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Abstract:
This study aims to investigate the occupational burnout levels of Turkish EFL teachers by various variables. The general survey method was used in the study. The data were collected by creating a scale in the Google forms. The study group of the research consists of 365 EFL teachers working in the fall semester between January and March 2021. In this study, the Teacher Burnout Scale developed by Kaner, Şekercioğlu, and Yellice (2008) was used. According to the results of the research, no significant relationship was found between the burnout levels of Turkish EFL teachers and the variables of gender, marital status, and economic level. On the other hand, it was seen that the variables of professional seniority, getting support from colleagues and administrators affected the burnout levels of the teachers. The findings were discussed in relation to the literature and suggestions were made.
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Introduction

The concept of burnout was first used by Freudenberger and Maslach (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Freudenberger (1974) describes burnout as the failure, weariness, and exhaustion of the individual due to increased demands on energy, power, and resources. Burnout emerges with the feeling of physiological and emotional exhaustion, which is seen in individuals working in occupational groups that interact with people intensely and as a result of not being able to cope with the stress that arises from the nature of the profession (Maslach and Jackson 1981). According to Maslach, burnout is a structure with three factors: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and decreased individual achievement (Maslach et al, 2001).

Emotional Exhaustion: It refers to the stress-related area of professional burnout (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). It is when a teacher feels he/she has nothing left to give to others emotionally or psychologically (Wisniewsk & Gargiulo, 1997). Emotional exhaustion is the state of excessive wear and depletion of an individual's emotional resources. The reason for this professional burnout is the excess workload in the institution and individual conflicts in the workplace (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998).

Depersonalization: It represents the interpersonal relationship dimension of professional burnout (Wright & Douglas, 1997). It is the emotional disconnection of the individual from his/her work (Yıldız, 2015). In other words, it is the feeling of a psychological disconnection that disrupts both the personal and professional life of the person and distancing himself/herself from society. A teacher can distance himself/herself from students. Besides, he/she may develop a rude attitude towards his/her students, parents, and colleagues. He/she can also develop cynical attitudes towards personal and professional events (Wisniewsk & Gargiulo, 1997).

Low sense of achievement: Individual sense of achievement represents the self-evaluation dimension of professional burnout (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). Here, the individual believes that his/her professional competence (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998) and productivity have decreased. In other words, he/she thinks that he/she is not sufficient in his/her professional responsibility towards his/her students, colleagues, and families (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Burnout first emerges with the depletion of one's emotional resources. To put it differently, it results in the emotional exhaustion of the individual. The emotionally exhausted individual psychologically distances himself/herself from people by limiting his/her relationship with the people around him. Thus, the dimension of depersonalization begins (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach et al., 2001). And, at the final stage, the person realizes the difference between his/her previous positive attitudes and his/her current attitudes, and as a result, he/she thinks that his/her reserved attitudes limit his/her contributions to the institution and society he/she works for. Thus, the individual feels a sense of inadequacy in work and human relations (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). In other words, he/she begins to consider himself/herself inadequate in doing his job and providing services to his/her customers. A person's tendency to evaluate himself/herself negatively is defined within the dimension of personal achievement (Maslach et al., 2001).

It is the teachers who teach in schools and control this process. In parallel with today's population growth, the number of students in schools is increasing rapidly. However, there is a shortage in the number of teachers. In addition, the education and training conditions are constantly changing, and the role of and expectations from teachers are increasing in a parallel way. The teacher, who strives to achieve what is expected of him/her, has always been an indispensable element of the education system. Technological developments and especially the innovations in the field of education can contribute to education and training activities up to a point and reduce the burden of the teacher a little, but they can never fulfill the functions of teachers. However, this should not cause the teacher to see himself/herself as an indispensable element of the system and not to keep up with the developing technology and renew himself/herself. That is because, with the developments and
changes, the aims of education and the roles of teachers also change. Teachers interact with students, parents, and school administrators throughout the day, which can cause stress for teachers (Gürbüz, 2008). This stress can cause teachers to experience burnout.

Teachers who experience professional burnout do not make much effort to increase the academic success of their students and believe that they cannot positively affect students (Egyed & Short, 2006). Besides, teachers who experience professional burnout have low school attendance levels and have problems in performing their teaching duties. Additionally, they are less concerned about their students, participate less in teaching, and abstain from being in contact with students (Wisniewski and Gargiulo, 1997). Studies report that teachers leave the field of education due to professional burnout and work in other fields (Miller et al., 1999).

