



Job satisfaction of teacher of students with hearing impairment in post-authoritarian Indonesia

Amka Abdul Aziz

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

Abstract

In Indonesia, the landscape of education system changed following the fall of last authoritarian regime in 1998. For decades, the past regimes maintained low spending in education and Indonesia found itself among the lowest ranking countries in the world in terms of its education budget. In post-authoritarian era, a number of key laws and regulations have provided an overall framework for the country's education reforms indicating that government pays attention to teachers, including teachers of disabled students. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing following the reform especially with regard to their job satisfaction as well as to identify the specific factors that positively and negatively affect their ability to do their jobs well. In addition, responses of different subsets of teachers were compared. Responses from 245 teachers of students with hearing impairment are reported. Collectively, 54% of participants stated that they were satisfied to very satisfied with their overall job. Specific aspects of the job that respondents indicated that they were most satisfied or most dissatisfied with are presented and suggestions for addressing some of the identified challenges are provided.

Keywords: job satisfaction, teacher, students, hearing impairment

1. Introduction

Job satisfaction refers to the gratification and sense of fulfillment individuals feel about specific aspects of their job or their job in general (Locke, 1969) ^[58]. Typically, it alludes to the assessment that people make about regardless of whether their employment related necessities are being met (Evans, 1997) ^[33]. Investigation on job satisfaction began in the early 1930s and was influenced by developments in attitude measurement and employment crises of the depression (Weiss & Brief, 2001) ^[93]. There has been a generally accepted belief ever since that worker are more motivated in their work and perform better, if they find satisfaction in their job (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001) ^[49]. On the contrary, job dissatisfaction has been linked with employee issues like job outcomes such as lateness, absenteeism and diminished performance, as well as reduced retention (e.g., Currivan, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986) ^[28, 88, 27].

Additionally, disappointment on employment also affects psychological wellness in that people who are unhappy with their occupation may display the harming impacts of burnout (i.e., lack of personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization) (Lee & Ashforth, 1996) ^[53], lack of self-esteem, anxiety and depression (Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005) ^[34]. Furthermore, they may show expanded counterproductive work practices, for example, activities that are intended to hurt collaborators or the organization as a whole (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006) ^[72].

1.1 Teachers' work pressure

Educators are under public pressure, in the current educational climate, because there seems to be a general perception that there are grave problems with public education and that major

fundamental changes are needed in order to fix these problems. Accordingly, there has been a strong education reform movement focusing on more academically challenging standards for graduation, make teachers and school administrators accountable for students' failure or success, substantial reliance on assessments to test students' knowledge and new curriculum frameworks to guide instruction (Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[66]. Along with the requirement to educate more students, these increased societal pressures are significantly changing the working conditions of all teachers (Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Harrington, 2014; Nichols & Berliner, 2007; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011) ^[44, 74, 83]. Another issue at present contributing to teachers' work pressure is the manner by which they are being assessed. Lewis and Young (2013) ^[55] reported that some states in the United States have actualized teacher assessment systems that base as much as half of the weight of educator evaluation decisions dependent upon students' scores on standardized tests. In Indonesia, a national exam was still considered an important instrument for the government to assess students. However, the exam became a primary source of stress not only for students but also for teachers.

However, since scores on standardized tests may be heavily influenced by socioeconomic factors, the fairness of this practice has been called into question. These socioeconomic factors may include parents' education, family health, family mobility, influence of peers, family resources, the home communication and literacy environment, and school demographics (Berliner, 2014; Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[11, 60]. At the point when these continuous contemporary workforce challenges are added to the general steady requests of the occupation, it is not amazing that a few educators are getting to be plainly disappointed with the calling.

When the regular persistent demands of the job is combined with these ongoing contemporary workforce challenges, it is not surprising that some teachers are becoming discontent with their profession. The feeling of numerous educators was abridged by one educator who made a YouTube video as part of her abdication from teaching. She said, "Everything I loved about teaching is extinct. Curriculum is mandated. Minutes spent teaching subjects are audited. Schedules are dictated by administrators. The classroom teacher is no longer trusted or in control of what, when, or how she teaches" (Gates, 2013) [40].

Schools depend on teachers who work with one another to build a workplace community and who are satisfied with their jobs. Educators' sense of job satisfaction has been associated with their commitment to teaching (Feather & Rauter, 2004) [35], motivation (Barnabé & Burns, 1994) [9], and well-being (Vansteenkiste *et al.*, 2007) [91]. Teacher's well-being and welfare is one of important motivation to boost teachers' quality and performance to improve and to better the quality of education development. Nevertheless, data from World Education Indicators (WEI) in 2007 showed that teachers in Indonesia were significantly underpaid compared to their international counterparts. Indonesia has the second-lowest income per person among WEI countries at less than one-half of the group average (OECD, 2005) [76].

Between 1995 and 2002, development in Indonesia was dominated by the Asian economic crisis of 1997 and an ensuing national political crisis that brought down the country's last authoritarian regime in 1998. For decades, the past regimes maintained low spending in education and Indonesia found itself among the lowest ranking countries in the world in terms of teachers' salaries due to a combination of the oversupply of teachers and limited government funding. Education spending was focused on building infrastructure while neglecting teacher salaries. The hymn of teachers, which designates them as 'heroes without medals', was an accurate expression of teachers' hard work without proper reward (Bachtiar, 2015) [8].

The landscape of education system changed following the fall of the last regime in 1998 when Indonesia entered the democratic era that made education reform possible. The amended constitution mandated that the government prioritize budget for education at least 20% from national budgeting to fulfill the necessity of national education. The mandate from the constitution brings fresh air to fund all education costs in Indonesia. All products of legislation about teachers that follow suit have given an understanding that government pays enough attention to educators from regulation perspective (Sulisworo, *et al.*, 2017) [86].

A number of key laws and regulations have provided an overall framework for education reform in Indonesia. These include Law 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, which defines a number of key areas, including the function and purpose of education; the rights and obligations of citizens, parents, communities, and government; national education standards, curriculum, education personnel and their roles and responsibilities; and finance, management, evaluation, accreditation and certification (OECD, 2015) [76].

