years	.36314	.486
	4-5 years	.02084	1.000
	6+ years	-.04188	1.000
	Said No	.29064	.126
	0-6 months	.14602	.857
	7-12 months	.18918	.849
1-2 years	2-3 years	.55232	.077
	4-5 years	.21002	.962
	6+ years	.14730	.968
	Said No	-.26167	.710
	0-6 months	-.40629	.200
	7-12 months	-.36314	.486
	1-2 years	-.55232	.077
2-3 years	4-5 years	-.34230	.825
	6+ years	-.40502	.415 (continued)

Table 4.21. *Results for the Relationship between the Motivations of ELT Students to Choose ELT Department and Teaching Experience (continued)*

Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
4-5 years	Said No	.08063	1.000
	0-6 months	-.06399	1.000
	7-12 months	-.02084	1.000
	1-2 years	-.21002	.962
	2-3 years	.34230	.825
	6+ years	-.06272	1.000
6+ years	Said No	.14335	.899
	0-6 months	-.00127	1.000
	7-12 months	.04188	1.000
	1-2 years	-.14730	.968
	2-3 years	.40502	.415
	4-5 years	.06272	1.000

In Table 4.21, the mean differences of the teaching experience of the participants are displayed in terms of the mean scores of the motivations to choose ELT department. The results show that the mean difference of motivations between the participants who have no teaching experience and the ones with 0-6 months of teaching experience is -0.144 with a significance level of 0.041 regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is a significant difference between these groups.

According to Table 4.21, the difference between the participants with no experience and the participants with 7-12 months of experience is -0.101 with 0.955 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between no experience group and 1-2-year group is -0.290 with a significance level of 0.126. These values mean that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is 0.261 mean difference between the participants who have no teaching experience and the ones with 2-3 years of teaching experience with 0.710 significance level. Thus, it is not possible to mention a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from Table 4.21 is that there is -0.080 mean difference between the ones with no experience and 4-5 years of teaching experience with a significance level of 1.000. It could be said that there is statistically no difference between these two groups.

According to Table 4.21, the difference between no experience group and 6+ year-group is -0.143 with 0.899 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups.

There is 0.043 mean difference between the participants with 0-6 months of teaching experience and the participants with 7-12 months of experience with 1.000 significance level. Thus, it would probably not be possible to mention a significant difference between these groups.

There is -0.146 mean difference between 0-6-month group and 1-2 year-group with 0.857 significance level. Thus, there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between 0-6-month group and 2-3 year-group is 0.406 with a significance level of 0.200. These values mean that there is not a significant difference between these groups in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

The participants with 0-6-month experience and those who are with 4-5 years of experience are 0.063 different from each other with a significance level of 1.000 regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between 0-6 months of teaching experience group and 6+ years of teaching experience group is 0.001 with a significance level of 1.000 in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that these groups' motivation mean scores are not statistically significant.

According to Table 4.21, the difference between the participants who have 7-12 months of teaching experience and the participants who have 1-2 years of experience is -0.189 with 0.849 significance level. Therefore, it can be said that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from the table is that there is 0.363 mean difference between 7-12-month group and 2-3 year-group with a significance level of 0.486. It could be said that there is not a statistically significant difference between these two groups.

The mean difference between the participants who have 7-12 months of teaching experience and the participants who have 4-5 years of teaching experience is 0.020 with a significance level of 1.000. These values mean that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is -0.041 mean difference between 7-12-month group and 6+ year-group with 1.000 significance level. Thus, there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference of motivations between the participants who have 1-2 years of teaching experience and the ones with 2-3 years of teaching experience is 0.552 with a



significance level of 0.077 regarding the motivations for choosing the ELT department. These values indicate that there is not a significant difference between these groups.

According to Table 4.21, the difference between the participants with 1-2 years of experience and the participants with 4-5 years of experience is 0.210 with 0.962 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups.

The mean difference between 1-2-year group and 6+ year-group is 0.147 with a significance level of 0.968. These values mean that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups in terms of the motivations for choosing the ELT department.

There is -0.342 mean difference between the participants who have 2-3 years of experience and the ones with 4-5 years of teaching experience with 0.825 significance level. Thus, it is not possible to mention a significant difference between these groups.

Another implication from Table 4.21 is that there is -0.405 mean difference between the ones with 2-3 years of teaching experience and 6+ years of teaching experience with a significance level of 0.415. It could be said that there is not a significant difference between these two groups.

According to Table 4.21, the difference between 4-5-year group and 6+ year-group is -0.062 with 1.000 significance level. Therefore, it can be seen that there is not a statistically significant difference between these groups.

#### **4.6 Results for the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Burnout Levels**

Beside the motivation mean scores of the ELT students, their burnout levels are an informative variable when they are analyzed together with the demographic features of the participants. Thus, the last research question for this study was:

6. Is there any relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their level of student burnout?

This research question has eight sub-questions as in the previous question. Each sub-question focuses on a different demographic feature of the participants, namely their genders, ages, the high school they graduated from, the lesson hours they take a week, GPAs, their reasons to choose ELT Department, their opinion about their suitability of the ELT Department and their teaching experience.

There were two differences between these research questions. The first one is that the previous research question aims to find out if there is a difference between the different groups of the demographic features in terms of their motivations to choose the ELT department while this research question concerns with the difference between the different groups of the demographic feature in terms of student burnout. The second difference is that there are three different categories of burnout while there was only one variable for the motivations for choosing the ELT department. Because of the last difference, the way of presenting information was changed for the sake of practicality. As a result, only the groups which have significant differences in terms of burnout levels according to the demographic features are mentioned in detail for providing practicality and brevity instead of giving every bit of detail including the groups which do not have any meaningful difference. With only the presentation of the meaningful differences, the results from the examination of the demographic features of the participants and the burnout levels of the participants are given below under eight separate titles.

#### **4.6.1 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Genders**

The difference between genders in terms of burnout levels of the ELT students was the first analysis to be done. In order to be able to conduct this analysis, a t-test was applied to the gender groups and the mean scores of the burnout levels. The results are shown in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Genders*

	t	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Exhaustion	-1.557	.120	-1.17746
Cynicism	-2.314	.021	-1.57106
Professional Efficacy	-.731	.465	-.51408

In Table 4.22, the *t* value, significance value and the mean difference between the males and females are given. The attention-getting point here is that the mean difference between the females and males regarding the cynicism which is -1.571 with a significance level of 0.021. This result means that there is a significant difference between the genders of the participants in terms of cynicism. On the contrary, there was not found a meaningful difference between the genders in terms of exhaustion (*md*: -1.557, *p*: 0.120) and professional efficacy (*md*: -0.731, *p*: 0.465).

#### 4.6.2 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Ages

Another demographic feature to be examined together with the burnout levels was the age groups of the participants. To analyze the difference between these variables, one-way ANOVA was applied to the age groups. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Ages

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	17-18	19-20	-2.45515	.157
		21-22	-.03153	1.000
		23-24	.57917	1.000
		25-26	-.23750	1.000
		27+	5.12917	.175
	19-20	17-18	2.45515	.157
		21-22	2.42362	.057
		23-24	3.03431	.456
		25-26	2.21765	.950
		27+	7.58431*	.004
	21-22	17-18	.03153	1.000
		19-20	-2.42362	.057
		23-24	.61070	.999
		25-26	-.20597	1.000
		27+	5.16070	.142
	23-24	17-18	-.57917	1.000
		19-20	-3.03431	.456
		21-22	-.61070	.999
		25-26	-.81667	1.000
		27+	4.55000	.476
25-26	17-18	.23750	1.000	
	19-20	-2.21765	.950	
	21-22	.20597	1.000	
	23-24	.81667	1.000	
	27+	5.36667	.534	
27+	17-18	-5.12917	.175	
	19-20	-7.58431*	.004	
	21-22	-5.16070	.142	
	23-24	-4.55000	.476	
	25-26	-5.36667	.534	
Cynicism	17-18	19-20	-3.26054*	.006
		21-22	-1.71474	.502
		23-24	-3.37083	.298
		25-26	-1.36250	.992
		27+	2.98036	.677
	19-20	17-18	3.26054*	.006
		21-22	1.54580	.344
		23-24	-.11029	1.000
		25-26	1.89804	.959
		27+	6.24090*	.016

(continued)

Table 4.23. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of ELT Students and Their Ages (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Cynicism	21-22	17-18	1.71474	.502
		19-20	-1.54580	.344
		23-24	-1.65609	.891
		25-26	.35224	1.000
		27+	4.69510	.157
	23-24	17-18	3.37083	.298
		19-20	.11029	1.000
		21-22	1.65609	.891
		25-26	2.00833	.973
		27+	6.35119	.074
	25-26	17-18	1.36250	.992
		19-20	-1.89804	.959
		21-22	-.35224	1.000
		23-24	-2.00833	.973
		27+	4.34286	.659
	27+	17-18	-2.98036	.677
		19-20	-6.24090*	.016
		21-22	-4.69510	.157
		23-24	-6.35119	.074
		25-26	-4.34286	.659
	17-18	19-20	-2.04615	.276
		21-22	-.11274	1.000
		23-24	-.85256	.996
		25-26	-1.99145	.970
27+		.94505	.998	
19-20	17-18	2.04615	.276	
	21-22	1.93341	.165	
	23-24	1.19359	.973	
	25-26	.05470	1.000	
	27+	2.99121	.662	
21-22	17-18	.11274	1.000	
	19-20	-1.93341	.165	
	23-24	-.73982	.997	
	25-26	-1.87871	.974	
	27+	1.05780	.995	
23-24	17-18	.85256	.996	
	19-20	-1.19359	.973	
	21-22	.73982	.997	
	25-26	-1.13889	.999	
	27+	1.79762	.976	
25-26	17-18	1.99145	.970	
	19-20	-.05470	1.000	
	21-22	1.87871	.974	
	23-24	1.13889	.999	
	27+	2.93651	.931	
27+	17-18	-.94505	.998	
	19-20	-2.99121	.662	
	21-22	-1.05780	.995	
	23-24	-1.79762	.976	
	25-26	-2.93651	.931	

Table 4.23 indicates the difference between each age group regarding the burnout levels. It is seen that the mean difference between the age groups of 19-20 and 27+ (*md*: 7.584, *p*: 0.004) constitutes a significant difference in terms of exhaustion. The rest of the age groups were not found to have a significant difference between each other.

Regarding the cynicism side of the student burnout, the mean difference between 17-18 age group and 19-20 age group (*md*: -3.260, *p*: 0.006) and 19-20 and 27+ age groups (*md*: 6.240, *p*: 0.016) have a significant difference in terms of cynicism. There seems to be not much significant difference between the rest of the age groups. According to Table 4.23, there is no indication of any significant difference between the age groups in terms of professional efficacy.

#### 4.6.3 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types

The next variable to be analyzed together with the burnout levels of the ELT students is the high school types the ELT students graduated from. For the analysis of these variables, the high school types of the participants were applied one-way ANOVA and examined in terms of sums of the burnout level categories. The results are shown in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	Anatolian High School	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.06687	1.000
		Anatolian Vocational High School	5.03562	.878
		General High School	4.07408	.109
		Vocational High School	-.96438	1.000
		Other	2.06264	.647
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	Anatolian High School	-.06687	1.000
		Anatolian Vocational High School	4.96875	.900
		General High School	4.00721	.380
		Vocational High School	-1.03125	1.000
		Other	1.99578	.899

(continued)

Table 4.24. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance	
Cynicism	Anatolian Vocational High School	Anatolian High School	-5.03562	.878	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-4.96875	.900	
		General High School	-.96154	1.000	
		Vocational High School	-6.00000	.936	
		Other	-2.97297	.989	
		Anatolian High School	-4.07408	.109	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-4.00721	.380	
		General High School	.96154	1.000	
	Vocational High School	Vocational High School	-5.03846	.899	
		Other	-2.01143	.917	
		Anatolian High School	.96438	1.000	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	1.03125	1.000	
		Vocational High School	6.00000	.936	
		General High School	5.03846	.899	
		Other	3.02703	.988	
		Anatolian High School	-2.06264	.647	
	Other	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-1.99578	.899	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	2.97297	.989	
		General High School	2.01143	.917	
		Vocational High School	-3.02703	.988	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	1.01995	.971	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	1.61370	.999	
		General High School	2.15216	.668	
		Vocational High School	1.61370	.999	
			Other	.30814	1.000

(continued)

Table 4.24. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Cynicism	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	Anatolian High School	-1.01995	.971
		Anatolian Vocational High School	.59375	1.000
		General High School	1.13221	.991
		Vocational High School	.59375	1.000
		Other	-.71181	.998
		Anatolian High School	-1.61370	.999
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-.59375	1.000
		General High School	.53846	1.000
	Anatolian Vocational High School	Vocational High School	.00000	1.000
		Other	-1.30556	1.000
		Anatolian High School	-2.15216	.668
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-1.13221	.991
		Anatolian Vocational High School	-.53846	1.000
		Vocational High School	-.53846	1.000
		Other	-1.84402	.915
		Anatolian High School	-1.61370	.999
	General High School	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-.59375	1.000
		Anatolian Vocational High School	.00000	1.000
		General High School	.53846	1.000
		Other	-1.30556	1.000
		Anatolian High School	-.30814	1.000
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	.71181	.998
		Anatolian Vocational High School	1.30556	1.000
		General High School	1.84402	.915
	Vocational High School	Vocational High School	1.30556	1.000
		General High School	1.84402	.915
		Vocational High School	1.30556	1.000
		Other	1.30556	1.000

(continued)

Table 4.24. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance	
Professional Efficacy	Anatolian High School	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-.05211	1.000	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	5.11455	.823	
		Anatolian General High School	1.83919	.842	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	5.11455	.823	
		Other	1.28122	.911	
		Anatolian High School	.05211	1.000	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	5.16667	.843	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	1.89130	.933	
	Anatolian Vocational High School	Anatolian Vocational High School	5.16667	.843	
		Other	1.33333	.975	
		Anatolian High School	-5.11455	.823	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-5.16667	.843	
		General High School	-3.27536	.976	
		Vocational High School	.00000	1.000	
		Other	-3.83333	.949	
		Anatolian High School	-1.83919	.842	
	General High School	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-1.89130	.933	
		Anatolian Vocational High School	3.27536	.976	
		Vocational High School	3.27536	.976	
		Other	-.55797	1.000	
		Anatolian High School	-5.11455	.823	
		Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-5.16667	.843	
		Vocational High School	Anatolian Vocational High School	.00000	1.000
			General High School	-3.27536	.976
	Other		-3.83333	.949	

(continued)



Table 4.24. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Graduated High School Types (continued)*

Other	Anatolian High School	-1.28122	.911
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	-1.33333	.975
	Anatolian Vocational High School	3.83333	.949
	General High School	.55797	1.000
	Vocational High School	3.83333	.949

In Table 4.24, the mean differences of the graduated high school types of the participants are displayed in terms of the sums of the burnout level categories. Table 4.24 indicates that there are no groups between which there is a significant difference in terms of exhaustion side of the burnout levels. Furthermore, the results show that there is not a significant difference regarding cynicism between any of these graduated high school type groups. Again, there is no statistically significant difference in terms of the graduated high school type and professional efficacy sub-dimension of student burnout.

#### 4.6.4 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Weekly Lesson Hours

The next sub-question under the eighth research question was *Is there any relationship between the burnout levels of ELT students and the lesson hours they take a week?* To find and answer to this question the sums of the burnout categories of the participants and the lesson hours they take a week are applied one-way ANOVA with post hoc analysis. The results are shown in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Weekly Lesson Hours*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	0-10	11-20	-3.48756	.090
		21-30	-3.08408	.212
		31-40	-5.87778	.105
		41-45	-10.27778	.186
	11-20	0-10	3.48756	.090
		21-30	.40347	.987
		31-40	-2.39022	.779
		41-45	-6.79022	.565
	21-30	0-10	3.08408	.212
		11-20	-.40347	.987
		31-40	-2.79369	.679
		41-45	-7.19369	.512

(continued)

Table 4.25. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels of the ELT Students and Their Weekly Lesson Hours (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Cynicism	31-40	0-10	5.87778	.105
		11-20	2.39022	.779
		21-30	2.79369	.679
		41-45	-4.40000	.900
	41-45	0-10	10.27778	.186
		11-20	6.79022	.565
		21-30	7.19369	.512
		31-40	4.40000	.900
	0-10	11-20	-3.39822	.050
		21-30	-1.96542	.554
		31-40	-3.83889	.381
		41-45	-8.97222	.206
	11-20	0-10	3.39822	.050
		21-30	1.43280	.274
		31-40	-.44067	.999
		41-45	-5.57400	.644
	21-30	0-10	1.96542	.554
		11-20	-1.43280	.274
		31-40	-1.87347	.860
		41-45	-7.00680	.423
	31-40	0-10	3.83889	.381
		11-20	.44067	.999
		21-30	1.87347	.860
		41-45	-5.13333	.773
	41-45	0-10	8.97222	.206
		11-20	5.57400	.644
		21-30	7.00680	.423
		31-40	5.13333	.773
	0-10	11-20	-1.34514	.843
		21-30	-.94048	.959
		31-40	-.71429	.998
		41-45	-1.85714	.993
	11-20	0-10	1.34514	.843
		21-30	.40467	.984
		31-40	.63086	.998
		41-45	-.51200	1.000
	21-30	0-10	.94048	.959
		11-20	-.40467	.984
		31-40	.22619	1.000
		41-45	-.91667	1.000
	31-40	0-10	.71429	.998
		11-20	-.63086	.998
21-30		-.22619	1.000	
41-45		-1.14286	.999	
41-45	0-10	1.85714	.993	
	11-20	.51200	1.000	
	21-30	.91667	1.000	
	31-40	1.14286	.999	

Table 4.25 shows the mean differences and significance levels between each group of participants who take certain hours of lessons weekly in terms of burnout categories. According to Table 4.25, there are not any statistically significant differences between the lesson hour groups regarding emotional exhaustion, cynicism or professional efficacy.