García-Arroyo et al. (2019) examined teacher burnout and its variation across countries. Tsang (2019) analyzed how teacher burnout can be caused by certain structural forces. In another recent study, Mohammed et al. (2021) investigated the lecturers’ burnout behaviors and consequences in public and private higher education in Iraq. Although various studies have found demographic factors related to the phenomenon of teachers’ burnout, very few of them have been carried out within the scope of subject-specific teachers’ burnout. This study focused on the EFL teachers in Turkey as they bear the burden of teaching English in the context of ESL, where English is not the native language of almost the entire population. When we look at the literature, we come across a limited number of studies on the burnout levels of English teachers. Özgür (2007) examined the relationship between English teachers’ job satisfaction and burnout levels in his study. Mukundan and Khandehroo (2010) examined the burnout level of the EFL teachers in Malaysia and investigated the relationship between age and workload and the burnout level of EFL teachers. In their study, Sadeghi and Khezrlou (2014) aimed to expand previous studies on teacher burnout by exploring the factors contributing to Iranian EFL teachers’ feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal achievement. Adabi and Ghafournia (2020) investigated the relationship among anxiety, motivation, and burnout syndrome among Iranian EFL teachers and found out a significant correlation between teachers’ burnout and the research factors such as their motivation and anxiety. Since the number of studies examining the burnout levels of Turkish EFL teachers is very few, this research aims to fill the gap in the field and contributing to the literature with this aspect.

Regarding the important role that teachers play in language learning, their feelings and emotions have been the subject of many studies (Borg et al., 1991; Chan, 2004; Swanson & Koonce, 1986). According to some scientists, these feelings and emotions can develop teachers’ professional dimensions such as high teacher autonomy or prevent their progress in situations such as burnout (Özer & Beycioğlu, 2010). Therefore, raising and developing awareness of such feelings and emotions and the relationship between them can assist in the occupational development of EFL teachers.

Besides, the causes of professional burnout are known. When the reasons that cause occupational burnout are known, appropriate measures can be taken to prevent these causes. If necessary measures are taken for occupational burnout, teachers will be able to do their jobs in a more qualified way. And, the fact that teachers do their jobs in a qualified way will contribute positively to the quality of education. For this reason, in this study, the professional burnout levels of teachers teaching English as a foreign language were examined. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. Does the level of professional burnout of EFL teachers show a significant difference by the gender variable?
2. Does the level of professional burnout of EFL teachers show a significant difference by marital status variable?
3. Does the level of professional burnout of EFL teachers show a significant difference by the variable of receiving support from the administrators?
4. Does the level of professional burnout of EFL teachers show a significant difference by the variable of getting support from their colleagues?

5. Does the level of professional burnout of EFL teachers show a significant difference by the variable of their perceived economic status?

6. Do EFL teachers' burnout levels show a significant difference by the variable of professional seniority?

METHOD

The Study Pattern

In this study, EFL teachers' professional burnout levels were examined in terms of gender, marital status, support from administrators, support from colleagues, self-perceived economic status, and seniority in the profession. For this reason, the survey model was used in this study. General survey models are the scanning arrangements conducted on the whole universe or a group of samples to be taken from the universe to reach a general judgment about the universe in a universe consisting of many elements (Karasar, 2005).

The participants were contacted through the internet and they filled in google form surveys distributed to them. The researcher contacted most of the participants directly as they were her former students and were easy to contact, in this sense the convenience sampling method was used to collect the data. The contacted teacher participants also distributed the surveys further to their contacts who were also EFL teachers in state or private schools in Turkey. In this sense, the snowball sampling technique was employed to reach as many participants as possible.

Study Group

The study group of the research consists of 365 EFL teachers working in the fall semester between January and March 2021 in the 2020-2021 academic year.

Table 1. Teachers' Demographic Characteristics

| Gender       | N    | %  | Marital status          | N    | %  |
|--------------|------|----|-------------------------|------|----|
| Female       | 260  | 71,2| Married                 | 230  | 63,0|
| Male         | 105  | 28,8| Single                  | 135  | 37,0|
| Do you receive support from your colleagues? | N | % | Are you appreciated by administrators? | N | % |
| No           | 276  | 75,6| No                      | 233  | 63,8|
| Yes          | 89   | 24,4| Yes                     | 132  | 36,2|
| In which sector do you work? | N | % | Your perceived economic level? | N | % |
| State        | 300  | 82,2| Low income              | 89   | 24,4|
| Private sector | 64  | 17,5| Medium class            | 259  | 71,0|
| High income  | 17   |     |                         |      | 4,7 |

Data Collection Tools

This research utilized google form to collect primary data. "Personal Information Form" and "Teacher Burnout Scale" were used to collect the data of the study.