Law 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers increased the minimum teacher academic qualification from D2 (two years

education after completion of senior secondary education) to an academic bachelor's degree (S1) or D4, a four-year diploma. It also requires teachers to have successfully completed the certification process and that all teachers must meet this requirement by 2015 (OECD, 2015) [76].

Further, the law sets minimum competency standards in the areas of professionalism, pedagogy, social skills and personal behavior. The law not only specifies what teachers should be able to do and how to behave, but also addresses the issue of teacher welfare by introducing a set of new professional allowances (equal to their basic salary) for teachers who have successfully completed the teacher certification process. However, the full implementation of education reform takes time because the real problems actually come upon real field implementation at school, goodwill from people to support government's programs of teacher development, and multi-interpretative regulations (Sulisworo, 2016) [86].

Actually educator's welfare cannot be measured from incomes only, but also from other aspects, such as professional development opportunities, comfort, protection, career opportunity, further study, and simple bureaucracy to manage functional teacher degree as regulated by law (Sulisworo, 2016) [86]. Teachers who are less satisfied may be less motivated to meet educational objectives, and dissatisfaction with conditions of teaching may lead to higher stress, absenteeism, and turnover (Grissom, 2012; Ingersoll, 2001; Allensworth, Ponisciak, & Mazzeo, 2009; Ladd and Chiu, 2011; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005; Perrachione, Rosser, & Peterson, 2008; Renzulli, Parrott, & Beattie, 2011) [43, 45, 3, 51, 59, 79, 80]. Attrition is another consequence of teacher job dissatisfaction (Boe, 2014; Billingsley, 2004) [14, 13]. Schools as well as students were adversely affected when teachers leave their positions. Students face barriers to quality teachers as their schools are regularly replacing them (Barnes *et al.*, 2007) [10].

1.2 Students with hearing impairment

In Indonesia, the number of disabled persons accounted for 11-13% of total population in 2015, an increase of 9% from only 2.45% of the approximately 249 million population in 2012. There were several causes of the increase including social conflict, natural disaster, and alcohol abuse. Among the disabled, the proportion of those physically impaired reached 39.37%, blind 29.63%, and deaf 7.89% (Akmal, 2017; Central Bureau of Statistics, 2012 & 2015) [2, 24].

Indonesia ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2011, and the government included provisions on the need for education for disabled people in Law No. 20 of 2003 on National Education. The Indonesian government's policies on inclusive education determine that students with all type of disabilities (physical, mental and social) should be mainstreamed into only general schools. However, it has always been challenging to teach disabled students especially deaf or hard of hearing students. So much so that Stewart and Kluwin (2001) [85] wrote: "Deaf students arguably present the most complex challenge for teachers of any group of students in both the general and special education populations. Every corner of their educational process is multidimensional and each dimension has the potential to significantly impact their academic achievement" (p. 14).

In addition to the contemporary issues mentioned above, most teachers of students with hearing impairment are required to be able to communicate with students who use a variety of modes of communication. Schools for the deaf in Indonesia have adopted the educational methodology of “total communication” (or simultaneous communication) from Western models. This method combines signs from American Sign Language with spoken Indonesian and other foreign languages. They refer to this as Signed Indonesian (Brown *et al.*, 2013) ^[18]. Few teachers are fluent signers, and many sign very little. Students communicate in their every day natural sign language outside of the classroom.

Teachers are also required to provide direct instruction to an increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse student body, to consult and collaborate with administrators, colleagues, families and community agencies, and to write Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that include goals and objectives that align with state standards and meet unique student needs, to stay updated on continuously changing hearing assistive technology, to conduct and support frequent progress monitoring, and to facilitate transition services (Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[60]. These activities occur along with limited planning time, and the expectation that teachers will complete due process compliance paperwork and attend compliance related meetings, often with a lack of administrative support (Bullard & Luckner, 2013) ^[20].

Working conditions can also seriously affect teachers’ quality of work, morale, and level of effort. Negative responses to day-to-day work may lead teachers to leave the profession or teachers may maintain their jobs, but simply cut their effort and overall involvement. Likewise, instructors may bring down their expectations for students, which can prompt a substandard quality of education for students who are deaf or hard of hearing. Students are likely to experience decades of underachievement, frustration and dependence if they do not acquire the knowledge, skills, and strategies needed for adult functioning during their years in school. Conversely, those who have great mentalities toward their jobs are more highly motivated to stay in and perform their jobs effectively (Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[60].

1.3 Previous Studies

This section presents a brief review of previous studies on teacher stress, teacher morale, Teacher burnout and job satisfaction of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. Johnson (1983) ^[47] examined the job stress of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing (n = 377). She reported that 27% rated teaching as very stressful or extremely stressful and that the primary sources of stress were (1) paperwork, (2) developing IEPs, (3) planning and preparing materials for a wide ranges of abilities, (4) inappropriate and/or disruptive behavior of students, and (5) inadequate time for planning.

McNeill and Jordan (1993) ^[64] compared teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing using an oral approach (n = 31) with teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing who used a total communication approach to teaching (n = 93) for stress and job satisfaction and reported that the two groups did not differ significantly and that neither group reported high stress.

Stedt and Palermo (1983) compared the morale of a group of teachers of deaf students with a group of teachers of deaf students who had additional disabilities. They reported that the teachers of students with additional disabilities had higher morale than the teachers of students without additional disabilities and higher than the norms for general education teachers.

Moore (1991) ^[71] reported that teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing (n = 231) were experiencing low morale due to the workload and pressure from community expectations. Meadow (1981) ^[65] reported that 80% of a sample of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing (n = 240) were satisfied with their jobs, but that they experienced significantly more “emotional exhaustion” than a sample of teachers of hearing students.