#### 4.6.5 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' GPA

Another demographic feature which needs analysis with the participants' sums of the burnout levels is their grade point averages (GPA). To be able to do this analysis, one-way ANOVA with post hoc test was applied to the burnout category sums and the participants' GPA groups. The results are given in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' GPA*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	No GPA	1.01-2.00	-1.83815	.818
		2.01-3.00	-2.88392*	.008
		3.01-4.00	-1.75785	.215
	1.01-2.00	No GPA	1.83815	.818
		2.01-3.00	-1.04577	.961
		3.01-4.00	.08030	1.000
	2.01-3.00	No GPA	2.88392*	.008
		1.01-2.00	1.04577	.961
		3.01-4.00	1.12607	.641
	3.01-4.00	No GPA	1.75785	.215
		1.01-2.00	-0.08030	1.000
		2.01-3.00	-1.12607	.641
Cynicism	No GPA	1.01-2.00	-3.84980	.179
		2.01-3.00	-2.46224*	.014
		3.01-4.00	-1.18008	.478
	1.01-2.00	No GPA	3.84980	.179
		2.01-3.00	1.38756	.887
		3.01-4.00	2.66972	.505
	2.01-3.00	No GPA	2.46224*	.014
		1.01-2.00	-1.38756	.887
		3.01-4.00	1.28216	.449
3.01-4.00	No GPA	1.18008	.478	
	1.01-2.00	-2.66972	.505	
		2.01-3.00	-1.28216	.449

(continued)

Table 4.26. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' GPA (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Professional Efficacy	No GPA	1.01-2.00	-3.80497	.196
		2.01-3.00	-2.10573	.058
		3.01-4.00	1.04503	.607
	1,01-2.00	No GPA	3.80497	.196
		2.01-3.00	1.69924	.817
		3.01-4.00	4.85000	.062
	2.01-3.00	No GPA	2.10573	.058
		1.01-2.00	-1.69924	.817
		3.01-4.00	3.15076*	.003
	3.01-4.00	No GPA	-1.04503	.607
		1.01-2.00	-4.85000	.062
		2.01-3.00	-3.15076*	.003

The mean differences between the GPA groups of the students regarding the sums of the burnout categories are displayed in Table 4.26. As can be seen in the table, in respect to exhaustion side of the burnout level categories, there is a significant difference between the participants with no GPA and participants who have GPA of 2.01-3.00 (*md*: -2.883, *p*: 0.008). The rest of the GPA groups do not seem to have a statistically significant difference between each other.

For the cynicism side of the burnout levels, the mean difference between the participants who have no GPA and the participants with 2.01-3.00 GPA is -2.462 with a significance level at 0.014. This mean difference and significance level demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference between these two groups. On the other hand, there is no significant difference between the rest of the GPA groups in terms of cynicism.

The eye-catching difference for the professional efficacy category is the mean difference between the group of participants with 2.01-3.00 GPA and the group of participants with 3.01-4.00. The mean difference between these groups is 3.150 with a significance level of 0.003. This result signifies that there is a significant difference between these groups. The rest of the groups do not seem to have a difference in terms of professional efficacy.

#### 4.6.6 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants'

##### Reasons to Choose ELT Department

The reasons to choose ELT department here, as it was stated before, focus on whether the participants chose the ELT department by their own will or with, for example, their families', friends' or teachers' will. The analysis of these data was done by applying one-

way ANOVA with post hoc test to determine the relationship between the reasons to choose the ELT department and the ELT students' burnout levels. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.27.

Table 4.27. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Participants' Reasons to Choose ELT Department*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	I wanted to	My family wanted me to	1.53298	.599
		Other	-2.57831	.085
	My family wanted me to	I wanted to	-1.53298	.599
		Other	-4.11129	.082
	Other	I wanted to	2.57831	.085
		My family wanted me to	4.11129	.082
Cynicism	I wanted to	My family wanted me to	-1.25785	.645
		Other	-4.75130*	.000
	My family wanted me to	I wanted to	1.25785	.645
		Other	-3.49345	.101
	Other	I wanted to	4.75130*	.000
		My family wanted me to	3.49345	.101
Professional Efficacy	I wanted to	My family wanted me to	-2.38106	.220
		Other	-4.19730*	.001
	My family wanted me to	I wanted to	2.38106	.220
		Other	-1.81624	.549
	Other	I wanted to	4.19730*	.001
		My family wanted me to	1.81624	.549

In Table 4.27, it can be seen that in terms of emotional exhaustion, there is no significant difference between the participants who chose the ELT department by their own decision, by their families' decision or guidance and with other reasons such as their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives, acquaintances, physical or emotional reasons.

There is a mean difference of -4.751 between the participants who chose ELT department themselves and the ones who have other reasons influencing them with a significance level of 0.000. This means that there is a meaningful difference between these groups regarding cynicism. Contrarily, there is no meaningful difference between the participants who chose the ELT department by their own decision, by their families' decision or guidance and with other reasons in terms of cynicism.

The mean difference between the ones who chose ELT department with their own will and the ones with other influences to choose the ELT department is -4.197 with a significance level of 0.001. These values show that there is a significant difference between these groups in terms of their professional efficacy. On the other hand, there is no significant difference between the participants who chose the ELT department by their own decision, by their families' decision or guidance and with other reasons in terms of professional efficacy.

#### 4.6.7 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Perspectives of Suitability

The next demographic feature to be analyzed was about the perspectives of the participants about the suitability of the ELT department for themselves. This analysis was done by applying one-way ANOVA with post hoc test to the participants' suitability perspectives and the sums of the burnout categories. The results are displayed in Table 4.28.

Table 4.28. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Perspectives of Suitability*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Exhaustion	Not at all	Not suitable	4.86667	.385
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	7.37132*	.004
		Suitable	8.16625*	.000
		Very suitable	12.34631*	.000
	Not suitable	Not at all	-4.86667	.385
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	2.50465	.753
		Suitable	3.29958	.461
		Very suitable	7.47965*	.003
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	Not at all	-7.37132*	.004
		Not suitable	-2.50465	.753
		Suitable	.79493	.916
		Very suitable	4.97499*	.000
	Suitable	Not at all	-8.16625*	.000
		Not suitable	-3.29958	.461
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	-.79493	.916
		Very suitable	4.18006*	.000
	Very suitable	Not at all	-12.34631*	.000
		Not suitable	-7.47965*	.003
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	-4.97499*	.000
		Suitable	-4.18006*	.000
Cynicism	Not at all	Not suitable	3.06667	.693
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	6.12403*	.007
		Suitable	9.07810*	.000
		Very suitable	12.84226*	.000

(continued)

Table 4.28. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and the Perspectives of Suitability (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
Professional Efficacy	Not suitable	Not at all	-3.06667	.693
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	3.05736	.443
		Suitable	6.01144*	.005
		Very suitable	9.77560*	.000
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	Not at all	-6.12403*	.007
		Not suitable	-3.05736	.443
		Suitable	2.95407*	.003
		Very suitable	6.71823*	.000
	Suitable	Not at all	-9.07810*	.000
		Not suitable	-6.01144*	.005
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	-2.95407*	.003
		Very suitable	3.76416*	.000
	Very suitable	Not at all	-12.84226*	.000
		Not suitable	-9.77560*	.000
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	-6.71823*	.000
		Suitable	-3.76416*	.000
	Not at all	Not suitable	4.20000	.428
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	7.07470*	.002
		Suitable	9.31304*	.000
		Very suitable	12.57431*	.000
	Not suitable	Not at all	-4.20000	.428
		Neither suitable nor not suitable	2.87470	.548
		Suitable	5.11304*	.036
		Very suitable	8.37431*	.000
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	Not at all	-7.07470*	.002
		Not suitable	-2.87470	.548
		Suitable	2.23834	.072
		Very suitable	5.49961*	.000
Suitable	Not at all	-9.31304*	.000	
	Not suitable	-5.11304*	.036	
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	-2.23834	.072	
	Very suitable	3.26127*	.000	
Very suitable	Not at all	-12.57431*	.000	
	Not suitable	-8.37431*	.000	
	Neither suitable nor not suitable	-5.49961*	.000	
	Suitable	-3.26127*	.000	

Table 4.28 shows the perspectives of the participants about the suitability of the ELT department for themselves in terms of their burnout levels. By looking at the table, in terms of emotional exhaustion, it could be seen that the mean difference between the ones who do

not find the ELT department suitable at all and the ones who find the ELT department neither suitable nor not suitable for themselves is 7.371 and the significance level is at 0.004. These values mean that there is a meaningful difference between these groups. Moreover, there are statistically significant differences between the ones who do not find the ELT department suitable at all and the ones who find it suitable for themselves (*md*: 8.166, *p*: 0.000), and between the ones who do not find it suitable at all and the ones who find it very suitable (*md*: 12.346, *p*: 0.000). There are also meaningful differences between the participants answering not suitable and the ones with the answer very suitable (*md*: 7.479, *p*: 0.003), between the participants answering neither suitable nor not suitable and the ones with the answer very suitable (*md*: 4.974, *p*: 0.000) and between the suitable group and the very suitable group (*md*: 4.180, *p*: 0.000). The rest of the groups do not seem to have any difference in terms of emotional exhaustion side of the student burnout.

According to Table 4.28, the groups which have a significant difference between each other in terms of cynicism are: the ones who do not find the ELT department suitable at all and the ones who find it neither suitable nor not suitable for themselves (*md*: 6.124, *p*: 0.007), the ones who do not find it suitable at all and the ones who find it suitable for themselves (*md*: 9.078, *p*: 0.000), the ones who do not find it suitable at all and the ones who find it very suitable (*md*: 12.842, *p*: 0.000), the ones who find the ELT department not suitable for themselves and the ones with the answer suitable (*md*: 6.011, *p*: 0.005), the ones who find the ELT department not suitable for themselves and the ones with the answer very suitable (*md*: 9.775, *p*: 0.000), the participants answering neither suitable nor not suitable and the suitable group (*md*: 2.954, *p*: 0.003), the ones who find it neither suitable nor not suitable for themselves and the very suitable group (*md*: 6.718, *p*: 0.000), and the ones who find it suitable for themselves and the ones with the answer very suitable (*md*: 3.764, *p*: 0.000). The group sets which are not mentioned here do not have any significant difference between each other regarding cynicism.

Another implication from the table is that there is a significant difference between the not suitable at all group and the neither suitable nor not suitable group (*md*: 7.074, *p*: 0.002), the ones who do not find ELT department suitable at all and the ones who find it suitable (*md*: 9.313, *p*: 0.000), the ones who do not find it suitable at all and the ones who find it very suitable (*md*: 12.574, *p*: 0.000), the ones who find the ELT department not suitable for themselves and the suitable group (*md*: 5.113, *p*: 0.036), the ones who find the ELT department not suitable for themselves and the ones with the answer very suitable (*md*: 8.374, *p*: 0.000), the ones who find it neither suitable nor not suitable for themselves and the



ones who find it very suitable ( $md: 5.499, p: 0.000$ ), and the ones who find themselves suitable and very suitable ( $md: 3.261, p: 0.000$ ) regarding their professional efficacy. The rest of the groups which were not mentioned here do not seem to have any statistically significant differences between each other.

#### 4.6.8 Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience

The last variable to be analyzed together with the burnout level categories is the teaching experience of the ELT students. For the analysis of these variables, teaching experiences of the participants were applied one-way ANOVA and examined in terms of sums of each burnout category. The results are shown in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance	
Exhaustion	Said No	0-6 months	2.23169	.080	
		7-12 months	3.05510	.556	
		1-2 years	2.82169	.736	
		2-3 years	-3.08621	.928	
		4-5 years	2.16379	.994	
		6+ years	3.35129	.643	
		Said No	-2.23169	.080	
		7-12 months	.82340	.999	
		0-6 months	1-2 years	.58999	1.000
			2-3 years	-5.31790	.494
			4-5 years	-.06790	1.000
			6+ years	1.11960	.998
	Said No		-3.05510	.556	
	7-12 months	0-6 months	-.82340	.999	
		1-2 years	-.23341	1.000	
		2-3 years	-6.14130	.471	
		4-5 years	-.89130	1.000	
		6+ years	.29620	1.000	
		Said No	-2.82169	.736	
		1-2 years	0-6 months	-.58999	1.000
			7-12 months	.23341	1.000
	2-3 years		-5.90789	.552	
	4-5 years		-.65789	1.000	
	6+ years		.52961	1.000	
	2-3 years	Said No	3.08621	.928	
		0-6 months	5.31790	.494	
		7-12 months	6.14130	.471	
		1-2 years	5.90789	.552	
		4-5 years	5.25000	.876	
		6+ years	6.43750	.479	
	4-5 years	Said No	-2.16379	.994	
		0-6 months	.06790	1.000	
		7-12 months	.89130	1.000	
		1-2 years	.65789	1.000	
		2-3 years	-5.25000	.876	
		6+ years	1.18750	1.000	
					(continued)

Table 4.29. Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience (continued)

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance	
Cynicism	6+ years	Said No	-3.35129	.643	
		0-6 months	-1.11960	.998	
		7-12 months	-.29620	1.000	
		1-2 years	-.52961	1.000	
		2-3 years	-6.43750	.479	
		4-5 years	-1.18750	1.000	
		Said No	0-6 months	.29598	1.000
			7-12 months	-1.15867	.989
			1-2 years	3.65140	.315
			2-3 years	-3.13149	.881
			4-5 years	-2.67316	.970
			6+ years	1.86851	.948
	0-6 months	Said No	-.29598	1.000	
		7-12 months	-1.45464	.968	
		1-2 years	3.35543	.441	
		2-3 years	-3.42747	.832	
		4-5 years	-2.96914	.951	
		6+ years	1.57253	.979	
		7-12 months	Said No	1.15867	.989
			0-6 months	1.45464	.968
			1-2 years	4.81007	.298
			2-3 years	-1.97283	.994
			4-5 years	-1.51449	.999
			6+ years	3.02717	.844
	1-2 years	Said No	-3.65140	.315	
		0-6 months	-3.35543	.441	
		7-12 months	-4.81007	.298	
		2-3 years	-6.78289	.256	
		4-5 years	-6.32456	.472	
		6+ years	-1.78289	.990	
		2-3 years	Said No	3.13149	.881
			0-6 months	3.42747	.832
			7-12 months	1.97283	.994
			1-2 years	6.78289	.256
			4-5 years	-.45833	1.000
			6+ years	5.00000	.659
	4-5 years	Said No	2.67316	.970	
		0-6 months	2.96914	.951	
		7-12 months	1.51449	.999	
		1-2 years	6.32456	.472	
		2-3 years	-.45833	1.000	
		6+ years	4.54167	.831	
6+ years		Said No	-1.86851	.948	
		0-6 months	-1.57253	.979	
		7-12 months	-3.02717	.844	
		1-2 years	1.78289	.990	
		2-3 years	-5.00000	.659	
		4-5 years	-4.54167	.831	
Professional Efficacy	Said No	0-6 months	1.84139	.173	
		7-12 months	3.06808	.471	
		1-2 years	3.81556	.312	
		2-3 years	-.42056	1.000	
		4-5 years	1.70444	.997	
		6+ years	2.49016	.869	

(continued)

Table 4.29. *Results for the Relationship between the Burnout Levels and Teaching Experience (continued)*

Dependent Variable	Group 1	Group 2	Mean Difference	Significance
		Said No	-1.84139	.173
		7-12 months	1.22669	.989
	0-6 months	1-2 years	1.97417	.926
		2-3 years	-2.26194	.977
		4-5 years	-.13694	1.000
		6+ years	.64877	1.000
		Said No	-3.06808	.471
	7-12 months	0-6 months	-1.22669	.989
		1-2 years	.74747	1.000
		2-3 years	-3.48864	.902
		4-5 years	-1.36364	1.000
		6+ years	-.57792	1.000
		Said No	-3.81556	.312
	1-2 years	0-6 months	-1.97417	.926
		7-12 months	-.74747	1.000
		2-3 years	-4.23611	.807
		4-5 years	-2.11111	.996
		6+ years	-1.32540	.999
		Said No	.42056	1.000
	2-3 years	0-6 months	2.26194	.977
		7-12 months	3.48864	.902
		1-2 years	4.23611	.807
		4-5 years	2.12500	.998
		6+ years	2.91071	.970
		Said No	-1.70444	.997
	4-5 years	0-6 months	.13694	1.000
		7-12 months	1.36364	1.000
		1-2 years	2.11111	.996
		2-3 years	-2.12500	.998
		6+ years	.78571	1.000
		Said No	-2.49016	.869
	6+ years	0-6 months	-.64877	1.000
		7-12 months	.57792	1.000
		1-2 years	1.32540	.999
		2-3 years	-2.91071	.970
		4-5 years	-.78571	1.000

In Table 4.29, the mean differences of the teaching experiences of the participants are displayed in terms of the burnout categories. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the teaching experience groups of the participants in terms of emotional exhaustion. Moreover, there is also no statistically significant difference between these groups regarding the cynicism side of the student burnout. In addition to exhaustion and cynicism, there is also not a significant difference between these teaching experience groups and professional efficacy sub-dimension of student burnout.