Personal Information Form
In the personal information form developed by the researcher, information about the teacher’s gender, marital status, support from administrators, support from colleagues, self-perceived level of income, and professional seniority are included.

The Burnout Scale

Teacher Occupational Burnout Scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale developed by Kaner et al. (2008). The Teacher Occupational Burnout Scale consists of four sub-scales and 24 items. Scoring of the scale; the scale is scored as follows: describes me very well-5, describes me well-4, describes me a little-3, does not describe me very well-2, does not describe me at all-1. The sub-scales of the scale are occupational burnout (OB), Alienation to Students-Depersonalization to Students (ASDS), Physical and Emotional Burnout (PEB), Alienation to Colleagues and Managers-Depersonalization to Colleagues and Managers (ACMDCM). Exploratory factor analysis was used to test the construct validity of the Teacher Occupational Burnout Scale. The variance explained by the four factors is 60.902%. To test the similar scale validity of the Teacher Professional Burnout Scale, the Teacher Professional Burnout Scale and the Maslach Burnout Inventory were applied to 59 teachers. It was observed that the correlation between the total scores of the two scales was significant (r=0.60, p<0.01). The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.92 for the whole scale, and 0.90 for burnout for the teaching profession, 0.87 for alienation from students, 0.86 for emotional burnout, and 0.80 for alienation from colleagues and administrators for the sub-scales. The Cronbach's alpha reliability value for this study was .87.

Data Collection and Analysis

A scale was created in Google forms to collect the data. In the next phase, the scale was sent to only EFL teachers via social media. Those who volunteered to participate in the study filled the scale form. The quantitative data collected were analyzed statistically. SPSS version 24 was used for the data analysis. Before analyzing the data, the accuracy of the data entry and the normality of the distribution of the variables were tested. The analysis of the data was made on 365 teacher candidates. To test the normality of distribution of the research data, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was performed, the kurtosis skewness values were controlled and it was concluded that the data were not normally distributed. The Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis Test, and Spearman Correlation Coefficient were used for the data analysis.

Table 2. The Mann Whitney U Test Results of Teachers’ Burnout Levels by the Gender Variable

| Gender | N  | Mean Rank | Rank Sum | U     | P   |
|--------|----|-----------|----------|-------|-----|
| Burnout |    |           |          |       |     |
| Female | 260| 180,40    | 46905,0  | 12975,00 | .459|
| Male   | 105| 189,43    | 19890,0  | 12975,00 | .825|
| Female | 260| 178,03    | 46288,5  | 12358,50 | .156|
| Male   | 105| 195,30    | 20506,5  | 12988,50 | .466|
| ASDS    |    |           |          |       |     |
| Female | 260| 180,46    | 46918,5  | 12988,50 | .466|
| Male   | 105| 189,30    | 19876,5  | 13449,00 | .825|
| PEB     |    |           |          |       |     |
| Female | 260| 183,77    | 47781,0  | 19014,00 | .459|
| Male   | 105| 181,09    | 19014,0  | 12975,00 | .825|
As can be seen in Table 2, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether teachers' burnout levels changed by the gender variable. According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, no significant difference was found in terms of gender (U =12975,000, p=.459). No significant difference was observed in the sub-dimensions of OB (U=12358,500, p=.156), ASDS (U=12988,500, p=.466), PEB (U=13449,000, p=.825), and ACMDCM (U=.825) 13384,500, p=.770).