Luckner and Hanks (2003) ^[60] surveyed teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing (n = 608) and reported that overall, respondents were satisfied with their jobs. Of the 59 items in the survey, 51 were rated as satisfied or very satisfied by more than 50% of participants. In addition, subgroup (i.e., itinerant, elementary, secondary, and resource room teachers) responses were similar to those of the group as a whole. The items teachers reported being most satisfied with were (1) relationships with colleagues, (2) opportunity to use training and education, (3) importance and challenge (i.e., meaningful work and the drive to be successful), (4) structuring lessons to promote learning, and (5) job as a whole. The items they expressed the most dissatisfaction with were (1) amount of paperwork, (2) state assessment tests, (3) lack of family involvement, (4) time for nonteaching responsibilities, and (5) providing students with adult role models.

Most recently, Luckner and Dorn (2017) ^[60] examined the perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students who were deaf or hard of hearing to identify the factors that positively and negatively affected their ability to do their jobs well. Responses were analyzed from 495 teachers from across the United States. Eighty-nine percent of participants reported being satisfied to very satisfied with their overall job. In addition, of the 64 aspects of the job identified in the survey, 52 aspects were rated as satisfied or very satisfied by more than 50% of participants.

2. Research Methods

The objective of this study was to study the perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students with hearing impairment with regard to the factors that positively and negatively affect their ability to do their jobs well in post-authoritarian Indonesia. The research questions that guided the study were:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are teachers of students with hearing impairment with their job in general and with particular aspects of their job specifically?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are different subsets of teachers of students with hearing impairment with their job in general and with particular aspects of their job specifically?

I used questionnaire consisted of 59 statements on the “Job Satisfaction of Teachers of Students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing” created by Luckner and Hanks (2003) ^[60] to answer

the above research questions. The survey consisted of four parts. Part one explained the survey objectives and provided the consent form for respondents. Part two contained questions related to participants' professional and personal demographic information. The items in this section asked about gender, years of teaching experience, highest degree earned, job responsibilities, student services provided, and the type of program where teachers worked.

Part three contained the 59-statements that focused on a variety of aspects of the job such as satisfaction with salary, opportunity for promotion and advancement, physical work environment, pride and respect felt from being in this profession, relationships with colleagues, amount of paperwork required, number of students on caseload etc. I added a few job-related items previously discussed to reflect current trends in Indonesia resulting in 64 items in the questionnaire. Participants answered to each item using a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

The fourth part contained three open-ended questions that asked respondents to comment on the most enjoyable and the most challenging aspects of their job and to predict how long they thought they would continue working as a teacher of students with hearing impairment.

A face-to-face combined with telephone survey was conducted in order to explore the responses of the respondents and to gather more and deeper information. A face-to-face survey implies a door-to-door interview that involves going directly to the place of the respondents and conduct the interview either on-the-spot or at a scheduled date. A telephone interview was conducted in case the respondents were not available at the time of visit or they agreed to an impromptu telephone interview or on a scheduled date. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated to determine an internal consistency estimation of reliability of the items on the survey. The Cronbach's alpha was .82 indicating that the questionnaire items have relatively high internal consistency.

This study employed a three-step process to obtain data from a broad-based sample of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. First, preparing a list of schools and programs that educate students who are deaf or hard of hearing. An available database on the number of teachers of students with hearing impairment in the nation does not exist. Since we do not know what percentage of the true population is captured in this study, so sampling procedure used is purposive, a nonprobability sampling without involving random selection. Some four hundred and sixty-five addresses were entered into a database. Second, schools or programs for students who are deaf and hard of hearing were called and sent an email message asking them to share the information about the survey with the teachers on their staff.

Third, two hundred forty-five teachers were selected purposively, interviewed and completed the survey questionnaires. Years of teaching experience ranged from one to twenty-two, with the mean being 11 years. One hundred and seventy-six were female (72%) and 69 were male (28%). Twelve teachers (5%) described themselves as deaf, fifteen (6%) as hard of hearing and 218 (89%) as hearing. Most had a bachelor's degree ($n = 159$, 65%). Thirty-seven percent ($n = 91$) indicated that their primary job responsibility was as

itinerant teachers, 24% ($n = 59$) were elementary teachers, 15% ($n = 37$) were secondary level teachers and 24% ($n = 59$) checked "other" and added the specifics of their position (e.g., preschool, home intervention, resource room, consultant, part-time itinerant part-time resource room, transition specialist, outreach consultant).

Regarding direct services to students, the majority ($n = 103$, 42%) had a caseload of between seven and 15 students, 64 (26%) worked with less than six students, 44 (18%) of teachers worked with between 16 and 20 students, and 34 teachers (14%) had more than 20 students on their caseload. In addition, they provided consultation services for one to six students ($n = 142$, 58%), seven to 15 students ($n = 42$, 17%), 16–20 students ($n = 22$, 9%) and more than 20 students ($n = 39$, 16%). Participants were also asked to report the different types of communication they use with students. They were encouraged to check more than one option, or "check all that apply." Auditory/oral ($n = 159$, 65%) was the most often used, the second most frequently used communication approach was total communication ($n = 125$, 51%), the third was sign language ($n = 68$, 28%) and Cued Speech was used by three respondents (1%). Table 1 provides additional demographic details about the participants.

3. Results

The first research question asked: How satisfied or dissatisfied are teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing with their job in general and with particular aspects of their job specifically? To answer the first part of the question we examined the responses to the final item of the survey, which asked participants to share their perceptions of "the job as a whole." The biggest portion of replies was "satisfied" ($n = 78$, 32%), many were "very satisfied" ($n = 54$, 22%), the second biggest replies were "dissatisfied" ($n = 64$, 26%) and some were "very dissatisfied" ($n = 49$, 20%). In order to identify the positive and negative trends for the total group, very dissatisfied and dissatisfied replies were combined, as were satisfied and very satisfied responses for articles in the questionnaires. Collectively, 54% of participants reported being satisfied to very satisfied with their overall job.