#### 4.7 Additional Results for the Participants' Burnout Levels and WIP Answers

Although all the research questions were tried to be answered in the previous parts, the participants' burnout levels were not presented individually because the research questions required the comparisons and mean differences between the groups of the study. Besides, the questions in the WIP would provide more information about the motivations of the ELT students for choosing the ELT department and their burnout levels. This would open a new window into the world of English teacher education in Turkish EFL context. Thus, the results deducted from the participants' burnout levels and answers given to the questions in the WIP from the fifth to the tenth question will be presented in this part.

##### 4.7.1 Results for the Burnout Levels of the Participants

As this study investigated the burnout levels of the ELT students, the burnout levels of the participants were given in this part. In this part, the professional efficacy values were not reversed in order to make the interpretation suitable for Bosley's (2004) way of interpretation. The letter *m* used in the presentation of the values in Table 4.30 stands for mean score.

Table 4.30. Mean Scores of the Participants' Burnout Levels

Burnout Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Exhaustion	469	3.3448	1.57662
Cynicism	468	2.3558	1.77777
Professional Efficacy	469	1.8609	1.20389

Table 4.30 shows the mean scores of the participants' burnout level categories. It is seen in the table that the participants' emotional exhaustion mean score is 3.3448, cynicism is 2.3558 and professional efficacy level is 1.8609. When these results were analyzed according to Bosley's (2004) study, it can be seen that the participants' emotional exhaustion levels were high ( $m > 3.2$ ), cynicism levels were also high ( $m > 2.2$ ), and professional efficacy levels were low ( $m < 5.0$ ).

##### 4.7.2 Results for the Fifth Question of the WIP

In the fifth question of the WIP, the reasons for student burnout in the ELT department were asked to the participants. These reasons stated by the participants are classified under 16 different categories. The results are given in Table 4.31.

Table 4.31. *Results for the Reasons of the Burnout in the ELT Department*

Burnout Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
Homework and Assignments	192	27.6
Courses, Lesson Hours	78	11.2
Presentations	61	8.8
Lecturers and Professors	44	6.3
Obligation to Choose ELT, Not Liking ELT	36	5.2
Lesson Schedules, Attendance	31	4.4
Lack of English Competency / Background	25	3.6
Exams	24	3.4
Lack of Motivation / Confidence / Personal Skills	23	3.3
Difficulties of Life	18	2.6
Lack of Success	13	1.8
Lack of Sleep / Personal Life	11	1.6
Expectation and Reality Differences	6	0.9
Worry about the Future	4	0.6
Homesickness	2	0.3
Missing	128	18.4
TOTAL	696	100

In Table 4.31, the burnout reasons given by the participants, frequencies of those answers and their percentages are shown. As some of the participants gave more than one reason for student burnout in ELT department, so the total number in Table 4.31 does not represent the number of the participants. Instead, it reflects the number of the reasons given. According to the table, the most frequent reason for burnout in the ELT department is the difficulty, frequency and abundance of the homework and assignments with the frequency of 192 (27.6%). Participant 395 expressed his / her opinion about the assignments as follows:

*I think the most important reason is assignment overload. Some teachers give too much assignments and this case causes students get stressed too much. Another reason may be that there are too many lessons per day. This may cause students not get enough efficiency from lessons and makes them often tired. (Participant 395)*

This comment refers to the homework and assignments item in Table 4.31. Participant 395 shows the assignments load as the reason for student burnout. In addition, lots of homework is stated to be another reason for student burnout.

The second most mentioned reason is the courses and the lesson hours. The participants who mentioned this reason state that the some of the courses are too difficult to pass and some of them are unnecessary for becoming an English teacher. Moreover, some of the ELT students were observed to find the lesson hours too long. The frequency of this reason is 78 (11.2%). Participant 363 said the following:

*First one is the intensity of the courses. Some lessons are difficult to understand by its very nature... Also, long-course hours make students got bored. Second one is thought that courses do not reflect reality. Sometimes given knowledge does not make sense from student perspective. (Participant 363)*

The comment refers to the courses, lesson hours item in Table 4.31. Participant 363 finds content of some courses difficult. Then, he / she complains about the length of the lessons. Finally, he / she draws attention to the expectation and reality differences.

The third reason which has the most frequency is the presentations. ELT students are given assignments to prepare a presentation and present it in the early semesters of their training. Towards the end of their training, they are supposed to prepare demo lessons and rehearse teaching English in some of their courses. As mentioned by the participants, these presentations may lead to anxiety and worries about grading. Regarding this reason, Participant 345 expressed his / her thoughts as follows:

*Doing many presentations. I know we have to do it for being better teachers but they are too many. (Participant 345)*

This comment leads us to the presentation item in Table 4.31. Participant 345 thinks that the ELT students have to do many presentations for their teaching skills.

Lecturers and professors are another point for ELT students who consider them as the reason for the burnout because the frequency of the participants who consider lecturers and professors as a reason for their burnout is 44 (6.3%). About this reason, Participant 70 says that the reason for burnout is:

*teachers if they are unable to teach effectively. (Participant 70)*

Participant 70 refers to the lecturers at the ELT department which is the fourth item in Table 4.31 and the opinion that some of them cannot teach effectively.

Some ELT students do not choose the ELT department with their own will as the previous results show. They may choose this department because their university entrance exam points are not enough for the departments they desire; their families may force them to choose the ELT department or they may lose their interest in the major. Thus, the fifth most frequent reason they mentioned is obligation to choose the ELT department or not liking it with the frequency of 36 (5.2%). To support this reason, Participant 93 explains:

*... I didn't want to be an English teacher and I am still not sure ... (Participant 93)*

S/he refers to the fifth most frequent reason in Table 4.31: Obligation to choose ELT, not liking ELT. S/he states that s/he is not sure of the department s/he chose.

### 4.7.3. Results for the Sixth Question of the WIP

The sixth question in WIP was about the perspectives of the ELT students about their instructors and their attitude towards burnout. The participants were asked if their instructors took student burnout into account and gave them enough guidance about it. The results regarding these perspectives are indicated in Table 4.32.

Table 4.32. *Results for the Instructors' Attitudes towards the Burnout*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	69	14.7
No	215	45.7
Yes and No	12	2.6
Some of them	33	7.0
Missing	141	30.0
TOTAL	470	100

Table 4.32 demonstrates the participants' perspectives about their instructors in terms of student burnout and if they give enough instruction about it with the frequencies and percentages of each answer category.

The frequency of the participants who think that their instructors take student burnout into account and give enough instruction about it is 69 (14.7%). Participant 106 states about these thoughts as follows:

*... the instructors give enough information about it and thanks to the instructs they have given us we get rid of the feeling of burned. (Participant 106)*

With this comment, Participant 106 explains that he / she is contented about the instructions given about student burnout by the instructors.

As the most frequent answer, the participants do not think that their instructors care about their burnout levels or give any instruction about it. Participant 128 supports this claim by saying as follows:

*...They just want to do their class and go. Even some of them do not give breaks and that makes us feel more burnt out. (Participant 128)*

Participant 128 states that the lecturers at the ELT department do not care about the ELT students' burnout.

Some of the participants think that the instructors take the student burnout into account; yet, they give no instruction about it or do nothing even though they consider the effects of student burnout. Therefore, *Yes* and *No* in the table is to shorten this explanation. Participant 399 states about this topic as in the following:

*They didn't talk about that issue with us. But, they tolerate our mistakes in gentle way. (Participant 399)*

Participant 399 says that the instructors in ELT department do not give enough instruction about student burnout; however, they take student burnout into account.

*Some of them* phrase in Table 4.32 means that some of the participants' instructors consider student burnout, act accordingly and give enough instructions about it, but the others do not. The frequency of this answer is 12 (2.6%). Participant 373 supports his / her answer as follows:

*... some instructors make some changes about the assignments such as date, priority or some features of the task. They even make some changes about the exams and try to create an enjoyable and relax classroom environment. Some instructors unfortunately don't and stick to their own rules and make us feel like they don't have any empathy. (Participant 373)*

It is explained here that some of the instructors take student burnout into account although any instruction about it is not mentioned while some of the instructors do not take it into account.

#### 4.7.4 Results for the Seventh Question of the WIP

The seventh question of the WIP was *Do you plan to have an M.A. degree (Master's degree) or Ph.D. (Doctorate degree) degree in the ELT Department? Why?* The aim of this question was to find out if ELT students still have the motivation and a little to no burnout to pursue a further education in ELT department. The answers given to this question are displayed in Table 4.33.

Table 4.33. *Results for Motivation and Burnout to Continue Further Education*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	163	34.7
No	235	50.0
Ambivalent / No sure	38	8.1
Missing	34	7.2
TOTAL	470	100

Table 4.33 shows the frequency and the percentage of the answers given to the seventh question of the WIP which asks if the participants are willing to keep studying in ELT department for an M.A or Ph.D. degree. One hundred and sixty-three (34.7%) participants answered this question positively. The participants' reasons for pursuing further education are given below.

*... I can improve myself better and I can find a better job. (Participant 5)*



Positive features of an M.A. or Ph.D. degree are emphasized here with the features of opportunities for self-improvement and finding a better job.

*...teaching in university is better than high school or elementary. (Participant 12)*

Participant 12 draws attention to the job opportunities an M.A. or Ph.D. degree may provide.

*... in our country there are some problems in our ways of teaching English and I think, I can learn new ideas to solve these problems. (Participant 331)*

Participant 331 thinks positively that she can find ideas to solve the problems in ELT department by getting an M.A. or Ph.D. degree.

The majority of the participants, as can be seen in Table 4.33, do not have the will to move on for postgraduate education ( $n: 235, 50\%$ ). They seem to have different reasons not to continue. Some of these reasons are presented below.

*... I have always wanted to be an english teacher. (Participant 158)*

Participant 158 states that s/he does not have a plan for further education or becoming an academician or a researcher.

*I think that's a waste of time. Also the examples and the results of it would be more competition and more research. Well, I'd like to learn more but the atmosphere in there is unnecessarily tense. Currently I'm doing celt-p and I'd like to pursue that. (Participant 405)*

Participant 405 does not consider an M.A. or Ph.D. degree necessary for becoming a good English teacher. Instead, s/he thinks that s/he can improve himself / herself in this field with the help of other programs such as CELT-P.

*... I do not believe that I can be successful in these degrees. Because obtaining a master's degree requires a significant time and financial commitment. Time commitment can also be extremely draining. While part-time programs are certainly an option, juggling work, family and other activities can be difficult while attending graduate school. The master's degree typically takes two to four years to complete, but a Ph.D. takes an average of 8.2 years to finish. This is very difficult to manage, especially if there are other commitments such as family and work. (Participant 474)*

It is explained here that further education requires time and finances to maintain. Participant 474 is concerned that s/he may not have time for any other activities in his/her life if s/he starts a further education mean.

Some of the participants are not sure if they want to pursue postgraduate education or some of them only want to get M.A. degree in ELT department. The number of participants who think in this way is 38 (8.1%). They support their thoughts with these sentences:

*For now I don't but maybe in the future it can be. I can try to M.A degree when I have enough confident myself. (Participant 106)*

Participant 106 appears not to have any plans to have such a degree for now. Yet, s/he still leaves the door open for further education with his/her last sentence in this comment.

*Maybe, depending on the situation and requirements of the time when I will have graduate.*

(Participant 278)

Participant 278 hesitates to make firm conclusions due to changing situations after graduation.

#### 4.7.5 Results for the Eighth Question of the WIP

The emotions a student feels every day would probably provide an opinion in terms of student burnout. Therefore, the participants were asked about how they felt when they thought about morning/afternoon and evening classes. The answers given by the participants were analyzed under three categories namely morning, afternoon and evening. Moreover, there are three sub-categories under these times of the day which are positive, negative and ambivalent describing the opinions of the ELT students. The results are shown in Table 4.34.

Table 4.34. *Results for Feelings of the Participants towards Morning / Afternoon / Evening Classes*

Time of the day	Opinion	Frequency	Percentage
Morning	Positive	83	8.6
	Negative	224	23.0
	Ambivalent	62	6.4
Afternoon	Positive	95	9.8
	Negative	130	13.3
	Ambivalent	57	5.9
Evening	Positive	82	8.5
	Negative	107	11.0
	Ambivalent	54	5.6
Missing		77	7.9
TOTAL		971	100

In Table 4.34, the emotions which participants feel in the morning, afternoon and evening are given with the categories of the feelings such as positive, negative and ambivalent. The table also includes the frequencies and the percentages of these categories and times of the days. The total frequency in the table does not show the total number of the participants in the study. Instead, it shows the number of answers given for each time of the day.

Table 4.34 demonstrates that the time of the day which arouse the most positive feelings and thoughts is the afternoons ( $n$ : 95, 9.8%). However, the other times of the day have a quite close percentage to the afternoons in terms of positive feelings (morning

positive  $n$ : 83, 8.6%; evening positive  $n$ : 82, 8.5%). Participant 352 expresses his / her thoughts about the afternoon classes as in the following:

*I don't like morning classes, so I prefer late classes. When I wake up early, I can't focus on classes because I'm sleepy. Afternoon classes are more productive for me.* (Participant 352)

Participant 352 states some negative thoughts about morning classes because s/he has problems focusing on the lessons caused by his / her sleepiness. However, s/he states positive feelings towards afternoon classes and claims that s/he becomes more productive and effective in the afternoon classes.

The most negative-feeling-arousing time of the day, according to Table 4.34, is morning classes with a frequency of 224 (23.0%). This means that the majority of the participants do not like the morning classes or the morning classes make them experience negative emotions. As Participant 146 claims:

*... afternoon and evening classes are better than the morning classes because learners may have sleep problems and they may be late for the class because of oversleeping.* (Participant 146)

S/he refers to the sleeping problems and feeling sleepy in the mornings. The other times of the days do not arouse negative feelings as much as morning classes do (afternoon negative  $n$ : 130, 13.3%; evening negative  $n$ : 107, 11.0%). Yet, it is obvious from the Table 4.34 that the most frequent feeling seems to be the negative feelings among all the others.

There were also some participants who state that their emotions depend on their own mood or that of the lecturers. Moreover, there were some participants who have changing feelings at a certain time of a day. In addition, there were the ones who think they are okay and the ones who gave both positive and negative answers together. Thus, these participants are gathered under the category ambivalent. The number of the ambivalent answers for the mornings was 62 (6.4%), for the afternoon, it was 57 (5.9%) and for the evening lessons, it was 54 (5.6%). The percentages of these answers for each time of the day are pretty close to each other. For an ambivalent answer example, Participant 281 says:

*I'm ... tired and exhausted every time of my busy days. But I feel happy and peaceful because I'm in the part I want to be in the remaining days.* (Participant 281)

S/he explains that both positive feelings such as happiness and peacefulness, and negative feelings such as tiredness and exhaustion are experienced at the same time. Further, Participant 324 explains:

*Depending on the lesson program the time of the classes may affect my progress. I mean if I have 3 or more classes I can't enjoy attending evening classes. Also some morning classes can be stressful if they need extra effort to do.* (Participant 324)

Participant 324 states that his / her emotions depend on the lesson intensity of the certain days, the number of courses s/he attends during a day and also the amount of effort required for different lessons.

#### 4.7.6 Results for the Ninth Question of the WIP

When the students' personal accomplishment level decreases, the participation of the students in learning activities reduces as well (Kılavuz, 2006). Therefore, the ninth question which aims to gather data about effective participation of the ELT students may provide some sound data about this phenomenon. The results about the answers from this question are shown below in Table 4.35.