Table 3. The Mann Whitney U Test Results of Teachers' Burnout Levels by Marital Status

|                  | N   | Mean Rank | Rank Sum  | U          | P     |
|------------------|-----|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Burnout          |     |           |           |            |       |
| Married          | 230 | 177,13    | 40739,00  | 14174,000 | .165  |
| Single           | 135 | 193,01    | 26056,00  |            |       |
| OB               |     |           |           |            |       |
| Married          | 230 | 177,04    | 40720,00  | 14155,000 | .159  |
| Single           | 135 | 193,15    | 26075,00  |            |       |
| ASDS             |     |           |           |            |       |
| Married          | 230 | 180,78    | 41580,00  | 15015,000 | .599  |
| Single           | 135 | 186,78    | 25215,00  |            |       |
| PEB              |     |           |           |            |       |
| Married          | 230 | 178,62    | 41083,50  | 14518,500 | .300  |
| Single           | 135 | 190,46    | 25711,50  |            |       |
| ACMDCM           |     |           |           |            |       |
| Married          | 230 | 178,50    | 41055,50  | 14490,500 | .286  |
| Single           | 135 | 190,66    | 25739,50  |            |       |

As seen in Table 3, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether the burnout levels of teachers changed by the variable of marital status. According to Mann-Whitney U test results, no significant difference was found in terms of the variable of marital status (U =14174,000, p=.165). No significant difference was observed in the sub-scales of OB (U=14155,000, p=.159), ASDS (U=15015,000, p=.599), FDT (U=14518,500, p=.300), and ACMDCM (U=14490,500,500, p=.286).

Table 4. The Mann Whitney U Test Results of Teachers' Burnout Levels by Support from Administrators

|                  | N   | Mean Rank | Rank Sum  | U          | P     |
|------------------|-----|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Burnout          |     |           |           |            |       |
| No               | 233 | 153,68    | 35808,00  | 8547,000   | .000  |
| Yes              | 132 | 234,75    | 30987,00  |            |       |
| OB               |     |           |           |            |       |
| No               | 233 | 162,74    | 37917,50  | 10656,500  | .000  |
| Yes              | 132 | 218,77    | 28877,50  |            |       |
| ASDS             |     |           |           |            |       |
| No               | 233 | 165,38    | 38533,50  | 11272,500  | .000  |
| Yes              | 132 | 214,10    | 28261,50  |            |       |
| PEB              |     |           |           |            |       |
| No               | 233 | 157,34    | 36661,00  | 9400,000   | .000  |
| Yes              | 132 | 228,29    | 30134,00  |            |       |
| ACMDCM           |     |           |           |            |       |
| No               | 233 | 139,99    | 32617,00  | 5356,000   | .000  |
| Yes              | 132 | 258,92    | 34178,00  |            |       |

2002
As seen in Table 4, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether the burnout levels of teachers changed by the variable of receiving support from administrators. According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, a significant difference was found in terms of receiving support from administrators (U = 8547,000, p = .000). A significant difference was observed in the sub-scales of OB (U = 10656,500, p = .000), ASDS (U = 11272,500, p = .000), PEB (U = 9400,000, p = .000), and ACMDCM (U = 5356,000, p = .000). According to the results of the general scale and in all the sub-scales, it was observed that the occupational burnout levels of the teachers who did not receive support from administrators were high.

Table 5. The Mann Whitney U Test Results of Teachers' Burnout Levels by Support from Colleagues

| Burnout | N  | Mean Rank | Rank Sum | U      | P   |
|---------|----|-----------|----------|--------|-----|
| No      | 276| 168,92    | 46621,00 | 8395,000 | .000 |
| Yes     | 89 | 226,67    | 20174,00 |        |     |
| No      | 276| 174,10    | 48052,50 | 9826,500 | .005 |
| Yes     | 89 | 210,59    | 18742,50 |        |     |
| No      | 276| 172,64    | 47647,50 | 9421,500 | .001 |
| Yes     | 89 | 215,14    | 19147,50 |        |     |
| No      | 276| 169,95    | 46906,00 | 8680,000 | .000 |
| Yes     | 89 | 223,47    | 19889,00 |        |     |
| No      | 276| 164,14    | 45303,50 | 7077,500 | .000 |
| Yes     | 89 | 241,48    | 21491,50 |        |     |

As seen in Table 5, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine whether the burnout levels of teachers vary by the variable of receiving support from colleagues. According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, a significant difference was found in terms of receiving support from colleagues (U = 8395,000, p = .000). A significant difference was observed in the sub-scales of OB (U = 9826,500, p = .005), ASDS (U = 9421,500, p = .001), PEB (U = 8680,000, p = .000), and ACMDCM (U = 7077,500, p = .000). According to the results of the general scale and in all the sub-scales, it was observed that the occupational burnout levels of the teachers who did not receive support from administrators were high.