The second part of the first research question asked: How satisfied or dissatisfied are teachers of students with hearing impairment with particular aspects of their job? Participants were satisfied with some facets of their jobs and dissatisfied with others. The greater parts of items on the survey were scored as positive by more than 50% of respondents. Table 2 shows the 10 aspects of the job that the group altogether identified as being satisfied or very satisfied. Table 3 shows the 10 items reported as dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

An item 'salary and fringe benefits' appear in table 2 and table 3 indicating that the item became a source of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The teachers interviewed in this study said they felt satisfied with professional allowances they received as the most enjoyable of their job since it contributed significantly to their incomes. The teachers added that they became motivated in doing their job because of the allowance. Those who said satisfied were mainly teachers who have successfully completed the teacher certification process as a prerequisite to receive professional allowances. On the other hand teachers who haven't completed the certification process

found themselves dissatisfied with their minimal salaries prompting some of them to look for a second job. For this group of teachers, professional allowance was the most challenging of their job because without it they felt their status were still unrecognized by the government.

The second research question asked: How satisfied or dissatisfied are different subsets of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing with their job in general and with particular aspects of their job specifically? The four categories of itinerant, elementary, secondary, and other were used because they represented the majority of the respondents.

The combined “satisfied” and “very satisfied” percentages by group are presented in Table 4 while the combined “dissatisfied” and “very dissatisfied” percentages by group are presented in Table 5. Variance analysis was made to compare ratings for “job overall” with a result that was not statistically significant ($F(3, 242) = 0.635, p < .05$). The eta squared was.

006567, indicating that the independent variable of job type explained only 0.66% of the variance in the dependent variable of “job overall” rating.

The second part of the second research question asked: How satisfied or dissatisfied are different subsets of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing with particular aspects of their job specifically? As in Tables 4 and 5, the four categories of itinerant, elementary, secondary, and other were used.

The comparison between the satisfied or very satisfied responses are presented in Table 6 while the comparison between the dissatisfied or very dissatisfied items and percentages were presented in Table 7. Overall, the subsets of participants replied in a similar manner, yet the elementary and secondary teachers were more dissatisfied with the lack of professional development related to deaf education and the state assessment tests.

Table 1 Demographic characteristic of participants

	Frequency	Percent
Highest degree earned		
B.A. or B.S.	161	65
M.A., M.S, M.Ed.	42	17
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	-	-
Specialist degree	5	2
Other	37	15
Current job responsibilities		
Itinerant	91	37
Elementary	59	24
Secondary	37	15
Other	59	24
Type of program		
Local public school	118	48
School for the Deaf/hard of hearing	47	19
Cooperative agency	34	14
Other	47	19

Table 2. Items participants identified most frequently as “satisfied” or “very satisfied”

Item	Percent
Relationships with colleagues	59
Amount of time spent with students	58
Salary and fringe benefits	57
Time to collaborate with families	57
The daily schedule	56
Celebrating holidays and important events with students	55
Being part of an educational team	54
Working with a wide age range of students	54
Importance and challenge	53
Working with students from diverse cultures	52
Opportunity for promotion and advancement	50

Table 3. Items participants identified most frequently as “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied”

Item	Percent
Salary and fringe benefits	51
State assessment tests for students	49
Professional development related to deaf education	47
Providing students with deaf adult role models	48
Amount of paperwork required	47
Time to collaborate with school staff	46
Family involvement	46
Availability of appropriate tests for students	45
Time for nonteaching responsibilities	43
Time to collaborate with families	43
Evaluation system	41

Table 4. Percentage of each group who reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the job overall

Job as a whole	All respondents	Itinerant	Elementary	Secondary	Other
	54%	56%	52%	58%	55%

Table 5. Percentage of each group who reported being “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with the job overall

Job as a whole	All respondents	Itinerant	Elementary	Secondary	Other
	46%	44%	48%	42%	45%

Table 6. Items participants identified most frequently as “satisfied” or “very satisfied”

Item	All respondent	Itinerant	Elementary	Secondary	Other
Relationships with colleagues	59%	58%	60%	57%	61%
Amount of time spent with students	58%	56%	57%	59%	60%
Salary and fringe benefits	57%	59%	58%	56%	55%
Time to collaborate with families	57%	56%	58%	55%	56%
The daily schedule	56%	58%	57%	54%	55%
Celebrating important students	55%	57%	56%	53%	52%
Being part of an educational team	54%	56%	52%	55%	53%
Working with a wide age range of students	54%	55%	56%	53%	52%
Importance and challenge	53%	54%	55%	51%	52%
Working with students from diverse cultures	52%	54%	51%	54%	53%
Opportunity for promotion and advancement	50%	51%	49%	48%	52%

Table 7. Items participants identified most frequently as “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied”

Item	All respondent	Itinerant	Elementary	Secondary	Other
Salary and fringe benefits	51%	53%	52%	49%	50%
State assessment tests for students	49%	47%	48%	51%	50%
Professional development	47%	45%	46%	49%	48%
Providing students with deaf adult role models	48%	50%	49%	46%	47%
Amount of paperwork required	47%	49%	48%	46%	45%
Time to collaborate with school staff	46%	48%	47%	45%	44%
Family involvement	46%	45%	44%	48%	47%
Availability of appropriate tests for students	45%	47%	46%	43%	42%
Time for nonteaching responsibilities	43%	45%	44%	42%	41%
Time to collaborate with families	43%	42%	44%	45%	41%
Evaluation system	41%	40%	39%	43%	42%

In order to identify common themes, a qualitative analysis of open response questions in section four of the survey was conducted. All responses were transcribed and grouped according to the individual prompts, (a) “What are the most challenging aspects of your job?” (b) “What are the most enjoyable aspects of your job?” and (c) “Additional comments.” To create the categories, the constant comparison method of data analysis was used. Each reply was compared with every other reply in order to look for consistency of meaning, similarities and differences. As a new concept appeared, themes were expanded and similar items were grouped into provisory categories. All responses under each question were organized on a comprehensive list.

Responses to the question about challenging aspects of the job were similar to those presented in Table 3, but the most frequently reported issues in order of recurrence were salary and fringe benefits, state assessment tests for students, providing students with deaf adult role models, professional development related to deaf education, amount of paperwork required, time to collaborate with school staff, family involvement, availability of appropriate tests for students, time for nonteaching responsibilities, time to collaborate with families and evaluation system.