Table 4.35. *Results for the Effective Participation of the Participants*

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	228	48.5
No	130	27.7
Sometimes	55	11.7
Missing	57	12.1
TOTAL	470	100

Table 4.35 indicates the frequency and percentages of the participants' effective participation in the lessons. According to the table, 228 (48.5%) participants claim that they make effective participation in the lessons. Participant 388 says:

*I try to actively listen %90 of the time and I read what we are going to talk about in the class beforehand because our instructor wants us to write a question about it. I think this method is very good. Normally there is no reason for me to read before coming to class but this method even though demanding, is also really good at encouraging students to check up on the subject. (Participant 388)*

Participant 388 explains that she participates effectively in the lessons and adds that normally she is not prepared before the lessons but due to the strategy of the instructor, s/he has to have a look at the upcoming topic before the lesson, which increases her preparation and participation.

On the other hand, the ones who cannot participate effectively due to some reasons are 130 (27.7%) ELT students. The participants who stated that they did not participate effectively utilize these sentences to mention their reasons for not participating:

*... I ... understand nearly all written things but I can't speak efflulently so I don't prefer to speak in the classroom or crowded. I understand the person who is speaking but I couldn't speak so I don't attend. (Participant 42)*

Participant 42 seems to have problems at speaking in a foreign language and gives this as a reason for his / her participation effectiveness.

*Due to my social anxiety I don't want to actively participate in ELT classes (My pronunciation is also another reason) (Participant 145)*

The reasons for Participant 145 not to participate in the lessons effectively are stated to be the personal characteristics and speaking problems in a foreign language.

*I don't like answering easy questions that everybody can answer ... (Participant 278)*

Participant 278 explains his / her reason for not participating effectively as the personal preference of not answering the easy questions.

There are also some students who sometimes participate and sometimes do not depending on the course, lecturer or time of the day. The frequency of the participants in this group was 55 (11.7%). The participants who gave this answer say similar to this participant's answer:

*I am trying to be effective participant all the time ... but sometimes I feel shy to talk in the classes. (Participant 285)*

This participant states the reason as his / her personal characteristics. However, he / she puts some effort to be participative in the lessons.

*In some of them i do. But not in most of them because they are completely teacher-centered. (Participant 296)*

Participant 296 complains about the teacher-centeredness of the lessons. Yet, apparently, for the student-centered lessons, s/he participates effectively in the lessons.

#### **4.7.7 Results for the Tenth Question of the WIP**

The tenth question of the WIP was *Do you have any other comments about your motivation to choose the ELT Department and student burnout? Please specify.* The aim of this question was to find out if the participants have any more thoughts and perspectives about the motivation to choose the ELT department and student burnout. This way, the participants could have given the researcher a different point of view which was not noticed before. The participants shared their ideas about their motivations for choosing the ELT department and student burnout, and they also gave some suggestions for their departments which they find useful, and some of these are shared below:

*It has always been my dream to choose ELT. That was my major motivation. Student burnout is something which all of the student can not avoid to feel. But actually studying so much and feeling burnout will probably help them to achieve their goals. (Participant 11)*

This participant made comments for both motivations and student burnout. He / she states that he / she chose this department very willingly, suggested that burnout is in the nature of academic success and adds that spending effort is likely to help reach personal goals.

*I had an English teacher who motivated me to choose ELT department. (Participant 16)*

In this comment, it is seen that a previous English teacher motivated the participant to choose ELT department, which shows the effect of a model teacher on at student's preferences.

*I find English teaching is enjoyable and I want to teach new perspective and ideas which are my own's ideas. I want to understand other peoples who live in abroad or in the other countries. I want to communicate in effective way. (Participant 42)*

This participant finds English teaching enjoyable and wants to share his/her own opinions. Besides, s/he would like to be involved in intercultural communication and communicate fluently.

*I think the hours of classes must be smartly chosen for every day so that the students will not be uncomfortable. There shouldn't be classes more than 6 hours a day and the hours must not be early. The number of students in a class must be the same. It must not exceed 20 students per class. (Participant 54)*

Participant 54 suggests some solutions to his / her department for avoiding student burnout in this comment in terms of the number of class hours and classroom size.

*Please, cancel the "attendance is a must" rule. Don't force us to choose the lessons that we don't want to take. And please take a look at the education courses. (Participant 77)*

Participant 77 states that the reasons for student burnout are compulsory attendance, compulsory lessons and the course contents.

*If you want to teach something, you should be sure you know it first and have confidence for it, so as an English teacher candidates, we need encourage. Maybe our teachers take this problem into account and help us. (Participant 85)*

This participant draws attention to self-confidence need of pre-service teachers and guidance of the lecturers for a more effective teaching environment.

*I think the best way to feel motivated and overcome student burnout is doing meditation and taking time for yourself, to relax it helps me :) (Participant 98)*

A suggestion for avoiding or getting over student burnout is given by the Participant 98 in this comment. S/he suggests feeling motivated, doing meditation, setting aside time for himself/herself and relaxing to avoid the negative effects of student burnout.

*To prevent the student burnout our department should arrange some activities that can help us to improve ourselves. With the help of these activities we also won't feel exhausted and burned about the some lessons and some classes. (Participant 106)*

Another suggestion to prevent the ELT students from student burnout was done by the Participant 106 in this comment as arranging some activities by their department.

*I read a lot to improve myself informally. Formal education is not enough at all. Although sometimes, mostly, feel desperate, what else can I do except carrying on? Illumination is reached through darkness. (Participant 124)*

Participant explains his / her despair which may lead to burnout in this example but s/he states that formal education is not enough to overcome student burnout and s/he refers to reading a lot for personal improvement. S/he also states that one goes through some hard times before reaching personal goals.

*I think we all need more guidance about what to do during college and after it. Also we need guidance about how to deal with this exhaustion. (Participant 161)*

Similar to Participant 85, this participant also mentions the need for the guidance to cope with exhaustion.

*It's my thirth month in ELT. I haven't burnout yet. The one important reason about my motivation to choose the ELT is wanting to go abroad and being able to work there as a teacher. (Participant 215)*

Participant 215 states that his / her motivation for choosing the ELT department as the opportunity to work abroad and the short time period in this department helped him/her not to feel burnout yet.

*Elt should be chosen because it feels a person precious and different in the life. I really believe a language is another person and I hope including me, we all will be future's well-trained teachers. (Participant 224)*

This participant thinks that being a language teacher makes someone different and valuable and hopes to become a well-trained teacher in the feature.

*Actually I think students have right to choose but we can not choose the classes that we attend or the teacher for these classes. It is an important factor for motivation and our assignments make us tired. (Participant 283)*

In this comment, Participant 283 shows the compulsory courses, assignments, and the lack of choice to choose the lecturer as the reasons for student burnout.

*In my first years, I hate my department because I didn't choose myself. I had higher score than this university I could have become a translator that was my dream. I learned that life don't give us everything that we want and everything has a reason. Now, I am 3th grade student, I feel like I can be a good teacher. I love my department so much that I am thinking about have an M.A degree. (Participant 356)*

Participant 356 tells his / her story about how he / she liked or accepted ELT department although he / she did not like it in the beginning. Although s/he wanted a different department and got the opportunity to do so due to his/her university exam score, s/he had to study at this department. However, in the course of time, s/he started to have more favorable attitudes towards the department. This quotation may be a good example to show

the positive change in the attitudes of an ELT student thanks to the positive experiences gained in the department.

*I studied science in high school but my English teacher always supported me and saw that I am able to learn this language and even furthermore he saw that I'm successful. His words, his attitude and his approach toward me changed everything. He encouraged me, opened my eyes and helped me to see that no matter where I am, no matter what people say I can achieve anything I want despite all the unfavorable conditions. Since the day one, I know I am here in ELT department thanks to him and his well guiding skills. (Participant 373)*

Similar to participant 16, this participant also shows how an English teacher can change the life and decisions of a student in a positive way via guidance and encouragement despite a different department s/he studied at high school.

*I want to change my students life by teaching different things. I feel comfortable when I achieve my goals. I enjoy researching information about new materials, approach the acquisition process of language. Thanks to these information we can make our lesson more effective, enjoyable. Students need to enjoy when learning sth, I want to teach interesting way and they don't afraid making mistakes. (Participant 401)*

Participant 401 mentions his / her own motivations for choosing the ELT department and the gains from the ELT department. S/he seems to change his/her future students' lives and conduct enjoyable, effective lessons by using different materials, and s/he makes some research about how to achieve these goals.

*As long as we believe that coming to lessons and listening people in our seats without actually learning anything there will be no motivation to talk about. I don't think, in this university nobody is helping anybody to make us better English teachers. Everybody comes into the classroom, feel bored and annoyed to go home with several assignments having no idea what to do. We don't have real-life examples. How are we supposed to learn anything from that? ((Participant 405)*

Participant 405 criticizes his / her department in terms of the quality of the courses and assignments. She also states her hopelessness about the ELT department due to lack of motivation, help, guidance and real-life examples at university.

As can be seen in the quotes presented above, the participants mentioned additional motivations for choosing ELT department and some reasons for student burnout. Some of these comments were positive while some of them were negative. Besides, there were some comments which suggest solutions to student burnout. It was seen that the participants have internal, external and altruistic reasons for choosing ELT department. They mentioned that their motivations were a model teacher who guided them to this department, the affection towards the language and communication, the desire to work abroad, and opportunity to change the society or students' thoughts. Some of the participants also mentioned their



stories for choosing the ELT department and how they liked it even though they did not like it in the beginning. Moreover, the reasons for burnout were mentioned to be compulsory attendance and lessons, insufficiency of formal education, assignments, and inflexibility to choose the desired courses and lecturers. Further, they suggested some ways to avoid or get over student burnout. These suggestions were doing meditation, focusing more on the success and courses, guidance from the lecturers and professors, seminars and activities for providing information about student burnout and how to avoid student burnout.

## CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the discussions and conclusions of the findings for the research questions will be presented under different parts. In addition to the research question, the additional results from the WIP will also be discussed and concluded.

### 5.1 Discussion and Conclusion of the Most Frequent Motivations for the ELT Students to Choose ELT Department

It would be beneficial to remember the first research question in the beginning:

1. What is the most frequent motivation for the participant ELT students to choose ELT Department?

According to the quantitative analysis results, the most frequent motivation leading the ELT students to choose the ELT department was *English is an international language and is spoken everywhere* ( $n: 435, 95\%$ ). As is known, English is the lingua franca (Firth, 1990) or the international language (Jenkins, 2009), which means communicating in English in a case where both speakers' first language is not English (Ellis, 2008), and it is known as the international contact language (Canagarajah, 2006). Thus, 1.75 billion people speak English all across the world for the commercial, political and communicative purposes (British Council, 2013). Therefore, an ELT candidate may want to choose this department for the purpose of learning the language and becoming a world citizen and/or teaching it to the ones who want to be a world citizen, too. On the other hand, this motivation in the QoM was not supported by the analysis results of the WIP. However, a few participants mentioned that English is the lingua franca, global language or communication language which takes the 19<sup>th</sup> place out of 30 with the frequency of 5 (1.1%). In a study conducted in an ELT context, Kyriacou and Kobori (1998) found that global language feature of English, the importance of a foreign language in professions, English for further education were the most frequent motivations for choosing the ELT department among the EFL learners while the most frequent motivations for ELT pre-service teachers were affection towards the subject, importance of English worldwide, the will to help young learners and the varied work pattern of the job.

Speaking English can provide me with other opportunities was the second most frequent motivation for the ELT students ( $n: 441, 94.2\%$ ). This motivation refers to the job, further education or financial opportunities. Actually, this may sound disappointing to some ears because teachers are the ones that can make a difference in the society with their ability

and their light (Richardson & Watt, 2007). However, the ELT students seem to choose this profession for opportunities ‘other’ than teaching and affecting the forthcoming generations. Moreover, the quantitative analysis results which include job opportunities as a motivation in the fourth place support this motivation to some extent. Many ELT students choose this department because they want a paid and secure job instead of really contributing to the society or their students’ lives.

The results showed that the third most pursued motivation was *I want to speak English like my native language* in the quantitative analysis results ( $n: 440, 93.8\%$ ). This motivation was also supported by the qualitative analysis results whose third most frequent motivation was their interest in learning English / other languages (i.e. Spanish, Japanese, Russian) ( $n: 46, 9.8\%$ ). For this reason, it can be said that some of the ELT students who chose the ELT department consider ELT department as a place to learn or improve English. The reason for the ELT students to think that they can learn English in the ELT department may be due to the social attitude towards the department. Furthermore, the reason for the ELT students to expect their departments to teach English could be that they do not get enough language education especially in terms of language skills such as speaking, writing and listening before enrolling a university (Fahmy & Bilton, 1992; Murdoch 1994). This is also the case for the Turkish ELT students (Köksal & Ulum, 2019).

The fourth most frequent motivation to choose the ELT department was *I would like to understand written or spoken texts in English on my own* for the quantitative analysis results ( $n: 437, 93.8\%$ ). However, this motivation does not gain enough support from the qualitative analysis results. Yet, it could be stimulating to discuss the qualitative results as it has a high frequency. It may be a natural and logical expectation from an ELT department to improve its students’ English skills because low competency in English may cause negative effects on teaching English to young learners, adolescents and/or adults (Penn-Edwards, 2010). Another point that needs mentioning here is that there is a perspective supporting that a real English teacher should be a native-speaker, and a native-speaker is a better teacher than an English teacher with pedagogical knowledge on learning a second language and teaching it (Phillipson, 1992). However, this claim was rejected by Canagarajah (1999) and he suggested that a non-native speaker with pedagogical knowledge and background on learning a foreign language can also teach English as well as or better than a native-speaker.

*Our country needs a high number of well-educated English language teachers* was the fifth most frequent motivation for choosing the ELT department in the quantitative

analysis results ( $n: 437, 93.8\%$ ). This motivation is also reinforced to some extent with the qualitative analysis results. The fifth most frequent answer the participants gave was the dream to learn or teach English / becoming an English teacher with the frequency of 31 (6.6%). However, when the more closely corresponding answer which was to help / change / improve the country was taken into account, there may not be that much of support behind that motivation. The rank of the last answer was 14<sup>th</sup> out of 30 answers and its frequency was eight (1.7%). Anyways, it has been discussed in Atmaca's (2016) study that our country needs competent and qualified teachers for the betterment of the English language proficiency of the ESL/EFL learners in our country. Thus, this idealistic and patriotic approach to the ELT training could constitute a strong and serious motivation for choosing the ELT department.

In addition to the motivations discussed above, it can be said, in terms of motivation categories, that the first and second most frequent motivations, respectively *English is an international language and is spoken everywhere* and *Speaking English can provide me with other opportunities* were extrinsic reasons as they refer to the awareness of the advantages of speaking English (Subaşı, 2010). Moreover, third and fourth most frequent motivations were, respectively, *I want to speak English like my native language* and *I would like to understand written or spoken texts in English on my own*, which were intrinsic motivations since they focus on interest in English and personal development or satisfaction (Subaşı, 2010). Besides, the last most frequent motivation was *Our country needs a high number of well-educated English language teachers* which is an altruistic motivation as it is about the betterment of the society. Therefore, it can be said that the most frequent motivations were extrinsic motivations which were followed by intrinsic reasons. However, Bergmark et al. (2018) found that pre-service teachers' intrinsic and altruistic motivations were more frequent than their extrinsic motivations. Yet, this study was conducted on Swiss pre-service teachers from different subject areas. In another study, Younger et al. (2004) found that pre-service teachers choose teaching profession due to the affection towards the subject matter, which is a moralistic motivation. In, Boz and Boz's (2008) study taking place in Turkish context, it was found that pre-service teachers chose teaching career with intrinsic reasons. In another study conducted in Turkish context, Yüce et al. (2013) found that extrinsic and altruistic motivations were higher than the intrinsic ones. Thus, it can be implied from these results that the motivations for choosing teaching profession differ from country to country, which may also mean that motivations can change according to social and financial conditions of pre-service teachers.

To sum up, the reasons leading the ELT students to choose ELT department were about English being the lingua franca, the opportunities it provides, improving their language skills and the well-educated English teacher need in a nutshell. In the light of these results, some implications were fathomed out. The ELT students want to become a world citizen instead of only a Turkish citizen. However, they want it for themselves and for the opportunities instead of contributing to the society or the world. In another word, they choose the ELT department with intrinsic and extrinsic motivations more than altruistic motivations (Barmby, 2006), which is not in line with Brown's (1992) study in which the ELT students were found to choose this department with primarily altruistic reasons. In another study, King (1993) found that the most popular reasons among the pre-service English teachers to choose this profession were mostly the altruistic and intrinsic motivations. Moreover, they have a thought that they can learn English in ELT department and there are some evidences that they improve some of their English language skills in the ELT department (Çetinavcı & Yavuz, 2011). The reasons for these are considered to be because of the society's attitudes towards ELT department and due to the insufficient language education in the former educational institutions, so some studies investigating these phenomena would be beneficial for the literature in ELT field. Furthermore, it can be inferred from the discussions that ELT student candidates can be encouraged to choose this department by stating that there is a need for competent English teachers in Turkey. Lastly, Su et al. (2001) found out that some students prefer ELT department for the facilities such as salary, job security, prestige, and opportunities for advancing in the career. This study has some points in common which are the job security and opportunities. Yet, it seems that there are differences in terms of the prestige of the profession and advancement in the career.