Table 6. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test Result of Teachers' Burnout Levels by the Variable of Economic Status

| Economic Status | N    | Mean Rank | sd | Kruskal-Wallis H | P  |
|-----------------|------|-----------|----|-----------------|----|
| Burnout         |      |           |    |                 |    |
| Low income      | 89   | 205,76    | 2  | 29,663          | .056 |
| Medium-level    | 259  | 196,75    |    |                 |     |
| income          |      |           |    |                 |     |
| High income     | 17   | 204,32    | 2  |                 |     |
| Low income      | 89   | 202,83    |    | 26,369          | .075 |

As seen in Table 6, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied to determine whether the burnout levels of teachers vary by the variable of economic status. According to the Kruskal-Wallis H test results, a significant difference was found in terms of economic status (H = 29,663, p = .056). A significant difference was observed in the sub-scales of OB (H = 26,369, p = .075) and ACMDCM (H = 29,663, p = .056). According to the results of the general scale and in all the sub-scales, it was observed that the occupational burnout levels of the teachers who did not receive support from administrators were high.
As seen in Table 6, the Kruskal-Wallis Test was used to test the significance of the difference between teachers' burnout and the variable of economic status. When we look at the overall score of the scale, no significant difference ($\chi^2$($df=2$ $n=365)= 0.56$, $p>0.05$) was observed in the context of the variable of economic status. No significant difference was observed in the sub-scales of OB ($\chi^2$($df=2$ $n=365)= 0.75$, $p>0.05$), ASDS ($\chi^2$($df=2$ $n=365)= 0.83$, $p>0.05$), PEB ($\chi^2$($df=2$ $n=365)= 0.85$, $p>0.05$) and ACMDCM ($\chi^2$($df=2$ $n=365)= 0.65$, $p>0.05$).

### Table 7. The Spearman's rho test results of Teachers' Burnout Levels by professional seniority

| Burnout | Correlation Coefficient | OB | ASDS | PEB | ACMDCM | Your Duration of Working in the Profession |
|---------|-------------------------|----|------|-----|--------|------------------------------------------|
| Burnout |                         | 1.00| 0.895**| 0.875**| 0.921**| 0.774**| -0.228**|
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .600 |
| N | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 364 |
| OB | Correlation Coefficient | 1.00| 0.706**| 0.767**| 0.548**| -0.023|
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 | .000 | .661 |
| N | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 364 |
| ASDS | Correlation Coefficient | 1.00| 0.782**| 0.594**| -0.014|
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 | .786 |
| N | 365 | 365 | 365 | 364 |

2004
As can be seen in Table 7, the Spearman Correlation coefficient technique was used to determine whether the burnout levels of teachers vary by the variable of professional seniority. According to the results, a negative relationship was observed between occupational burnout and working years in the profession ($r=-.228$, $p=.000$). No significant relationship was observed in the sub-scales of OB ($r=-.023$, $p=.000$), ASDS ($r=.014$, $p=.000$), PEB ($r=.003$, $p=.000$) and ACMDCM ($r=-.083$, $p=.000$).

**Discussion Conclusion and Recommendations**

In this study, six variables (gender, marital status, receiving support from administrators, receiving support from colleagues, economic level, professional seniority) that are thought to be predictors of burnout levels of ELT teachers in Turkey were examined. According to the results of the study, no significant relationship was found between the burnout levels of ELT teachers in Turkey and the variables of gender, marital and economic status. On the other hand, it has been observed that the variables of professional seniority, being supported by colleagues and administrators affect the burnout levels of EFL teachers.

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are different results regarding the effect of gender on the level of burnout. In the literature, there are many studies that found that gender affects the level of burnout and that female teachers experience more emotional exhaustion (Tuna & Çimen, 2013; Yavuz, 2019; Karakoç, 2011). The high level of burnout in women can be attributed to some socio-cultural reasons. According to Altınpark and Yılmaz (2012), both the sexist perspective prevailing in society and the roles of motherhood and babysitting imposed on women are some of the invisible obstacles women face in working life. On the other hand, there are studies showing that male teachers experience higher levels of depersonalization and emotional exhaustion (Seferoğlu et al., 2014; Yavuz & Yılmaz, 2021). According to the results of this study, no significant difference was found in terms of gender. When other studies in the field are examined, the result of this study is similar to many research results (Akınçi, 2016; Boydak, 2009; Farshi & Omranzadeh, 2014; Filiz, 2014; Nichols & Sosnowsky, 2002; Sadeghi & Khezrlou, 2014). According to the results of this research, the reason why gender did not have an effect on the level of burnout may be due to the personality traits of the participating teachers.