The satisfaction felt from relationships with colleagues and amount of time spent with students were common responses to the question about the most enjoyable aspects of the job. Relationships with coworkers and colleagues were frequently mentioned as was comments such as, “I am happy to see students learn, grow and succeed” and “the aha moments when the students understand” were repeated continuously. Salary and fringe benefits were at number 3 as the most enjoyable aspects of the job while the item was number one in the list of challenging aspects of the job. As mentioned earlier,

almost half of teachers’ income came in the form professional allowance from the government for teachers who passed certification program. Those who felt dissatisfied are teachers that didn’t pass the certification process.

Some participants gave ardent responses to the open-ended question that asked for additional comments. Several individuals indicated that they enjoy the opportunity to be part of a team and they love their job, nevertheless there is not sufficient time for them to do their job effectively. Other individuals revealed the difficulties they faced in fulfilling their obligations as teachers (discussed in the following discussion section). The final question on the survey asked respondents “Do you see yourself in this field in: 5, 10, 15, or more years?” Twenty eight percent reported that they would work up to five more years, 16% stated that they plan to work 6–10 years more, 17% thought they would continue to work in deaf education for 11–15 years, and another 39% indicated that they plan to be in the field more than 15 years.

The first reason for leaving the job, the majority of respondents said that they plan to retire. The second most frequently reason mentioned by the participants to leave their job was because they dislike certain aspects of the job. The third reason stated by participants was shrinking caseloads since they were concerned about whether or not they would continue to maintain their job due to declining student number.

4. Discussion

This study has objective to examine the perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students with hearing impairment to identify the factors that affect positively and negatively their ability to do their jobs well in post-authoritarian Indonesia. Responses were analyzed from 245

teachers from across Indonesia. Fifty-four percent of participants reported being satisfied to very satisfied with their overall job. In addition, of the 64 items of the job identified in the survey, 42 items were rated as satisfied or very satisfied by more than 50% of participants.

Apart from the education reform, the changes that occurred in schools became the boost for this study. For example, general education trends such as the use of annual state-level assessments to evaluate educators' effectiveness and test students' knowledge through national exams, more academically challenging standards, increased requirements to use evidence-based practices, the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity of the student population, and the inclusion movement have altered how general education teachers do their job. In education of students with hearing impairment specific trends, such as greater acceptance of sign language, newborn hearing screening, early intervention, cochlear implants and improved hearing assistance technology, have changed what teachers teach, where they teach, and the population of students they serve (Lenihan, 2010; Miller, 2014; Mitchell & Karchmer, 2006; Antia & Rivera, 2016; Foster & Cue, 2009) [54, 68, 69, 6, 36].

Table 1 shows additional evidence of the changes taking place in this field because 24% of the teachers who participated in the study checked "other" indicating their job responsibilities were significantly different from working as a self-contained elementary or secondary classroom teachers (e.g., transition specialist, home intervention, and outreach consultant). Many respondents also reported that their job was a combination or two positions (e.g., part-time resource room, and part-time itinerant). Finally, it is important to note that most of respondents (37%) were itinerant teachers of students with hearing impairment.

The major challenges teachers face (items participants identified most frequently as dissatisfied or very dissatisfied) include, salary and fringe benefits, the state assessments, lack of professional development specific to the field of deaf education, paperwork, and the lack of time to cooperate with other professionals and families. (items participants identified most frequently as dissatisfied or very dissatisfied). Based on items participants identified most frequently as satisfied or very satisfied, the primary aspects of the profession that teachers gain pleasures from are their relationships with students, colleagues, and families as well as professional allowance they got from the government.

4.1 State assessments

It is not surprising that the attitudes of teachers of students with hearing impairment were affected negatively by the state assessments. Participants of this research said they often feel frustrated because they are required to limit the curriculum and teach toward the state assessments, which does not allow them to address other necessary skills needed by students with hearing impairment in order to become successful adults (e.g., study skills, self-advocacy, social-emotional skills, learning strategies and career development). Furthermore, they said, the pressure to raise student exam scores, to the avoidance of other essential objectives, can dishearten good educators and incite them to leave their job, while simultaneously discourage talented young professionals from entering the profession.

Additional concerns often expressed about state assessments of national exam that include: concern that students are being assessed at levels that they are not prepared to pass the assessments and the negative impact that has on the students' motivation.

National exam is one of the issues in the Indonesian educational system as major controversies occurred in implementing it. As a state mandatory exam that every student has to take part, it determines whether a student deserves to graduate or must stay. The government believed the exam will push the educators to teach better and students will be motivated to learn more (Nafida & Musthofiyah, 2017) [73]. However, some revealed negative impacts of the policy. One educator said "The exam has become very political, with teachers, principals and local governments pushing students to get good scores for the reputation of the schools and the area." (Supratno, 2013) [87].

Teachers said they gives as many drills and practice as possible to make students be able in recognizing the answer to multiple-choice questions. Participants said they have begun to "teach to the test" and it can be assured that teacher only ask students to apply lower-level cognitive strategy. Teachers ignore the higher level cognitive such as critical thinking, problem solving and analysis.

With such a great amount of pressure on one test, cheating has become a major issue and teachers have been part of the problem, with some encouraging students to cheat and circulating answers to enable them to get higher marks possible. Critics have accused local governments of encouraging cheating because they want to show up their reputation with a high pass rate. Local governments felt embarrassing when knowing their students failed in the exam. The cheating was illegally acceptable and considered as commonplace to saving face. It is a shortcut to keep the prestige of school and region high (Nafida & Musthofiyah, 2017) [73].

4.2 Lack of professional development

Educators of students with hearing impairment expressed a concern about a lack of professional development specific to the field of deaf education. This is justifiable when considering what has generally been considered professional advancement, that is a scope of formal, organized exercises in which teachers are brought together, for the most part outside of the classroom, to further build up their teaching skills, learn new skills or knowledge, and/or to familiarize themselves with new regulations that influence their teaching. These approaches typically have required release after school time, release time during the school day, or in-service days in order for teachers to participate.