## **5.2 Discussion and Conclusion of the Difference among the Grades of ELT Students Regarding Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department**

As the years pass, the generations of the young population tend to change. Each year's generation may have a different field of interests, different thoughts and emotions or different motivation levels than each other. Thence, there was a need to investigate the motivation levels of each grade in order to find out if there are any differences between these grades. In this way, it will be possible to see the changes in terms of motivation levels of the students for choosing the ELT department.

The results showed that for the general motivation levels to choose English language teaching career, there is only an important difference between the 1<sup>st</sup> graders and the 3<sup>rd</sup>

graders in terms of their motivation levels ( $md: 0.16959, p: 0.018$ ). It can be implied from these results that the freshmen ELT students may have a little higher level of motivation levels to choose the ELT department than the juniors. Therefore, it can be said that the junior participants do not seem to be as willing as the other students in terms of their general motivation mean scores. As a result, it will reveal more information and insight about this topic if there is a research study about it.

The students may start a major with fresh and intense motivations; yet, a better vision to the motivation levels of the students could be provided by their perseverance to pursue a career in the ELT world. The results from the qualitative analysis showed that the freshmen have the lowest motivation to keep on studying in ELT department ( $n: 109, 69.4\%$ ). The numbers in the parenthesis indicate the negative answers given to the related question in the WIP. On the other hand, the percentages of the rest of the grades who answered the question positively are quite close to each other with 38.7%; 37.4% and 33.0%, respectively. The reason why the freshmen have less motivation level to keep on could be the participants who did not choose the ELT department by their own wills. This discussion can also be supported by the percentages of the further grades because the freshmen may drop off the department seeing that the department is not suitable for them or the ones with positive thoughts towards moving on could see that they are suitable for the department.

After all, the only difference in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department was between only the freshmen and juniors and the freshmen seem to have more motivation levels than the juniors. However, in the qualitative results, majority of the freshmen do not want to continue their education and the reason for this might be their wrong choice for their major. In a similar study, Subaşı (2010) found out that there is a general significant difference between the mean scores of the motivations between the second and fourth, and third and fourth grades. In another study, Lee, Kang and Park (2019) did not find any significant difference between the grades in terms of motivations for choosing teaching career except for the task demand dimension of motivations, which can be explained with the desire for becoming an expert in their career. The task demand of the juniors and seniors was found to be higher than the freshmen and sophomores. Based on these results and comparisons, it can be said that the motivations of the ELT students for choosing the ELT department change according to the context, sample's characteristics and the grades.

### **5.3 Discussion and Conclusion of the Differences among the ELT Students Regarding the Effect and Level of Student Burnout in Terms of Their Grade**

Some of the ELT students start a major with high motivations as can be remembered from the results of the quantitative analysis results for the motivations levels of each grade. However, keeping these motivations could get harder as the years pass in the same department depending on the expectations and ideals of the students (Dworkin et al., 2003; Freudenberger, 1974; Pines, 1993). Therefore, investigating the burnout levels of these students would contribute to the research studies in ELT field.

The quantitative analysis results revealed that in terms of emotional exhaustion, the burnout level of the juniors were higher than the freshmen (*md*: 2.56978) while the exhaustion level of the sophomores were even higher than the freshmen (*md*: 3.78261). Moreover, the exhaustion levels of the seniors were lower than the other grades especially sophomores and juniors (seniors: -0.81522, sophomores: -4.59782, juniors: -3.38500). The reason for the emotional exhaustion to be higher in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade could be that the ELT students start to take their ELT field-specific courses such as Approaches in English Language Teaching, Fundamental Aspects of English Language Teaching, Methodology in the Area of Specialization: Grammar / Reading / Listening / Speaking / Writing Teaching and Contemporary Approaches to English Language Teaching (Anadolu University [AÜ], 2020; Pamukkale University [PAÜ], 2019). When some of the ELT students meet the real face of the ELT department and realize that the department is much more than learning English, their expectations may not correspond with the reality of the department. Moreover, another reason for the exhaustion might be the negative perspective of the ELT students towards the courses which some of them find unnecessary or irrelevant to ELT studies.

Another statistically important finding from the quantitative analysis results was that the depersonalization side of the student burnout was higher for the sophomores than the freshmen (*md*: 3.27503). On the other hand, there was no meaningful difference among the rest of the grades. As depersonalization is felt more when the emotional exhaustion is high (Leiter & Maslach, 1988), less cynicism among the groups may happen because the level of emotional exhaustion does not come to a level that could affect the level of depersonalization. Moreover, another reason could be the less stressful human relation experiences. In that, they have not yet faced their own students and their parents, or felt the pressure coming from the school management, students, their parents, or their peers. They only cope with their lecturers who really try to train them, their families and their peer pre-

service classmates mostly. That may be the reason why they do not have such a high level of cynicism.

For the professional efficacy dimension of student burnout, there seems to be no meaningful difference between the grades of the ELT students. Therefore, the absence of differences between the grade groups supports the Leiter and Maslach's (1988) claim which suggests that high level of depersonalization also causes low professional efficacy.

When the qualitative analysis results are examined, it is seen that the freshmen have the least level of (24.8%) student burnout while the juniors have the highest level (60.0%). The burnout levels of the sophomores and seniors are quite close to each other (sophomores: 41.1%; seniors: 47.2%) which are higher than the sophomores and lower than the juniors. Though the sophomores had higher burnout levels according to the quantitative analysis results, the juniors also had higher burnout levels than the freshmen and seniors. This difference between both analysis results could be due to the fact that MBI-SS focuses on different categories of student burnout while the related WIP questions adopt a more holistic analysis approach. The reason for the juniors to have a higher level of burnout could be because they prepare lesson plans for the teaching the language skills and they are doing demo lessons, which means that they have to deal with a lot of assignment load, and presentation preparation processes are also mentioned as the reason for their burnout.

In sum, according to the results from quantitative and qualitative results combined together, the sophomores and juniors seem to be the ones with higher burnout levels than the the rest of the grades. There have not been found any significant difference between grades of the ELT students regarding the depersonalization and professional efficacy dimension of the student burnout. The emotional exhaustion levels are higher for these groups because the sophomores have just met the courses related to English language teaching and maybe, their motivations and expectations did not match with the facilities of their department. The reason for the juniors to have a higher degree of burnout was discussed to be because of the increase in the juniors' homework load and stress related to demo lessons.

#### **5.4 Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the ELT Student's Motivations for Choosing the ELT Department and Burnout Levels**

According to Maslach and Leiter (1997), people start a work or study with a burst of motivation, idealism and energy; yet, their energy, enthusiasm and engagement tend to decrease and transform into negative feelings as they experience burnout. Therefore, the sixth question focuses on the relation between motivations for choosing the ELT department



and student burnout. The aim of this question is to find out if the initial motivations affect student burnout or vice versa.

The results regarding the relation between initial motivations to choose a major in ELT department and student burnout showed that there is a significant negative relation between the motivations and all category of the student burnout ( $p < .001$ ). The results indicate that the emotional exhaustion of the participants tend to decrease as the motivation level increases ( $r: -.233$ ). The same interpretation is also valid for the cynicism dimension of the student burnout ( $r: -.341$ ). The highest negative relation is found between the motivations and professional efficacy ( $r: -.508$ ). These results, especially the last one, supports Maslach and Leiter's (1997) claim that, in this instance, the students tend to lose their professional efficacy sense by being exposed to burnout as the students start with high motivations and expectations.

In conclusion, there is a significant negative relation between student burnout and ELT students' motivations for choosing their department. The reason for the negative relation between these variables is in line with Maslach and Leiter's (1997) study. The study which was also supported by the current study claims that as the students or workers have a high motivation to start a job or a school, they tend to lose their interest in their job or school when they face bad experiences which may cause burnout.

### **5.5 Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Motivations for Choosing ELT Department**

The relation between gender, age groups, graduated high school types, weekly lesson hours, GPA, reason to choose the ELT departments, perspective about suitability of the department, teaching experience and motivations for choosing the ELT department were examined for the seventh research question. The seventh question was:

5. Is there any relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their motivations for choosing ELT Department?

Discussion of these results are given in separate paragraphs and the conclusion for these discussions will be presented in the last paragraph.

When the differences between the female and male participants in terms of their initial motivations were examined, there was found to be a mean difference of 0.15047 with a significance level of 0.001 which means that there is a significant difference between these gender groups. It was found that the females have a higher motivation level to choose ELT department than the males. These results are supported by earlier studies which focused on

the pre-service teachers' motivations for beginning their profession. In a study by Rots, Aelterman and Devos (2013), it has been found that in terms of the motivations for starting teaching profession, females tend to enter teaching profession more than males. In line with this study, an earlier study showed similar results (Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley 2006) in that it was found that the rate of women who chose teaching profession was higher than that of men. In a similar study, Yüce et al. (2013) found that more females chose teaching career as their first career choice than males. However, these studies were conducted on general pre-service teachers with no specific branches such as pre-service mathematics, history or language teachers, which makes this study unique due to its samples consisting only of pre-service English language teachers.

The next demographic feature to be investigated in terms of motivations was the age groups of the participants. There has not been found any significant difference between the age groups in terms of motivations for choosing the ELT department. In a study which investigates the pre-service teachers' motivations for becoming a teacher, Manuel and Hughes (2006) found out that there is 8.8% difference between the 19-21 age group and 22+ age group in terms of choosing the teaching profession as their first choice. In another study which was published in the same year, Sinclair et al. (2006) discussed that the age groups of the pre-service teachers do not affect their motivation levels. These studies on the pre-service teachers seem to reinforce the present study. Thus, it can be said that there is no relation between the age and the motivations of the pre-service English teachers.

Another demographic feature examined with the motivations was the participants' high school types which they graduated from. The results indicated that there is not a meaningful difference between the graduated high school types and the motivations for choosing the ELT department. It can be implied from the results that the motivations for choosing the ELT department rely on individuals' thoughts and emotions instead of their high school type. When the related literature was examined, there does not seem to be any similar study to the present study, so it would probably be correct to say that this study is unique in its examination of the graduated high school types.

A distinct number of participants complained about their workload including assignments and presentations in the answers they gave for the WIP. The main reason for this workload might be because of the weekly course quantity or weekly lesson hours. Because of this, the weekly lesson load of the participants was one of the non-ignorable features. When the results regarding the initial motivations and lesson hours were examined, it was seen that there was no significant difference between these variables. Therefore, it can

be said for these results that the motivation levels of the ELT students neither increase nor decrease according to their lesson load. The literature related to these variables do not seem to exist.

A higher GPA in the process of a training for a profession may be expected from a student who has a higher motivation to choose that profession. However, the results of the study showed that there is no meaningful difference between the GPA of the participants and their motivation levels. In his study investigating the interaction between the academic motivation and academic success, Erten (2014) found that the pre-service English language teachers' amotivation could cause student burnout which can lead to academic failure. The present and the early study results seem to contradict with each other. Yet, the latter can still be true for some contexts in terms of burnout while the academic failure effect may not be seen in these results.

When it comes to the reasons for choosing the ELT department which is concerned with the individual's own will, family or other people's (former teachers, friends, acquaintances, relatives) effect on choosing the ELT department, there seems to be a difference between the initial motivation levels of the participants. The ones who chose this department by their own will seem to have a significant positive difference with the ones who chose this department by the other people's will or guidance (*md*: 0.50434,  $p < 0.001$ ). Moreover, there is a positive mean difference between the ones who chose the ELT department with their families' will or guidance and the ones with other people involved in this choice (*md*: 0.30430,  $p < 0.001$ ). It was found that the participants who chose this department with their families' will or guidance seem to have a higher motivation level than the participants who chose this department with other people's influence. Considering these results, it could be said that the ELT students who chose the ELT department of their own accord have a higher motivation than those with family involvement and other people's involvement which would not be surprising to hear. It can be concluded from these results that the participants who chose ELT department with intrinsic motivations seem to have a higher level of motivations for choosing this department than the ones who chose it with extrinsic reasons.

According to the results, the majority of the participants chose the ELT department by their own will (84.3%) and some of the participants chose this department because they find this department suitable or very suitable for themselves (75.3%). For example, the qualitative results demonstrated that an important part of the pre-service English teachers chose this department due to their personal abilities and tendency to English language

(10.2%), which shows that they find the department suitable for themselves. Therefore, perspective of suitability seemed to be a crucial demographic feature to be investigated when the initial motivations were considered. The results from the analysis regarding these variables revealed for the sample of this study that there are more important and bigger mean differences between the ones who find the ELT department very suitable for themselves and the ones who do not find it suitable at all. (*md*: -1.06537,  $p < 0.001$ ). It can be implied from these results that if the ELT students have a higher motivation to choose the ELT department, they tend to see the department more suitable for themselves.

The last demographic feature to be investigated in terms of initial motivation levels was the teaching experience of the participants. It has been found that the participants who have no teaching experience seem to have less motivation level for choosing the ELT department than the ones with 0-6 months of teaching experience (*md*: -0.14462,  $p < 0.05$ ). Another intriguing finding was that there was not found any significant difference between the other teaching experience groups, even the most experienced group. This inconsistency may be because of the limitations of the study. Therefore, a further research investigating these variables is highly suggested. Anyways, the meaningful difference between the zero teaching experience group and the 0-6-month group indicates that the ELT students with higher initial motivation level have more tendency to have a little experience even before they really start teaching.

As a summary to all these findings and discussions, each gender distribution in each profession may differ from each other in terms of motivations for choosing a certain profession. In addition, the age, graduated high school types and weekly lesson load of the pre-service English teachers do not have any relation with the motivation levels to start this profession. On the other hand, high motivation for choosing the ELT department and an individual's choosing the department by his / her own will, the perspective of suitability for the department and the teaching experience, although the latest still looks controversial, seem to be positively related with each other.

## **5.6 Discussion and Conclusion of the Relationship between the Demographic Features of the ELT Students and Their Burnout Levels**

The student burnout may have a lot of factors leading to it, so it would be logical to investigate some of these factors for this study which are the demographic features. However, let us remember the last research question before the discussion and conclusion:

6. Is there any relationship between the demographic features of the ELT students and their level of student burnout?

These demographic features were gender, age groups, graduated high school types, weekly lesson hours, GPA, reason to choose the ELT department, perspective about suitability to the department and teaching experience as were in the previous part. The relation between student burnout and each of these variables will be discussed in separate paragraphs and the conclusion for all these discussions will be given in the last paragraph.

The first variable to be investigated with the student burnout level was the gender. It has been found that there is not any significant relationship between genders and exhaustion and professional efficacy levels; yet, there has been found a difference between the females and males in terms of cynicism (*md*: -1.57106, *p*: 0.021). According to these results, males tend to experience the effect of depersonalization more than females. When the related literature investigating the gender differences in terms of student burnout levels, there have not been found any study taking place in an undergraduate ELT setting. However, there were a few studies examining medical students. One of the studies supports males' cynicism level (Willcock, Daly, Tennant, & Allard, 2004). In this study, male medical students were found to have a higher degree of depersonalization than the females. On the contrary, in a later study, there have not been found any relationship between the genders and student burnout (Santen, Holt, Kemp, & Hemphill, 2010). Besides, it was found that freshmen and sophomores had lower level of burnout than the juniors and seniors. Another finding from this study was that as students' burnout levels increase, their academic success decreases. As a summary of this study, it was stated that pre-service teachers who have a higher level of burnout were found to be the ones who are male, sophomore or junior and have low academic success. In another study conducted in Turkey by Balkıs et al. (2011), male pre-service teachers had a higher level of burnout than female pre-service teachers, which partially supports the current study. On the other hand, in a more recent study, Bozgün and Akın Kösterelioğlu (2018) did not find any significant relationship between students' gender and burnout, which does not support the findings of the current study. Thus, it can be said that even though many studies found that males' burnout levels are higher than females, there are some studies claiming that age can be a determiner in certain contexts instead of all contexts.

The age groups of the participants were another important demographic feature to be investigated in terms of student burnout. The results indicated that 19-20 age group have more emotional exhaustion and cynicism level than the 27+ age group (*md*-age 19-20:

7.58431, *md*-age 27+: 6.24090). This significant difference between these age groups can be explained with their expectations, motivations and life experience. Younger people may tend to expect more from their department or have a higher level of motivation to start their education in the ELT department and this may cause them to get confused when their department does not meet their expectations or initial motivations. Therefore, this inconsistency may lead them to feel emotionally exhausted and prefer to be alienated from their academic activities. Further, as the older people experienced more events than the younger ones, they may have less expectation from their department making them feel less burned out. On the contrary, in a study conducted in a recent time, Bozgün and Akin Kösterelioğlu (2018) found no significant relationship between age and burnout among students. However, this study included pre-service teachers from different departments than English language teaching department. Therefore, the results implied from this study do not seem to be generalizable to the current study. This discussion may seem subjective, so a study investigating the relationship between students' age and student burnout may give a deeper insight about this topic since there have not been found enough evidence to support or confute this discussion when the related literature was reviewed.