In the current study, it was determined that the economic level variable, like gender, did not make a significant difference on the burnout levels of the teachers. Research results show parallelism with some other research results. Similarly, Yavuz and Yılmaz (2021) did not find a significant difference in
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the general scale score in terms of the variable of being satisfied with the wages of the teachers’ and their professional burnout levels. On the other hand, there are also studies stating that wages affect job satisfaction positively. Öztürk (2015) stated that low wages are among the factors affecting burnout. In the present study, no significant difference was observed in the general scale in terms of the economic status variable and burnout levels. This may be caused by the personality traits of these teachers. In other words, teachers may have thought of doing their job properly rather than their economic situation.

When the literature is reviewed, it is found that there is a relationship between professional seniority and burnout (Tümkaya, 1999; Özdemir, 2007). When examined in terms of the seniority variable, the results of this study determined that the burnout levels of EFL teachers decreased as the working years in the profession increased. This result is consistent with the results of some other studies in the field. (Seğmenli, 2001; Sezer, 2012). Seferoğlu et al. (2014) found in the results of their research that teachers with a professional seniority of 6-10 years experience a higher level of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization compared to those with a professional seniority of 21-25 years. Çam (1989) defended the reason for this, citing the Edelwich model as an example, with the idea that "Starting the profession with great hopes and not meeting their hopes at the level of expectation cause burnout in employees over time." As a result of the present study, the reason for the high level of burnout of teachers with low professional seniority may be that they do not have enough experience on how to deal with problematic situations because they are young and inexperienced.

Consistent with many other studies, this study could not empirically demonstrate a relationship between English teachers’ marital status and burnout levels. Boydak (2009), Sadeghi and Khezrlou (2014) and Yılmaz (2018) also did not find any effect of marital status on teachers’ burnout level. In summary, the results of the current research point to an important conclusion that both single and married EFL teachers may be prone to the detrimental effects of burnout.

It has been determined that the burnout levels of ELT teachers in Turkey differ according to their relationships with their administrators and colleagues, as well as the variable of professional seniority. In the general findings of the professional burnout scale, it was observed that the burnout levels of the EFL teachers who did not receive support from their colleagues were high. The burnout level of teachers who received support from their colleagues was lower than those who did not, which is in line with the results of many studies in the field (Aksoy, 2007; Yavuz, 2019; Yavuz & Yılmaz, 2021; Zabel & Zabel, 2002). Likewise, Girgin and Baysal (2005) examined the burnout level of teachers who provided education to the mentally handicapped. In this study, in which they discussed the sub-dimensions of support from colleagues and burnout level together, the mean scores of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization of the teachers who received support from their colleagues were found to be significantly lower than the teachers who did not. According to the results of this research, it can be said that the burnout level of teachers who do not receive support from their colleagues is high and that support from their colleagues reduces the level of burnout.

In the literature, there are studies stating that the support of the administrators to the teachers contributes positively to the business and life of the individual (Hocalar, 2018; Yavuz, 2019). The results of this study are similar to the results of these studies in the field. The burnout level of ELT teachers who received support from administrators was lower than those who did not. Zabel and Zabel (2001) stated that teachers who had problems with administrators and did not receive support from them had higher burnout levels. Drawing on an Education Service Advisory Committee report (1998), Kyriacou (2001) suggests that institutions and administrators can support teachers by improving existing curricula, supporting teachers in teacher practice, and providing them with adequate resources and opportunities. He also argues that making clear job descriptions will reduce stress by preventing role ambiguity and conflict. Kyriacou (2001) recommends creating and maintaining open lines of communication between teachers and administrators, and allowing teachers to engage in professional development activities that can establish a professional identity.
For a better quality of education, it is necessary to identify the causes of burnout and avoid unpleasant and discouraging factors. In order to get rid of the psychological and physical symptoms of burnout, both organizational and personal preventive measures are needed. It is obvious that teachers will do their jobs more effectively as long as they work in a stress-free and comfortable working environment. The results of this study can be a guide for taking measures to reduce the burnout levels of Turkish EFL teachers, as the study determines the factors affecting their burnout levels. Since burnout has negative effects on students' learning and the teaching system, it can be suggested that school administrators provide more extracurricular opportunities to overcome the syndrome. In order to examine the issue of professional burnout more comprehensively, future studies can be conducted with different groups and more variables can be examined.
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