Three factors have contributed to the decline of professional development for all educators in Indonesia, including teachers of students with hearing impairment: teacher welfare, teacher quality and teacher politicization (Chang *et al.*, 2014; Sulisworo, *et al.*, 2017) [25, 86]. First, from welfare point of view, teachers said satisfied with their jobs especially those who have successfully completed the teacher certification, and thus improve teaching quality and, eventually, student performance.

Second, from the teacher's quality aspect, certification

instruments demanded teachers to fulfill all constitutional criteria designed by the government, e.g. to master four basic competences: pedagogic, professional, personality and social competence. Furthermore, educators are also required to fulfill academic qualification on the subject level, and to participate in all professional development and training programs organized by private sectors, government and their own self-development programs. In addition, staff development trainers and teacher preparation programs should expose teachers of students with hearing impairment to online resources that provide a variety of tools that can save educators time and effort (Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[60].

However, the World Bank report in 2014 revealed that the certification instrument fell short of measuring competence; as a result, a number of teachers who lacked minimum subject knowledge and pedagogical skills received double income but did not improve the outcomes of their students (Chang, 2014) ^[25]. There is no proof that the certification procedure and the expanded levels of pay have led to better teaching quality in the classroom. Certification didn't make teachers teach better, at least not in ways that are measurable through student test scores. Overall, the experimental evidence shows that the certification process and the payment of the professional allowance do not benefit student learning. "It seems that there is no dormant, unused potential that can be activated by paying teachers more money" the World Bank said in the report.

This finding is not surprising, given that there are no clear theoretical reasons for why salary increases that are not conditional on classroom performance or further professional development would lead to better performance. It is also not surprising given the earlier analysis of the civil service mentality of many teachers (mostly older) who have focused for many years more on "educating" their students than on "teaching" them (Chang, 2014) ^[25]. The greatest impact of certification is expected from the higher quality of new inflow and the academic upgrading of teachers who did not yet qualify before the law was passed.

Third, the last problem is teacher politicization commonly happens to the local regions particularly at the political momentum such as legislative election, regional election and presidential election (Sulisworo, *et al.*, 2017) ^[86]. Since the number of teachers is by quantity significant enough to gain votes, the candidates usually make use of educational issues like teachers as their political commodity. Moreover, some teachers are also recruited as success team of a candidate. Teachers were promised a job promotion to be headmaster, head of education district or other strategic position for getting their votes. This dirty political practice make someone become a high rank officer merely more on his contribution as success team of the political candidates not because of his personal competence and meet standard qualification. On the contrary, if a teacher takes part in the political competition and lose, as a punishment he will be mutated or removed to a certain remote area (Sulisworo, *et al.*, 2017) ^[86].

4.3 Lack of consultation and collaboration

Teachers of students with hearing impairment reported that they do not have sufficient time to collaborate or consult with school staff and families. Although collaboration and

consultation take time, it is important for supervisors of teachers of students with hearing impairment to comprehend that in addition to teaching directly to students, teachers of students with hearing impairment need time in their schedules for meeting with educators, administrators, and families so they can help them increase their knowledge and skills about the needs of children and youth who are deaf or hard of hearing.

The collaboration has become essential for many students who are deaf or hard of hearing also attend general education classrooms for some portion of their school day. Unfortunately, most general educators have a limited understanding of the needs of students with hearing impairment and they need ongoing collaboration with teachers of students with hearing impairment in order to make appropriate adaptations so that students with a hearing loss have access to the academic content and social interactions (Bullard & Luckner, 2013) ^[20].

Meanwhile, most parents also have a limited understanding of what it is like to have a hearing loss since they have never knowingly come in contact with a person who is deaf or hard of hearing. Consequently, similar to general education teachers, many families rely on collaboration and consultation from teachers of students with hearing impairment to help them navigate the variety of challenges that do not occur for the parents of typical children and youth, but do exist for them.

In order to gather data about how well students with a hearing loss are functioning in general education classrooms, it is important that teachers of students with hearing impairment have time in their schedules to observe the room setting. Observation provides teachers of students with hearing impairment with data that enables students to adapt to the room so they can participate and benefit from the time spent in the general education classroom (Luckner & Dorn, 2017) ^[60].

5. Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that more than half of participants reported being satisfied to very satisfied with their overall job. As a group, they are most satisfied with the aspects of their job that relate to relationships with colleagues and amount of time spent with students as well as salary and fringe benefits. Professional allowance became a source of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Teachers felt satisfied with professional allowances they received as the most enjoyable of their job. On the other hand teachers who haven't completed the certification process found themselves dissatisfied. They were also dissatisfied with the aspects that surround the performance of their job (e.g., state assessments, lack of professional development, amount of paperwork).

Three factors have contributed to the decline of professional development for all educators in Indonesia, including teachers of students with hearing impairment: teacher welfare, teacher quality and teacher politicization.

The increased salary from certification program has prompted teachers to drop their second jobs, and many of them claim to no longer face income difficulties. However, there is no proof that the certification procedure and the expanded levels of pay have led to better teaching quality in the classroom.

Teacher also takes part in the political competition, and this teacher politicization commonly happens to the local regions particularly at the political momentum such as legislative election, regional election and presidential election. This political practice make someone become a high rank officer merely more on his contribution as success team of the political candidates not because of his personal competence and meet standard qualification.

Teachers of students with hearing impairment do not have sufficient time to collaborate or consult with school staff and families. Most general educators have a limited understanding of the needs of students with hearing impairment and they need ongoing collaboration with teachers of students with hearing impairment.