This study has also examined the student burnout level differences among the graduated high school types. It has been found in the analyses that there is not a significant difference between the participants' high school types which they graduated from. These results may mean that the burnout vulnerability of the ELT student is not correlated with their high school types.

Another demographic feature to be investigated in relation with the student burnout was the weekly lesson hours of the ELT students. One can expect that students with a lot of lesson hours a week may have a higher burnout level because a person gets tired more easily because of the workload. However, according to the results of the present study, there has not been found any difference between the participants who take different hours of lessons in terms of student burnout. Previous research seems to support these findings. For instance, Lingard et al. investigated the relation between workload and student burnout of the undergraduate students in Australia in 2007, and found no relationship between these variables. On the other hand, it has been discussed by many researchers that subjective workload experience causes more student burnout than the objective workload (Abouserie, 1994; Jacobs & Dodd, 2003; Morgan & de Bruin, 2010).

Grand Point Averages (GPA) of the student may give more opinion about the student burnout in ELT department. Thus, the relation between the GPA and student burnout levels

of the ELT students were investigated for this study. It was found that the emotional exhaustion levels of the ones with 2.01-3.00 GPA were significantly higher than the freshmen who did not have any GPA yet ( $md: 2.88392, p < 0.01$ ). Similar results were also found for the cynicism side of the student burnout ( $md: 2.46224, p < 0.05$ ). For professional efficacy, the participants who have a GPA between 2.01 and 3.00 and the participants with 3.01-4.00 GPA are significantly different from each other regarding the student burnout ( $md: 3.15076, p < 0.01$ ) in that the professional inefficacy level of the former was higher than the latter. It can be implied from these results that as the ELT students study their courses, but do not get the grade they think they deserve they tend to feel more emotionally exhausted and depersonalized. However, the highest GPA group and the lowest GPA groups do not seem to have any significant difference in terms of these burnout sides. Furthermore, the results showing that the 2.01-3.00 group to have less professional efficacy level than the 3.01-4.00 group also supports this claim because the students may think that they do not get the success they deserve no matter how much they study and thus lose their professional efficacy. Supporting these results and assertions to some extent, Schaufeli et al. (2002) found that students with a better performance have less emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced efficacy than the students with poor performance.

Students' reasons for choosing a major are an important variable because this choice will affect their further years. Sometimes, the students may be affected by the external factors such as their families, teachers in high school or their friends. Therefore, another demographic feature to be examined with the student burnout was the reasons to choose the ELT department. In this study, it has been found that the ones who chose this department of their own accord have less depersonalization and professional inefficacy than the ones who chose this department under the influence of the people other than their families such as their teachers at high schools, friends, relatives and acquaintances (Depersonalization  $md: -4.75130, p < 0.001$  and Professional Efficacy  $md: -4.19730; p: 0.001$ ). It can be implied from these results that the ones who chose the ELT department because they wanted to or their families wanted them to have less vulnerability to student burnout. When the related literature was examined, there have not been found any study investigating the reasons for choosing the ELT department and student burnout.

When people are confident with the job they do or if they think that they are suitable for that job, they work with a higher motivation and self-confidence. In the hope of finding a similar relation, the suitability perspective of the participants and student burnout levels were examined. It has been found in this study results that the participants who think that

ELT department is very suitable for themselves have less emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional inefficacy levels than the ones who do not find the department suitable at all (Exhaustion *md*: -12.34631, *p*: 0,000; Cynicism *md*: -12.84226, *p*: 0,000; Professional Efficacy *md*: -12.57431, *p*: 0.000). A similar relationship exists between the *not suitable* group and *suitable* and *very suitable* groups. Therefore, these results may mean that a student's perspective of suitability of a major affects his / her burnout level. The related literature does not seem to come up with a similar study which focuses on the suitability perspective and student burnout level.

The last demographic feature which was considered to be in relation with student burnout was the teaching experience of the ELT students. In the current study, it has been found that there is no relationship between the pre-service teachers' teaching experiences and their student burnout levels. There seems to be numerous studies on teacher burnout in the field and majority of these studies suggest that teachers are in the danger group which suffers the burnout more than many other professions and the dropout rates of the teachers are really high (Bobek, 2010; Bush, 1969; Gold, 2012; Hancock, 1999; Sumpter, 1995).

To sum up, in terms of student burnout males tend to be more depersonalized than the females. Younger students seem to have more emotional exhaustion and cynicism than the older ones because the younger ones probably tend to have more motivations for and expectations from their profession and major while the older ones have more experience and less motivation and expectation. The students with no GPA and the students with higher GPA (3.01-4.00 GPA group) seem to have less emotional exhaustion and cynicism than the ones with an average GPA (2.01-3.00 GPA group), and the reason for this might be that the students who study to some extent and think that they did not get the score they deserved may be more open to feel burned out. The ELT students who chose this department by their own will appear to have less cynicism and personal inefficacy level than the ones who chose this department with some other influences such as their families, friends, teachers, acquaintances or relatives. Furthermore, when the students find ELT department suitable for themselves and vice versa they tend to have less burnout level than the ones with the thought that the department is not suitable for themselves and vice versa. On the other hand, there have not been found any relationship between graduated high school type, weekly lesson loads, teaching experience and student burnout.



### **5.7 Discussion and Conclusion of the Additional Results from the WIP**

Although all the research questions were answered, discussed and hammered out, there were still some data which may contribute to this study and give a deeper understanding about motivations for choosing the ELT department and student burnout in ELT department. Therefore, some additional results deduced from the WIP were analyzed and some results were discussed. The discussion of the results from the other WIP questions which did not take place in the previous parts are presented under separate paragraphs and the conclusions of these results are given in the last paragraph.

One of the WIP questions was about the reasons for burnout of the participants. According to the participants, the most popular reasons for student burnout were assignments (27.6%), courses which they find difficult or unnecessary (11.2%), presentations including the demo lessons (8.8%), lecturers and professors (6.3%), and their dislike for the ELT department or their obligation to choose it because of their university entrance exam scores (5.2%). The related studies about the reasons for student burnout were searched; yet no specific study was encountered. This means that no qualitative research was conducted for getting information about the perspectives of the teacher students regarding the reasons of the student burnout. After all, it can be suggested to the stakeholders that it would be better for them to take the aforementioned burnout reasons into account. For example, less homework may be given to the students or the deadlines for these assignments can be extended allowing them to spare some time for themselves. Aims, outcomes and practicality of the courses can be given more explicitly and clearly to prevent students from thinking that those courses are unnecessary. Presentations and demo lessons seem to be becoming a nervous experience for the students, so the due time of these can be extended or graded accordingly. However, as some lecturers and professors may think that they are doing the best they can do, these ideas and suggestions may not seem very bright and useful although they may seem very suitable and appropriate from pre-service teachers' perspectives. Furthermore, lecturers could take student burnout into account more and act accordingly. Some students do not choose this major willingly or some of them do not like the ELT department. These students could be allowed to change their department.

The lecturers were seen as the fourth most popular reason for burnout among the ELT students. For this reason, this study asked the ELT students about their instructors, if they take the student burnout into account and give enough instruction about it. In light of the results regarding the students' perspectives about their lecturers' student burnout knowledge and their support about it, it has been found that the majority of the ELT students (45.7%)

do not think that their lecturers take student burnout into account. A thesis study (Collins, 1999) which researched the relationship between university students' burnout levels and the support they get from their lecturers seems to support this result. According to the study, university students with a high level of academic-social problems and with little support from their lecturers were found to have a high level of cynicism and emotional exhaustion. Therefore, the lecturers at universities may show a friendlier or supportive attitude towards their students to lessen their students' burnout levels.

Another question in the WIP was about the ELT students' plan for further education. In this question, the participants were asked if they wanted to get an M.A or Ph.D. degree in ELT department. The aim of this question was to find out if the ELT students still have enough motivations to move on and increase their professional efficacy, and if they have any student burnout level which may affect their decision to continue their graduate education. The results indicated that the majority of the students (50.0%) do not want a further education in the ELT department. However, some suggestions about this topic would make some contribution to the field of ELT. It can be seen that almost half of the participants do not want to continue their further education. This may be an indicator of the student burnout and that the students are losing their initial motivations for the ELT department. To reduce their burnout levels and reinforce their motivations, some measures can be taken such as seminars encouraging them to improve themselves in the ELT field, less homework load not to make them scared of the ELT department or support from the lecturers and instructors, which may decrease their burnout levels as aforementioned.

The next WIP question was about the ELT students' feelings and thoughts about their morning, afternoon and evening lessons. The aim for this question was to get information about which time of the day causes more burnout among the students. It has been found that the majority of the students (23.0%) have negative thoughts and emotions about the morning lessons. The reasons for the negative thoughts about the morning lessons which were expressed by the participants were the sleeping problems, which might indicate that they do homework at nights and this made them stay up late and have difficulty in waking up. In a study by Erakman (2015) which investigates the burnout levels of the students in the preparatory program, it was found that some students described the morning lessons as the winter season in which the conditions are really difficult for people. Therefore, the results of the previous and the present study seem to support each other. For further suggestions for this topic, the course hours can be at least taken to a later hour and this arrangement can be piloted for a certain time then according to the results some changes may be made.

The ninth question of the WIP was about the effective participation of the ELT students in their lessons. The aim of this question was to find out if the student burnout affects their participation in the lessons. In the previous questions, we discussed that a non-ignorable number of the ELT students suffer from student burnout. As known from the former research, student burnout reduces the academic success, participation in the lessons and willingness to continue taking courses (Kılavuz, 2006; Tsigilis, Zournatzi, & Koustelios, 2011). In the current study, it has been found that the ELT students tend to effectively participate in the lessons. When the quantitative and qualitative analysis results about the ELT students' burnout are taken into account, it is seen that they suffer from a high level of student burnout in general (Exhaustion  $m > 3.2$ , Cynicism  $m > 2.2$ , Professional Efficacy  $m < 5.0$ ). Therefore, reduced academic performance, involvement in lesson and increased absenteeism can be expected from the ELT students. When these results are taken into account, some certain measures should be taken in order to prevent the ELT students from the student burnout. These measures can be taken by arranging seminars, conferences or activities about effective participation and ways of avoiding student burnout for both lecturers and students.

The last question in the WIP was:

10. Do you have any other comments about your motivation to choose the ELT Department and student burnout? Please specify.

The participants contributed to this study with many answers to this question. Some of the answers which were considered to be more representative of the participants' thoughts were given in the previous chapter. Several comments can be made about the additional comments of the participants about motivations to choose the ELT department and student burnout. Firstly, other than the items in the QoM, many participants stated that they chose the ELT department because their English teacher at the previous educational steps were their idol, so this item maybe added up to a new version of the QoM. Another comment would be that a person may not choose the ELT department willingly; yet, this unwillingness does not mean that they may love the ELT department in the future. After the participants' comments about motivations, there were some other comments about student burnout. Some participants expressed that there should be some activities to guide them about how to cope with the student burnout, some suggested less assignments and presentations or extended due time for these assignments and presentations, and some came up with the idea of flexibility for the arrangement of the class hours and classroom size. Another comment was about the obligatory attendance. The participants told that there was no need for the

obligatory attendance. However, it can easily be confronted by the nature of the ELT department as there happen numerous practical activities in an ELT classroom, which constitutes a rehearsal for the real classroom environment. Therefore, if no student attends that class, this theatrical environment would be collapsed and the ELT students would not find any opportunities to practice their teaching skills. Another comment was about the content of the courses and some of the compulsory courses. Some participants regarded that some or all the content of the courses are unnecessary for them and if they do not find the content of the course appropriate, they should be able to request the freedom not to take that course. Thus, some piloting about this topic can be applied and the results can be discussed with the stakeholders.

As a conclusion, a certain number of ELT students seem to suffer from student burnout and as discussed in this part, this suffering cause them not to keep studying in the ELT department for further education, to hold negative attitudes towards their courses and reduce their effective participation. They indicate the assignment and presentation load, lecturers, course content and difficulty and their obligation to choose the ELT department as their reasons for their burnout. However, they seem to come up with solutions for the reasons which cause them to feel burned out. They request seminars, conferences or activities to show them the way to get over their burnout, more freedom in choosing their courses, a review in the content of the courses and less assignments and presentations or extended deadlines for the assignments and presentations.

### **5.8 Overall Conclusions and Implications**

High school students were expected to take a university entrance exam at the end of their high school education in Turkey. Some of these students tend to choose education faculties of universities, more specifically ELT departments which give training on how to teach English. These students choose ELT departments with various motivations; however, they have the risk to lose their initial motivations because of student burnout. Therefore, the researcher aimed to enlighten the students who want to choose ELT major for their career preparation or the ones who already chose it about ELT students' own motivations for choosing this department and raise all stakeholders' awareness of student burnout and its effects on the ELT students in its core. In addition, the researcher had an aim to fill in the gaps regarding the ELT students' motivations for choosing ELT department (Hayes, 2008), their burnout levels (Dirghangi, 2019; Hue & Lau, 2015; Igbokwe et al., 2019) and the relationship between these variables (Goddard & O'Brien, 2007; McLean et al., 2019) in the

growing literature of ELT field. As a result, this study was conducted with the aims of finding the popular motivations for choosing ELT department, explaining the relationship between the ELT students' motivation for choosing their department and demographic features, which would inform the ones who want to choose ELT department and give an idea or implication about what may happen when they choose ELT department with their own personal features, explaining the relationship between ELT students' burnout levels and their demographic features to enlighten the lecturers, policy makers, ELT students and higher education authorities about student burnout and its effects, and investigating the relationship between motivations for choosing ELT department and student burnout levels for acquainting the stakeholders about the causes and effects or inputs and outputs of these motivations and student burnout. These aims were achieved and the gaps in the ELT literature were tried to be filled despite some limitations such as length of the survey handed out to the participants, limited number of places to collect data, sampling method and problems in the way of collecting data.

To achieve the aims of the study, a survey which includes a personal information form, QoM, MBI-SS and WIP was formed. Personal information form was utilized to gather data about the demographic features of the participants. Quantitative data about motivations for choosing ELT department were collected via QoM, for quantitative data regarding the student burnout levels, data were gathered via MBI-SS. In addition, WIP was utilized to gather qualitative data about participants' both motivations for choosing ELT department and student burnout levels. Therefore, this study carries the characteristics of a concurrent mixed-method study. Next, the sample of the study were reached with convenience sampling method (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The participants were 470 ELT students from two different universities, from all grades and with various backgrounds. The survey was applied to the participants between their mid-term exams and final exams as this time interval was considered to be the most suitable interval for collecting data by the researcher. The quantitative data were analyzed with several analyses on SPSS 22 and the qualitative data were analyzed with summative content analysis method. Then, the analysis results and discussions of these results were presented in the thesis.

The first conclusion extracted from the data was that the ELT students choose their department with intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and think that they have the opportunity to learn English in ELT departments. These conclusions were supported by some studies (Barmby, 2006; Çetinavcı & Yavuz, 2011; Su et al., 2001). Another conclusion was that the motivations for choosing ELT department changed according to the sample's or participants'

characteristics, and their grades although the researcher expected the motivation scores to change from grade to grade. In addition, this study showed that the sophomores and juniors experience student burnout more than other grades because these grades are the busiest grades in terms of assignment load, which was found as one of the primary reason for burnout in this study. Another point found in this research study was that as the motivation scores of the ELT students decrease, their student burnout levels tend to increase, which was supported by several studies (König, & Rothland, 2012; Maslach, & Leiter, 1997; McLean et al., 2019). Before this study was conducted, demographic features were considered to be a factor influencing the motivations for choosing ELT department; however, it was concluded that ELT students' age, graduated high school types and weekly lesson hours did not determine their motivations for choosing ELT department. On the contrary, it was concluded in light of the present study that gender, choosing ELT department by one's own will, considering the ELT department suitable for oneself, and duration of teaching experience were the determining factors for motivations for choosing ELT department, which can be taken into consideration by the ones who want to choose this department. It was expected by the researcher that the demographic features of the ELT students could effect student burnout, and another conclusion of this study was that gender, age, GPA, reason to choose ELT department, suitability perspective were the determining factors of student burnout and must be born in mind and kept in check for preventing student burnout while graduated high school type, weekly lesson loads and teaching experience were not found to have an influence on student burnout. The last conclusion drawn from the data was that a number of ELT students suffered from student burnout, and this affects their perspectives about further education, courses and participation in the lesson negatively. The reason for their burnout was shown as the quantity of their assignment and presentations, their lecturers, courses contents and their obligation to choose this department. These conclusions can be a guide to all the stakeholders related with ELT departments.

In light of these conclusions, some educational implications which concern stakeholders, especially the students, lecturers at universities and policy makers, emerge from this study. One of these implications is that one's motivations and reasons for choosing ELT department, and the workload of this department should be taken into consideration when choosing this department because they have the risk of experiencing student burnout and even dropping off. Another educational implication of the study is that ELT students could be given an extended time for their assignments, presentations and preparations for demo or internship lessons as they have difficulty in catching up with all

these works and managing their time. They also request some seminars, conferences and guidance on how to manage and avoid student burnout because they state that they do not have enough awareness and information on this phenomenon. Lastly, the policy makers are requested to grant a chance to the ELT students who did not choose this department with their own accord, due to their university entrance exam scores and lost their motivation by discovering that this department is not suitable for them or vice versa.