6. Reference

1. Abrams S, Gallegos R. Deaf role models: Making a critical difference in New Mexico. *Odyssey: New Directions in Deaf Education*. 2011; 12:24-27.
2. Akmal. Public Policy and ICTs for Higher Education of Disabled Students in Indonesia. 2017 Retrieved from <https://www.knepublishing.com/index.php/Kne-Social/article/view/867/2260> DOI: 10.18502/kss.v2i4.867
3. Allensworth E, Ponisciak S, Mazzeo C. The schools teachers leave: Teacher mobility in Chicago Public Schools. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2009.
4. Allinder RM. The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 1994; 17:86-95. doi:10.1177/088840649401700203.
5. American Association for Employment in Education. Job search handbook for educators. Columbus, OH: American Association for Employment in Education. 2002-2007-2010-2017.
6. Antia SD, Rivera MC. Instruction and service time decisions: Itinerant services to deaf and hard-of-hearing students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. 2016; 21:293-302. doi:10.1093/deafed/enw032.
7. Ashton PT, Webb RB. Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1986.
8. Bachtiar PP. Teacher certification program and social envy. *The Jakarta Post*, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/07/11>
9. Barnabé C, Burns M. Teachers' job characteristics and motivation. *Educational Research*. 1994; 36:171-185. doi: 10.1080/0013188940360206.
10. Barnes G, Crowe E, Schaefer B. The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study. Arlington, VA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2007.
11. Berliner DC. Exogenous variables and value-added assessment: A fatal flaw. *Teachers College Record*. 2014; 116:1-31.
12. Biglan A, Layton GL, Jones LB, Hankins M, Rusby JC. The value of workshops on psychological flexibility for early childhood special education staff. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. 2013; 132:196-210. doi:10.1177/027121411425191.
13. Billingsley BS. Special education teacher retention and attrition a critical analysis of the research literature. *Journal of Special Education*. 2004; 38:39-55. doi:10.1177/00224669040380010401.
14. Boe EE. Teacher demand, supply, and shortage in special education: A national perspective. In: Sindelar P. T., McCay E. D., Brownell M. T., & Lignugaris/Kraft B. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on special education teacher preparation* New York, NY: Routledge, 2014, 67-93
15. Bond FW, Bunce D. Mediators of change in emotion focused and problem-focused worksite stress management interventions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2000; 5:156-163. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.5.1.156.
16. Bradfield A, Seagrest R. Deaf education teacher training issues. Unpublished notes from the Deaf Education Supervisors' Workshop. San Antonio, TX, 2001.
17. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006; 3:77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
18. Brown EL, Yeung AS, Lee C. Communication and Language: Surmounting the Barriers to Cross-cultural Understanding: *International Advances in Education: Global Initiatives for Equity and Social Justice*, IAP, 2013.
19. Brunsting NC, Sreckovic MA, Lane KL. Special education teacher burnout: A synthesis of research from 1979 to 2013. *Education and Treatment of Children*. 2014; 37:681-712.
20. Bullard C, Luckner JL. *The itinerant teacher handbook* (2nd Ed.). Hillsboro, OR: Butte Publications, 2013.
21. Caprara GV, Barbaranelli C, Borgogni L, Steca P. Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2003; 95:821-832. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.821.
22. Caprara GV, Barbaranelli C, Steca P, Malone PS. Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*. 2006; 44:473-490. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001.
23. Cawthon S. Professional development for teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing: Facing the assessment challenge. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2009; 154:50-61.
24. Central Bureau of Statistics. Survey on National Socioeconomics/Susenas, Jakarta. Retrieved from, 2015. <https://www.knepublishing.com/index.php/Kne-Social/article/view/867/2260>
25. Chang, Mae Chu, Sheldon Shaeffer, Samer Al-Samarrai, Andrew B Ragatz, Joppe de Ree, *et al.* *Teacher Reform in Indonesia: The Role of Politics and Evidence in Policy Making*. Directions in Development. Washington, DC: World Bank. 2014. doi:10.1596/978-0-8213-9829-6. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0
26. Chester MD, Beaudin BQ. Efficacy beliefs of newly hired teachers in urban schools. *American Educational Research Journal*. 1996; 33:233-257. doi:10.3102/00028312033001233.
27. Cotton JL, Tuttle JM. Employee turn-over: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research.

- Academy of Management Review. 1986; 11:55-70.
28. Currihan DB. The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*. 2000; 9:495-524.
 29. Darling-Hammond L, Wei RC, Andree A, Richardson N, Orphanos S. Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council, 2009.
 30. Dolman D. College and university requirements for teachers of the deaf at the undergraduate level: A twenty-year comparison. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2008; 153:322-327.
 31. Dolman D. Enrollment trends in deaf education teacher preparation programs, 1973–2009. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2010; 155:353-359.
 32. ESSA. Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177, 2015-2016.
 33. Evans L. Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 1997; 13:831-845. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(97)00027-9.
 34. Faragher EB, Cass M, Cooper CL. The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2005; 62:105-112. doi.org/ 10.1136/oem.2002.006734.
 35. Feather NT, Rauter KA. Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction, and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 2004; 77:81-94. doi:10.1348/096317904322915928.
 36. Foster S, Cue K. Roles and responsibilities of itinerant specialist teachers of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2009; 153:435-447.
 37. Friend M, Cook LS. *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals (7th Ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill, 2013.
 38. Fullan M. *The new meaning of educational change (4th Ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2007.
 39. Garberoglio CL, Gobble ME, Cawthon SW. A national perspective on teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in deaf education. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. 2012; 17:367-383. doi:10.1093/deafed/ens014.
 40. Gates S. Teacher resignation video: Ellie Rubenstein explains, Everything I love about teaching is extinct *Huffington Post*, 2013. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/23/teacher-resignation-video-ellierubenstein_n_3328117.html.
 41. Glazerman S, Dolfen S, Bleeker M, Johnson A, Isenberg E, *et al*. Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Results from the first year of a randomized controlled study (NCEE No. 2009-4034). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for the Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, 2008.
 42. Good TL, Brophy JE. *Looking in classrooms (9th Ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2003.
 43. Grissom JA. Revisiting the impact of participative decision-making on public employee retention: The moderating influence of effective managers. *American Review of Public Administration*. 2012; 42:1-19.
 44. Grissom JA, Nicholson-Crotty S, Harrington JR. Estimating the effects of No Child Left Behind on teachers' work environments and job attitudes. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 2014; 36:417-436. doi: 10.3102/0162373714533817.
 45. Ingersoll RM. Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2001; 38:499-534.
 46. Johnson HA. Initial and ongoing teacher preparation and support: Current problems and possible solutions. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2013; 157:439-49.
 47. Johnson JL. Stress as perceived by teachers of hearing impaired children and youth (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gallaudet University, Washington, DC, 1983.
 48. Jones TW, Ewing KM. An analysis of teacher preparation in deaf education: Programs approved by the Council on Education of the Deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2002; 147:71-78.
 49. Judge TA, Thoresen CJ, Bono JE, Patton GK. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2001; 127:376-407. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376.
 50. Klassen RM. Teacher stress: The mediating role of collective efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Educational Research*. 2010; 103:342-350. doi:10.1080/00220670903383069.
 51. Ladd HF, Chiu MM. Teachers' perceptions of their working conditions: How predictive of planned and actual teacher movement? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 2011; 33:235-261.
 52. LaSasso C, Wilson A. Results of two national surveys of leadership personnel needs in deaf education. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2000; 145:429-435.
 53. Lee RT, Ashforth BE. A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1996; 81:123-133.
 54. Lenihan S. Trends and challenges in teacher preparation in deaf education. *The Volta Review*. 2010; 110:117-128.
 55. Lewis WD, Young TV. The politics of accountability: Teacher education policy. *Educational Policy*. 2013; 27:190-216. doi:10.1177/0895904812472725.
 56. Lincoln Y, Guba E. *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York, NY: Sage, 1985.
 57. Little JW. Teachers' professional development opportunities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 1993; 15:129-151.
 58. Locke E. What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*. 1969; 4:309-336. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0.
 59. Loeb S, Darling-Hammond L, Luczak J. How teaching conditions predict teacher turn-over in California schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*. 2005; 80(3):44-70.
 60. Luckner JL, Slike S, Johnson H. Helping students who are deaf or hard of hearing succeed. *Teaching Exceptional Children*. 2012; 44:58-67.
 61. Marschark M, Shaver DM, Nagle KM, Newman LA. Predicting the academic achievement of deaf and hard-of-hearing students from individual, household,

- communication, and educational factors. *Exceptional Children*. 2015; 81:350-369. doi:10.1177/0014402914563700.
62. Maxwell J. *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2005.
 63. McLeskey J, Billingsley BS. How does the quality and stability of the teaching force influence the research-to-practice gap? A perspective on the teacher shortage in special education. *Remedial and Special Education*. 2008; 29:293-305.
 64. McNeill JH, Jordan LJ. Factors that contribute to stress as reported by teachers of deaf students at residential schools. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 1993; 138:284-287.
 65. Meadow KD. Burnout in professionals working with deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 1981; 126:13-22.
 66. Merriam SB. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
 67. Midgley C, Feldlaufer H, Eccles J. Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1989; 81:247-258.
 68. Miller KJ. Trends impacting one public school program for students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2014; 36:35-43.
 69. Mitchell RE, Karchmer MA. Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies*. 2004; 4:138-163.
 70. Mitchell R, Karchmer M. Demographics of deaf education: More students in more places. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2006; 151:95-104.
 71. Moores DF. Dissemination of a model to create least restrictive environments for deaf students. (OSERS Grant No G008720128). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Center for Studies in Education and Human Development, 1991.
 72. Mount M, Ilies R, Johnson E. Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*. 2006; 59:591-622.
 73. Nafida U, Musthofiyah U. The implications of national exam from different perspectives: students, teachers and government, 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/7128072/>
 74. Nichols SL, Berliner DC. *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2007.
 75. OECD. *Education trends in perspective. Analysis of the world education indicators*. Edition, 2005.
 76. OECD/Asian Development Bank. *Education in Indonesia: Rising to the Challenge*, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2015. [Http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264230750-en](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264230750-en)
 77. Peabody Journal of Education, Luckner JL, Hanks JA. Job satisfaction: Perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 2003; 148:5-17.
 78. Perie M, Baker D. Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1997.
 79. Perrachione BA, Rosser VJ, Peterson GJ. Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator*. 2008; 32:25-41.
 80. Renzulli L, Parrott HM, Beattie IR. Racial mismatch and school type: Teacher satisfaction and retention in charter and traditional public schools. *Sociology of Education*. 2011; 84:23-48.
 81. Rosen RS. Between-learners' outside-of-classroom uses of American Sign Language as a foreign language. *Sign Language Studies*. 2014; 14:360-381. doi:10.1353/sls.2014.0011.
 82. Showers B. *Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training*. Eugene, OR: Centre for Educational Policy and Management, 1984.
 83. Skaalvik EM, Skaalvik S. Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2011; 27:1029-1038.
 84. Stedt J, Palermo D. The morale of teachers of multi-handicapped and nonhandicapped children in a residential school for the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*. 1983; 128:383-387.
 85. Stewart DA, Kluwin TN. *Teaching deaf and hard of hearing students: Content, strategies, and curriculum*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.
 86. Sulisworo D, Nasir R, Maryani I. Identification of teachers' problems in Indonesia on facing global community. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*. 2017; 6(2):81-90.
 87. Supratno H. in the Jakarta Globe. Indonesia's National Exam: How Much Pressure Can Students Take? The Jakarta Globe, 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/>
 88. Tett RP, Meyer JP. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*. 1993; 46:259-293.
 89. Tschannen-Moran M, Hoy AW. Teacher self-efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2001; 17:783-805.
 90. US. Department of Education. 37th Annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act, 2015. Washington, DC: Office of Special Education Programs, 2015.
 91. Vansteenkiste M, Neyrinck B, Niemiec CP, Soenens B, De Witte H, Van DB. On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction and job outcomes: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*. 2007; 80:251-277.
 92. Varra AA, Hayes SC, Roget N, Fisher G. A randomized control trial examining the effect of acceptance and commitment training on clinician willingness to use evidence-based pharmacotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2008; 76:449-458. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.76.3.449.
 93. Weiss HM, Brief AP. Affect at work: A historical perspective. In: Payne RL, & Cooper CL. (Eds.),

Emotions at work: Theory, research and applications for management New York: Wiley. 2001, 133-171.

94. Yoon KS, Duncan T, Lee SW, Scarloss B, Shapley KL. Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. Issue and Answers Report, REL 20007 – No. 033. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2007.