As this study had some limitations and unique features, there is a need for further studies which could overcome the limitations of the study and support or confute the results of this study, and contribute to the growing literature in the ELT field. One of the further research suggestions is a study with a data collection tool that is compact and not as long as the survey utilized in this study, or a study with different means of data collection tools. In addition to the length of survey, a further research study could also take advantage of a random sampling and a larger sample. Moreover, a longitudinal or an experimental study design with more means of data collection tools can be contributory. In addition to these further research suggestions, a mixed-method study which focuses solely on the most preferred motivations for choosing ELT department both quantitatively and qualitatively would be contributory for the literature in the ELT field as the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study do not seem too support each other totally. Beside all these limitations, this study had some unique features, and to the knowledge of the researcher, there have not been found any studies including some of these features of this study. For example, there have not been encountered any studies in the ELT field investigating the relationship between gender and motivations, graduated high school types and motivations, weekly lesson hours and motivations, people's influence on the ELT student candidates and motivations, suitability perspectives of ELT students and motivations, teaching experience and motivations, age and student burnout, graduated high school types and student burnout, people's influence on the ELT student candidates and student burnout, suitability perspectives of ELT students and student burnout, and pre-service English language teachers' teaching experience and student burnout in the ELT field. Therefore, some further studies are strongly suggested for adding up to the literature on motivations for choosing ELT department and student burnout in English teacher training.

## REFERENCES

- Abouserie, R. (1994). Sources and levels of stress in relation to locus of control and self-esteem in university students. *Educational Psychology, 14*, 323-331.
- Anadolu Üniversitesi (2020). *İngilizce öğretmenliği program yeterlilikleri (çıktıları)*. Retrieved on 16.07.2020, from <https://www.anadolu.edu.tr/akademik/fakulteler/162/ingilizce-ogretmenligi-programi/program-cikti>.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). *A study on generic and field-specific teacher competency levels of English teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Avcı Akçalı, A. (2017). Turkish pre-service history teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and motivations on the teaching profession. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5*(4), 648-663.
- Balkıs, M. (2013). Academic procrastination, academic life satisfaction and academic achievement: The mediation role of rational beliefs about studying. *Journal of Cognitive & Behavioral Psychotherapies, 13*(1), 57-74.
- Balkıs, M., Duru, E., Buluş, M., & Duru, S. (2011). Tükenmişliğin öğretmen adayları arasındaki yaygınlığı, demografik değişkenler ve akademik başarı ile ilişkisi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*, 151-165.
- Balyer, A., & Özcan, K. (2014). Choosing teaching profession as a career: Students' reasons. *International Education Studies, 7*(5), 104-115.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control* (5<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Barmby, P. (2006). Improving teacher recruitment and retention: The importance of workload and pupil behaviour. *Educational Research, 48*(3), 247-265.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: Free Press.
- Baş, G., & Yıldırım, A. (2012). An analysis of burnout in Turkish elementary school principals. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers, 3*(3), 1-18.
- Bergmark, U., Lundström, S., Manderstedt, L., & Palo, A. (2018). Why become a teacher? Student teachers' perceptions of the teaching profession and motives for career choice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(3), 266-281.
- Bobek, B. L. (2002). Teacher resiliency: A key to career longevity. *A Journal of Educational Strategies, 75*(4), 202-205. doi: 10.1080/00098650209604932
- Bosley, H. P. (2004). *Levels of burnout and job satisfaction in large-scale agribusiness*. Unpublished Master thesis. Kentucky University, Western Kentucky.
- Boz, Y., & Boz, N. (2008). Kimya ve matematik öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen olma nedenleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 16*(1), 137-144.



- Bozgün, K., & Akın Kösterelioğlu, M. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarında tükenmişliğin yordayıcısı olarak mesleki kaygı. *SETSCI Confernece Indexing System*, 3, 1120-1123.
- British Council and Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı (TEPAV). (2013). *National needs analysis of English language teaching at state schools in Turkey*. Ankara: Mattek Publishing
- British Council (2013). *English effect*. Retrieved on 05.05.2019, from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf>.
- Brown, M. M. (1992). Caribbean first-year teachers' reasons for choosing teaching as a career. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(2), 1-10.
- Brownell, M. T., Smith, S. W., McNellis, J., & Lenk, L. (1995). Career decisions in special education: Current and former teachers' personal views. *Exceptionality*, 5(2), 83-102.
- Bruinsma, M., & Jansen, E. (2010). Is the motivation to become a teacher related to pre-service teachers' intentions to remain in the profession? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 185-200. doi: 10.1080/02619760903512927.
- Bulmer, M. (1979). Concepts in the analysis of qualitative data. *The Sociological Review*, 27(4), 651-677. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.1979.tb00354.x
- Bush, R. N. (1969). The status of the career teacher: Its effect upon the teacher dropout problem. *Research and Development Memorandum*, 47, 24-46.
- Butler, R., & Shibaz, L. (2008). Achievement goals for teaching as predictors of students' perceptions of instructional practices and students' help seeking and cheating. *Learning and Instruction*, 18, 453-467.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197-218.
- Chambel, M. J., & Curren, L. (2005). Stress in academic life: Work characteristics as predictors of student well-being and performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(1), 135-147.
- Chang, E. C., Rand, K. L., & Strunk, D. P. (2000). Optimism and risk for burnout among working college students: Stress as a mediator. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 255-263.
- Chuan, G. K., & Atputhasamy L. (2001). *Teacher education in Singapore: What motivates students to choose teaching as a career?* Paper presented at the AARE International Education Research Conference 2001 at the University of Sydney.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1989). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

- Collins, V. A. (1999). *A meta-analysis of burnout and occupational stress*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Texas.
- Cordes, C., & Dougherty, T. W. 1993. A review and an integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 621-656.
- Cushman, S., & West, R. (2006). Precursors to college student burnout: Developing a typology of understanding. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 7(1), 23–31. doi:10.1080/17459430600964638
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches: International student edition*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (Eds.). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. Thousands Oaks, California: Sage.
- Çapri, B., Özkendir, O. M., Özkurt, B., & Karakuş, F. (2012). General self-efficacy beliefs, life satisfaction and burnout of university students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 968–973. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.765
- Çetinavcı, U. R. & Yavuz, A. (2011). Language proficiency level of English language teacher trainees in Turkey. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 1(4), 26-54.
- Dirghangi, C. (2019). Mindful self-inquiry: Preventing burnout in preservice English teachers through a tailored mindfulness-based curriculum. *The Virginia English Journal*, 69(1), 72-78.
- Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2003). What do students say about their motivational goals?: Towards a more complex and dynamic perspective on student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28, 91-113.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics. Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dworkin, A. G, Saha, L. J., & Hill, A. N. (2003). Teacher burnout and perceptions of a democratic school environment. *International Education Journal*, 4(2), 108-120.
- Dyrbye, L. N., Thomas, M. R., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2005). Medical student distress: Causes, consequences, and proposed solutions. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 80(12), 1613–1622. doi:10.4065/80.12.1613
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Erakman, N. (2015). *Student burnout in an English preparatory program at a Turkish university: A case study*. Unpublished Master thesis. Bahçeşehir University Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

- Erten, İ. H. (2014). Interaction between academic motivation and student teachers' academic achievement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 173 – 178.
- Fahmy, J. J., & Bilton, L. (1992). Planning a TEFL education program: Policies, perspectives and promise. In: E. Sadtono. (Ed.) *Language Teacher Education in a Fast-Changing World*. (Anthology Series 29, pp.100-124).
- Farber, B. A., & Miller, J. (1981). Teacher burnout: A psychoeducational perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 83(2), 235- 243.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: SAGE.
- Fimian, M. J., Fastenau, P. A., Tashner, J. H., & Cross, A. H. (1989). The measure of classroom stress and burnout among gifted and talented students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 26(2), 139–153. doi:10.1002/1520-6807
- Firth, A. (1990). “Lingua franca” negotiations: Towards an interactional approach. *World Englishes*, 9(3), 269–280. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971x.1990.tb00265.x
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7<sup>th</sup> ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159-165.
- Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, G. (1980). *Burn-out. The high cost of high achievement*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1980). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research* (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goddard, R., & O'Brien, P. (2007). *Pre-service teacher education and beginning teacher burnout*. Paper presented at Proceedings of the AARE Conference 2006: Engaging Pedagogies at Australian Association for Research in Education.
- Gold, Y. (2012). Reducing stress and burnout through induction programs. *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(3), 66-70. doi: 10.1080/01626620.1989.10462740
- Golembiewski, R. T. (1989). A note on Leiter's study: Highlighting two models of burnout. *Group & Organization Studies*, 14(1), 5-13.
- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez H. K. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. [electronic version] *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 24, 1349-1363.
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173-208.

- Guglielmi, R. S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(1), 61-99.
- Güdük, M., Erol, Ş., Yağcıbulut, Ö., Uğur, Z., Özvarış, Ş. B., & Aslan, D. (2005). Ankara'da bir tıp fakültesinde okuyan son sınıf öğrencilerde tükenmişlik sendromu. *Sürekli Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi*, 14(8), 169-173.
- Hancock, D. R. (1999). Encouraging teachers to remain in the profession: A model for stress reduction. *The Educational Forum*, 63(2), 166-172.
- Hayes, D. (2008). Becoming a teacher of English in Thailand. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(4), 471-494.
- Harms, B. M., & Knobloch, N. A. (2005). Preservice teachers' motivation and leadership behaviors related to career choice. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 30(2), 101-124.
- Heinz, M. (2015). Why choose teaching? An international review of empirical studies exploring student teachers' career motivations and levels of commitment to teaching. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 21(3), 258-297. doi:10.1080/13803611.2015.1018278.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Hu, Q., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). The factorial validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-student survey in China. *Psychological Reports*, 105, 394-408.
- Huberman, M. (1993). *The lives of teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hue, M., & Lau, N. (2015) Promoting well-being and preventing burnout in teacher education: A pilot study of a mindfulness-based programme for pre-service teachers in Hong Kong. *Teacher Development*, 19(3), 381-401. doi: 10.1080/13664530.2015.1049748.
- Huebner, E. S., & Mills, L. B. (1994). Burnout in school psychology: The contribution of personality characteristics and role expectation. *Special Services in the Schools*, 8(2), 53-67.
- Igbokwe, U. L., Nwokenna, E. N., Eseadi, C., Ogbonna, C. S., Nnadi, E. M., Ololo, K. O., ... Ogbuagu, A. R. (2019). Intervention for burnout among English education undergraduates: Implications for curriculum innovation. *Medicine*, 98(26), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000016219>.
- Jacobs, S. R., & Dodd, D. (2003). Student burnout as a function of personality, social support, and workload. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 291-303. doi:10.1353/csd.2003.0028
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200-207.

- Kılavuz, D. (2006). *Exploring burnout and participation in professional learning activities among university prep Turkish EFL instructors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boğaziçi University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Kılınç, A., Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). Factors influencing teaching choice in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 199–226. doi:10.1080/1359866x.2012.700048.
- Kim, B., Jee, S., Lee, J., An, S., & Lee, S. M. (2017). Relationships between social support and student burnout: A meta-analytic approach. *Stress and Health*, 34(1), 127–134. doi:10.1002/smi.2771.
- King, S. H. (1993). Why did we choose teaching careers and what will enable us to stay?: Insights from one cohort of the African American teaching pool. *Journal of Negro Education*, 62(4), 475-492.
- Köksal, D., & Ulum, Ö. G. (2019). Pre-service EFL teachers' conceptions of language proficiency: Entry and exit level qualifications. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 484-495.
- König, J., & Rothland, M. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: Effects on general pedagogical knowledge during initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 289-315. doi:10.1080/1359866X.2012.700045.
- Krecic, M.J., & Grmek, M. I. (2005). The reasons students choose teaching professions. *Educational Studies*, 31(3), 265-274.
- Kyriacou, C., & Kobori, M. (1998). Motivation to learn and teach English in Slovenia. *Educational Studies*, 24(3), 345-351.
- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1993). A longitudinal study of burnout among supervisors and managers: Comparisons between the Leiter and Maslach (1988) and Golembiewski et al. (1986) models. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 54(3), 369-398.
- Lee, J.-A., Kang, M. O., & Park, B. J. (2019). Factors influencing choosing teaching as a career: South Korean preservice teachers. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20, 467-488. doi:10.1007/s12564-019-09579-z.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2014). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Leiter, M. P. (1989). Conceptual implications of two models of burnout: A response to Golembiewski. *Group & Organization Studies*, 14(1), 15-22.
- Leiter, M.P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 297-308.
- Li, X., Song, X., & Guo, C. (2009). A study on the relation between students' learning burnout and their social support, locus of control, adolescent stress in university. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 17, 287–289.

- Lingard, H.C., Yip, B., Rowlinson, S., & Kvan, T. (2007). The experience of burnout among future construction professionals: A cross-national study. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25, 345-357.
- Malmberg, L. (2006). Goal-orientation and teacher motivation among teacher applicants and student teachers. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 22, 58-76.
- Manuel, J., & Hughes, J. (2006). 'It has always been my dream': Exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing to teach. *Teacher Development*, 10(1), 5-24. doi: 10.1080/13664530600587311.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). The instinctoid nature of basic needs. *Journal of Personality*, 22, 326-347. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1954.tb01136.x>
- Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout. Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 19-32). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 2(2), 99-113.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Schwab, R. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educators Survey (MBI-ES). In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory – Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS). In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), pp. 1-48. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., & Schaufeli, W. B., (1993). Historical and conceptual development of burnout. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.). *Professional burnout. Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 1-16). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- McCarthy, M. E., Pretty, G. M., & Catano, V. (1990). Psychological sense of community and student burnout. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31(3), 211-216.
- McLean, L., Taylor, M., & Jimenez, M. (2019). Career choice motivations in teacher training as predictors of burnout and career optimism in the first year of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 204-214.

- Meier, S. F., & Schmeck, R. R. (1985). The burned-out college student: A descriptive profile. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 1*, 63-69.
- Moffat, K. J., McConnachie, A., Ross, S., & Morrison, J. M. (2004). Undergraduate medical education first year medical student stress and coping in a problem-based learning medical curriculum. *Medical Education, 38*, 482-491.
- Morgan, B., & de Bruin, K. (2010). The relationship between the big five personality traits and burnout in South African university students. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40*(2), 182-191. doi:10.1177/008124631004000208.
- Murdoch, G. (1994). Language development provision in teacher training curricula. *ELT Journal, 48*, 253-265.
- Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide*. Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi (2016). *KPSS: Kamu personeli seçme sınavı*. Retrieved on 09.09.2020, from <https://www.osym.gov.tr/TR,8837/hakkinda.html>
- Pamukkale Üniversitesi (2019). *Yabancı diller eğitimi bölümü İngiliz dili eğitimi anabilim dalı*. Retrieved on 16.07.2020, from <https://www.pau.edu.tr/yabancidiller/tr>.
- Parker, P. D., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2011). Developmental processes in school burnout: A comparison of major developmental models. *Learning and Individual Differences, 21*(2), 244-248.
- Penn-Edwards, S. (2010). The competencies of an English teacher: Beginning student teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education 35*, (2), 49.
- Peterka-Bonetta, J., Sindermann, C., Sha, P., Zhou, P. S. M., & Montag, C. (2019). The relationship between Internet use disorder, depression and burnout among Chinese and German college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 89*, 188-199.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: The native speaker's burden? *ELT Journal, 46*(1), 12-18
- Pines, A. M. (1993). Burnout: An existential perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 33-51). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Pines, A. M., Aronson, E., & Kafry, D. (1981). *Burnout, from tedium to personal growth*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Putkiewicz, E., & Witkomirska, A. (2003). *Problems of teacher education in rolling changes of educational system all over the world* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. G. (2007). Who chooses teaching and why? Profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(1), 27-56.

- Rots, I., Aelterman, A., & Devos, G. (2013). Teacher education graduates' choice (not) to enter the teaching profession: Does teacher education matter? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), 279–294. doi:10.1080/02619768.2013.845164.
- Rudow, B. (1999). Stress and burnout in the teaching profession: European studies, issues, and research Perspectives. In R. Vandenberghe, & A. Michael Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 38-58). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Santen, S. A., Holt, D. B., Kemp, J. D., & Hemphill, R. R. (2010). Burnout in medical students: Examining the prevalence and associated factors. *Southern Medical Journal*, 103, 758–763. doi: 10.1097/SMJ.0b013e3181e6d6d4.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Past performance and future perspectives of burnout research. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29, 1-15.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory - General Survey (MBI-GS). In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), pp. 19-26. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice. A critical analysis*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I. A., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 464-481. doi: 10.1177/0022022102033005003.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2005) The conceptualization and measurement of burnout: common ground and worlds apart. *Work and Stress*, 19(3), 256-62.
- Shively, J. (1992). Why I entered teaching, why I stay? *Education Digest*, 57(8), 1-4.
- Sinclair, C., Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2006). Motivations to teach: Psychometric perspectives across the first semester of teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1132-1154.
- Smylie, M. A. (1999). Teacher stress in a time of reform. In R. Vandenberghe, & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 59-84). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Su, Z., Hawkins, J. N., Huang, T., & Zhao, Z. (2001). Choices and commitment: A comparison of teacher candidates' profiles and perspectives in China and the United States. *International Review of Education*, 47(6), 611-635.
- Subaşı, G. (2010). *Why do I want to become an English teacher? Developing a questionnaire*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Anadolu University Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.



- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (Eds). (1998). *Basics of qualitative research, techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sumpter, R. D. (1995). Expanding field experiences: Reality, results, and revision. *The Teacher Educator*, 30(4), 6-15.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Taris, T. W., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2005). Are there causal relationships between the dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory? A review and two longitudinal tests. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 238-255.
- Tatar, M., & Horenczyk, G. (2003). Diversity-related burnout among teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 397-408.
- Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2006). *The research methods knowledge base* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Tsigilis, N., Zournatzi, E., & Koustelios, A. (2011). Burnout among physical education teachers in primary and secondary schools. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(7), 53-58.
- University Ranking by Academic Performance (2019). *Tüm üniversitelerin genel puan tablosu*. Retrieved on 20.05.2020, from [http://tr.urapcenter.org/2019/2019\\_t9.php](http://tr.urapcenter.org/2019/2019_t9.php).
- Warin, J., Maddock, M., Pell, A., & Hargreaves, L. (2006). Resolving identity dissonance through reflective and reflexive practice in teaching. *Reflective Practice*, 7(2), 233-245.
- Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2008). Motivations, perceptions, and aspirations concerning teaching as a career for different types of beginning teachers. *Learning and Instruction*, 5, 408-428.
- Watt, H. M. G., Richardson, P. W., Klusmann, U., Kunter, M., Beyer, B., Trautwein, U., & Baumert J. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: An international comparison using the FIT-Choice scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 791-805.
- Weckwerth, A. C. & Flynn, D. M. (2006). Effect of sex on perceived support and burnout in university students. *College Student Journal*, 40(2), 237-250.
- Willcock, S. M., Daly, M. D., Tennant, C. C., & Allard, B. J. (2004). Burnout and psychiatric morbidity in new medical graduates. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 181, 357-360. <https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2004.tb06325.x>.
- Woodrum, A. (2005). State-mandated testing and cultural resistance in Appalachian schools: Competing values and expectations. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 19, 1-9.

- Yang, H.-J., & Farn, C. K. (2005). An investigation of the factors affecting MIS student burnout in technical-vocational college. *Computers in Human Behavior, 21*, 917-932.
- Yıldırım, İ., & Ergene, T. (2003). Lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin akademik başarılarının yordayıcısı olarak sınav kaygısı, boyun eğici davranışlar ve sosyal destek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*, 224-234.
- Younger, M., Brindley, S., Pedder, D., & Hagger, H. (2004). Starting points: Student teachers' reasons for becoming teachers and their preconceptions of what this will mean. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 27*(3), 245-264.
- Yüce, K., Şahin, E. Y., Koçer, Ö., & Kana, F. (2013). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: A perspective of pre-service teachers from a Turkish context. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 14*(3), 295-306.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1. Survey of Motivations for Choosing Teaching Profession and Student Burnout for Pre-Service English Teachers

#### SURVEY OF MOTIVATIONS FOR CHOOSING TEACHING PROFESSION AND STUDENT BURNOUT FOR ENGLISH TEACHER CANDIDATES

Dear English Teacher Candidates,

This survey aims to analyze the motivations of English Language Teaching (ELT) students for choosing this department and find out relations between these motivations and student burnout in ELT Department. For this purpose, as English teacher candidates, your invaluable opinions will greatly contribute to the research. The research consists of four parts. In the first part, you are expected to provide information about your personal details. In the second part, you are expected to complete a questionnaire about motivations for choosing ELT Department which takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. In the third part, you are expected to complete an inventory about student burnout which takes approximately 5 minutes to complete. Finally, the fourth part consists of written interview questions in English about your motivations for choosing ELT Department and student burnout in this department.

Please note that there are no correct or wrong answers to these items and it is essential to answer all the items with the most suitable answer. Furthermore, it is really important to answer all the questions that require your personal information in terms of acquiring valid and reliable data for this study.

Your answers and your identity will be kept confidential. Your participation in the study involves no risks or requirements in any case. It is purely on voluntary basis.

Thank you for your valuable contribution. Please do not hesitate to contact me in case of any questions or concerns.

**\*I read the information above and am willing to take part in the study.**

Name Surname:

Date:

Signature:

*\*I would like to take part in the interview:*

Yes

No

Kind Regards

Onat KÜÇÜK

MA student, English Language Teaching Department, Pamukkale University

E-mail: onatkucuk22@gmail.com

\* : Necessary to be filled

### PART I) PERSONAL DETAILS FORM

**Grade:** 1<sup>st</sup> year  2<sup>nd</sup> year  3<sup>rd</sup> year  4<sup>th</sup> year

**Gender:** Female  Male

**Age:** 17-18  19-20  21-22  23-24  25-26  27+

**Type of High School Graduated:**

Anatolian High School

General High School

Anatolian Teacher Training High School

Vocational High School

Anatolian Vocational High School

Super High School

\*Other  \*Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Total lesson hours you take a week?**

0-10 hours  11-20 hours  21-30 hours  31-40 hours  41-45 hours

**GPA:** Do not have yet  0-1,00  1,01-2,00  2,01-3,00  3,01-4,00

**The reason why you choose ELT department:**

I wanted to  My family wanted me to  Other (Please specify)   
\_\_\_\_\_

**Do you find ELT department suitable for you?**

Not at all  Not suitable  Neither suitable nor not suitable  Suitable  Very suitable

**Have you ever taught English?:** Yes  No

**If yes, how many months / years?:**

0-6 months  7-12 months  1-2years  2-3 years  4-5 years  6 years+

## PART II) MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please specify the degree you agree or disagree with the statements on the motivations to become an English teacher. Please check (X) only one item for each statement and do not leave out any of the items.

	<b>I want to become an English teacher because</b>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I can make the society I live in develop more easily since I know English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2	It is more fun to learn English than to learn other subject matters.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3	I want to be successful at a hard work which requires creativity.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4	Being an English teacher improves my self-confidence.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5	I think that it is easier to find a good job as an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6	I was good at English lessons in secondary school.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7	I think that teaching English will suit me as a profession.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8	I like being with children and teaching them English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9	I would like to share my knowledge of English with younger students of mine.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10	I can even be an English teacher abroad.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11	Learning English is like solving a puzzle, I enjoy working on the rules and finding out the structures of this language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12	I think I can change the minds of those students who do not like learning English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13	I think becoming an English teacher will provide me a lifelong learning opportunity.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14	By teaching English, I would like to educate my students in a modern way.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15	I think that I have the capacity to become an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16	As a principled teacher I want to overcome the shortcomings in the educational system.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17	I do not want my students to feel isolated from life because they do not speak English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18	I believe I can find a job anywhere with a high level of English proficiency.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19	I like to read and understand the books written in English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20	I feel better when I teach English to kids than when I am with adults.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21	I think I have a predisposition to learn English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22	I like to speak English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
23	Via English, I would like to present my thoughts and ideas to the people of other countries.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
24	I like being with young people and teaching them English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
25	I believe I can contribute to the future of my country better by teaching English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
26	I would like to change the traditional methods of teaching English with new ones.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
27	I believe I can broaden the horizons of my students by teaching English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
28	I enjoy watching the programs and films prepared in the English language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29	Learning English is a very interesting experience.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30	I can teach Turkish to foreigners in this way.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
31	English is an international language and is spoken everywhere.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
32	I have always wondered to be able to use English in a perfect way.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33	Speaking English makes life easier in many respects.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

	<b>I want to become an English teacher because</b>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
34	I think in teaching English, we can have our students participate in the process and apply student-centered teaching to our classes.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
35	I like listening to songs in English and being able to understand their lyrics.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
36	I can pursue an academic career with the help of English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37	I find English language teaching more enjoyable and dynamic compared to other fields of study.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
38	For my country, I would like to educate students who are aware of their responsibilities, who speak English well, and who are researchers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39	Among all the foreign languages, English is the language that interests me the most.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40	My family believes that becoming an English teacher will be a good career for me.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41	I am going to be a good role model for young people by becoming an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
42	I would like to create a second person through a second language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
43	I believe that the problem of English language teaching in Turkey could best be solved by well-trained English teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
44	Since my childhood, I have always wanted to be an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
45	I will be able to learn English well as a foreign language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46	I enjoy pronouncing the words in English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47	I would like to educate students who need to know English to reach their ideals.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48	I can only feel emotionally satisfied if I become an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49	I would like my students to adopt the idea that knowing another language does not make one lose his or her culture.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50	I would like to learn British/American culture.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51	I can reach information on my profession and other current issues through English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
52	Teaching English is seen as a more respectable profession than teaching other fields of study by the society.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
53	I can read literature and research written in English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
54	English is more widely taught in schools as a foreign language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
55	English has become an indispensable element and important part of our lives.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
56	I like communicating with foreigners through English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
57	Teaching English is an intellectually satisfying profession.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
58	By being an English teacher, I would like to contribute to the improvement of those groups in the society who have not developed intellectually or culturally.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
59	I think that I can earn a satisfactory amount of money by teaching English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
60	I like learning English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
61	I would like to understand written or spoken texts in English on my own.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
62	I think that I can improve myself better when I teach English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
63	It makes me happy to see the students I taught English to be able to achieve things on their own in terms of this language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
64	I feel more comfortable when I teach English to young people than I do when I am with adults.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
65	Becoming an English teacher will make me happy.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

	<b>I want to become an English teacher because</b>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
66	I can carry on various kinds of work related to English while I am teaching or on holidays.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
67	I would like to learn British/American literature.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
68	Speaking English can provide me with other opportunities.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
69	I would like to have a profession which makes me active and forces me to be informed about new developments.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
70	I will be a good role model for children by becoming an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
71	By teaching English, I want to make my students be able to communicate with foreigners.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
72	English teachers are not seen as traditional teachers as in other branches, and I will also be a teacher who is open to innovations.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
73	In order for our country to become a developed one, the people in our society need to know foreign languages and I would like to contribute to that.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
74	I would like to share my knowledge of English with children.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
75	Through English, I can understand the perspectives of other countries and people with respect to different events.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
76	Considering the social facts of our society, I think being an English teacher is a suitable profession for my gender.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
77	I think I have an ability to learn English.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
78	English teachers have a more active role in the education of a young person compared to teachers of other branches.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
79	By becoming an English teacher, I can also demonstrate my students the ways to improve their selves.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
80	I want to speak English like my native language.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
81	English teachers have a more active role in the education of a child compared to the teachers of other branches.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
82	Our country needs a high number of well-educated English language teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
83	Many people think that English teachers have a high status in the society.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
84	Teaching English requires preparing and using a lot of materials for the class.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
85	My ideal is to become an English teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

### PART III) STUDENT BURNOUT INVENTORY

Please specify the frequency of student burnout you feel as a student at ELT Department. Please check (X) only one item for each statement and do not leave out any of the items.

<b>STUDENT BURNOUT INVENTORY</b>		Never	A Few Times per Year	Once a Month	A Few Times per Month	Once a Week	A Few Times per Week	Every Day
<b>PART 1: EXHAUSTION</b>								
1.1	I feel emotionally drained by my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.2	I feel used up at the end of a day at university.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.3	I feel tired when I get up in the morning and I have to face another day at the university.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.4	Studying or attending a class is really a strain for me.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.5	I feel burned out from my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>PART 2: CYNICISM</b>								
2.1	I have become less interested in my studies since my enrolment at the university.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2.2	I have become less enthusiastic about my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2.3	I have become more cynical about the potential usefulness of my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2.4	I doubt the significance of my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>PART 3: PROFESSIONAL EFFICACY</b>								
3.1	I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3.2	I believe that I make an effective contribution to the classes that I attend.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3.3	In my opinion, I am a good student.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3.4	I feel stimulated when I achieve my study goals.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3.5	I have learned many interesting things during the course of my studies.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3.6	During class I feel confident that I am effective in getting things done.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)



**PART IV) WRITTEN INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (WIP)**

- 1. Please write 5 most important reasons for you to choose the ELT Department. Please, write the most important reason in the first place.**

<b>1.</b>	
<b>2.</b>	
<b>3.</b>	
<b>4.</b>	
<b>5.</b>	

- 2. Would you drop off the ELT department and choose a different major if you had the chance? If yes, what major would you choose? Why?**

- 3. Do you know the term “student burnout”? If yes, please define it or give an example.**

- 4. Have you ever felt burned out in the ELT department? Why? Please explain and give examples.**

- 5. What could be the reason(s) for student burnout in the ELT department? Please explain and give examples.**



## Appendix 2. Correspondance of Permission for the Use of QoM

**Doktora Teziniz Hakkında** Gelen Kutusu x

**Onat Kızılcık** <onatkucuk2@gmail.com>  
Alıcı: goncas

20 Kas 2019 16:02

Mehaba hocam,

Ben mezun öğrencilerinizden Onat Kızılcık. Size doktora tezinde oluşturduğunuz veri toplama aracını ile ilgili bir soru sormak ve ayrıyeten bir ricada bulunmak üzere yazıyorum. Su anda Pamukkale Üniversitesinde İngiliz Dilini Eğitimi bölümünde yüksek lisans yapıyorum ve tezimi için ELT öğrencilerimi bu bölümü seçme motivasyonlarını ve tükennmiş seviyelerini ölçmek istiyorum. Bu yüzden tezimde sizin Why Do I Want to Become an English Teacher? isimli doktora tezinizde oluşturduğunuz anketinizi siz de uygun görürseniz veri toplama aracımın bir parçası olarak kullanmak istiyorum. Bu konu hakkında örneklerimin de bir kısmını Anadolu Üniversitesinden almak istiyorum. Dolayısıyla doktora tezinde oluşturduğunuz anketi tezimde kullanımda bir sakınca var mıdır? Ayrıca sizden veri toplama aracımı öğrencilerimize dağıtmanız rica edebilir miyim veya hem dersinize gelip hem de sizinle görüşüp bu aracı öğrencilerimize uygulatabilir miyim?

Cevaplarınız için şimdiden çok teşekkür ederim.  
İyi çalışmalar.  
Onat Kızılcık

**Gonca SUBAŞI** <goncas@anadolu.edu.tr>  
Alıcı: ben

20 Kas 2019 20:11

Mehaba Onat,

Tezinde geliştirdiğim ölçme aracını tabii ki veri toplamak için kendi tezinde kullanabilirsin, hiç bir sakıncası yok. Öğrencilere uygulama işine gelince, bunu yapabiliriz. Ben bu dönem sadece ikinci sınıf öğrencilerinin dersine giriyorum, bir de staj grubum var. Hangi gruplardan veri toplayacaksın, 1, 2, 3 ve 4.sınıflardan mı? ona göre başka gruplardan veri toplayacaksan hocalardan izin alıp veri toplama işini ayarlayabilirsin. Benimle de görüşebilirsin, hem bana hem de sana uygun bir vakte bulabiliriz. Pazartesi, salı ve perşembe günü derslerim var, çarşamba ve cumaları da staja gidiyorum. Buna göre bir ayarlama yapabilirsin. Kolay gelsin...

Gonca hoca

---

**Gönderen:** Onat Kızılcık <onatkucuk2@gmail.com>  
**Gönderildi:** 20 Kasım 2019 Çarşamba 15:02:52  
**Kime:** Gonca SUBAŞI  
**Konu:** Doktora Teziniz Hakkında

**CURRICULUM VITAE (CV)**

<b>Personal Information</b>	
Name	Onat
Surname	KÜÇÜK
Place of Birth and Birth Date	Edirne / Turkey – 22.09.1995
Nationality	T.R.
Contact Adress	Gaziemir / İZMİR
E-Mail Adress	onatkucuk22@gmail.com
<b>Educational Background</b>	
Primary	Edirne / Trakya Birlik Primary School (2001-2006)
Secondary	Edirne / Trakya Birlik Secondary School (2006-2009)
High School	Edirne / 80. Yıl Cumhuriyet Anatolian High School (2009-2013)
Higher Education (Bachelor's degree)	Eskişehir / Anadolu University, English Language Teaching Program (2013- 2018)
Higher Education (Master's degree)	Denizli / Pamukkale University, English Language Teaching MA Program (2018- 2020)
<b>Foreign Language</b>	
Foreign Language	English
Exam Name	YÖKDİL
Exam Date	17.03.2018
Points Received	100 / 100
<b>Professional Experience</b>	
2019 - still	İzmir / National Defence University, English Language Instructor