

**AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER PEDAGOGICAL MISCONDUCT IN  
TEACHING ENGLISH**

**AN ARTICLE**

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Sarjana Pendidikan**

**By:**

**HARDIANSAH SINURAT**

**Registration Number: 2153121016**



**ENGLISH AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND ARTS  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF MEDAN**

**2020**

ARTIKEL

**AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER PEDAGOGICAL  
MISCONDUCT IN TEACHING ENGLISH**

Disusun dan Diajukan oleh:

Hardiansah Sinurat  
NIM. 2153121016

Telah diverifikasi dan dinyatakan memenuhi syarat  
untuk diunggah pada jurnal online

Medan, Januari 2020

Menyetujui

Dosen Pembimbing I



Dr. Siti Aisah Ginting, M.Pd.  
NIP. 19570521 198403 2 002

Dosen Pembimbing II



Safrida Lubis, S.Pd., M.Hum  
NIP.19780721 200701 2 001

Ka. Program Studi  
Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris



Nora Ronita Dewi, S.Pd., S.S., M. Hum.  
NIP.19800522 200812 2 003

# AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER PEDAGOGICAL MISCONDUCT IN TEACHING ENGLISH

\*Hardiansah Sinurat

\*\*Dr. Siti Aisah Ginting, M.Pd

\*\*Safrida Lubis, S.Pd., M.Hum.

## ABSTRACT

**Sinurat, Hardiansah. Registration Number: 2153121016. An Analysis of Teacher Pedagogical Misconduct in Teaching English. A Thesis. English Education Program, English and Literature Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Medan, 2019.**

This study was aimed to find out the types of teacher pedagogical misconduct and the reasons of teacher pedagogical misconduct. The research was conducted by using descriptive qualitative. The data were the result of questionnaire and interviewing of English teacher at SMP Swasta Josua Medan. The data were analyzed based on types of teacher pedagogical misconduct by Kearney and reason of teacher pedagogical misconduct by Riley and Lewis. The findings showed that there were three types of teacher pedagogical misconduct. They were indolence, incompetence, and offensiveness. Moreover, the dominant category of indolence is changing assignments every time, while failure to treat student properly is in incompetence and involving sarcasm in offensiveness. The teacher conducted pedagogical misconduct due to treat students differently, teaching in sharp sarcasm technique, restricted, releasing anger and hardly braid good relationship.

**Keywords:** *teacher pedagogical misconduct, teaching English*

---

\*Graduate Status

\*\*Lecturer Status

## **INTRODUCTION**

### *Background of the Study*

Teaching is concerted of sharing knowledge and experience, from experienced and educated person to unexperienced and uneducated person. Teachers play a vital role in the attainment of goals in any nation. They are responsible for high standards in education, transmission of national values and norms to their pupils by teaching them being a good models. They are the front line of developing pupils' understanding skills, learning and core values. Therefore, the most important elements in producing quality education, they are expected to abide by the professional code of ethics. However, in spite of such values and importance attached to teachers and the teaching profession, there are professional misconduct and lack of integrity amongst the teachers that appears while learning. Teacher misconduct disturbs the implementation of the teaching and learning process.

Teaching is the didactic process in which both the teacher and student participate, and its main goal is to promote and support learning. According to Brown (2000) teaching should be defined with a term of learning, because "teaching" facilitates a learning process, gives the learner an opportunity to learn and sets the conditions essential for learning. A more extended definition of teaching always leads to many methods which the teacher can use to simplify the learning process.

Despite the common view of good teaching as something that is mostly learned through experience, our argument rests on a conception of teaching as unnatural work. Because it is, we argue, not natural, carefully designed learning is necessary. The notion that teaching is unnatural is difficult to grasp because of the ubiquity of teaching activity: In fact, as Cohen (2003) argues, most people teach. Parents teach children, friends and coworkers show one another how to do things, and many kinds of professionals provide information, demonstrations, and advice. Teaching, defined as helping others learn to do particular things, is an everyday activity in which many people engage regularly. Professional classroom teaching,

on the other hand, is specialized work that is distinct from informal, commonplace showing, telling, or helping (Cohen, in press). The problem of delineating the specialized, professional version of otherwise commonplace activities is not unique to teaching. In their analysis of the teaching of practice across professions, Grossman and her colleagues (2009) write, learning how to build and maintain productive professional relationships with the people in one's care is no simple matter, yet many assume that this is a natural rather than learned capacity. Someone can be described as "good with people" or a "people person," but being "good with people" in purely social interactions is not the same as cultivating relationships in a professional role. The apparently natural aspects of the professional work—evident in the frequent observation that teachers are born, not made creates additional challenges for professional education. The professional work entailed by the practice of teaching is different from the everyday teaching of the sort described above (Cohen, 2003). Although learning can occur without teaching, such serendipitous learning is chancy. The practice of teaching comprises the intentionally designed activity of reducing that chanciness, that is, of increasing the probability that students will attain specific intended goals (for detailed perspectives on the goals and intricacy of the work, see Cohen, in press; Lampert, 2001; Lee, 2007). In teaching learning process, teacher give direction and explanation for learners. And the direction must be clear and be polite based on the ethical learning. It must be guided so that students can understand what the teacher say. Meanwhile, in reality is different in the school while learning process is going on. There is still teacher who has not being professional in teaching English and it is called as *teacher pedagogical misconduct*.

According to Kearney (2002), teacher pedagogical misconduct as 'those teacher behaviours that interfere with instructions and thus, learning'. In their study, Kearney asks students what they deemed to be examples of teacher misconduct which led to three primary groupings: incompetence that covered poor teaching practices; offensiveness that dealt with inappropriate interactions; indolence that concerned behaviours such as lateness.

Based on researcher's experience during PPL in SMP Swasta Josua Medan, there are still teachers especially English teacher who are not being professional in teaching. His/her words in teaching still not having a good structure based on English, the sentences or utterances that teacher deliver are still not arranged well. In the classroom teacher also sometimes used sentences and responses to the students' answer are impolite. For instance, teacher comes late into the classroom and waste time. Moreover, teacher ever forget to give assignment and check student's assignment whereas make student unaware to work their homework or task that given by teacher on the next day. This case can be seen as a misconduct that affect badly for teaching learning process. This phenomenon make students become confuse and stuck to give responses for every teacher's movements. The interaction between teacher and students are still not effective based on the social theory. The communication that teacher build does not consist of two directions.

Based on this problem researcher wants to research the type of teacher pedagogical misconduct and the reasons of teacher pedagogical misconduct in teaching English.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **1. Teacher Pedagogical Misconduct**

#### **a. Definition of Teacher Pedagogical Misconduct**

Tools have the potential to be good and bad whereas the same case as a tool for student instruction, the same thing goes for teacher. That said, although many of the things as we as teachers are beneficial for student's development, the fact that matter is that instructors do not always teach their classes in ways that help students to learn. Even worse, teachers are often conduct themselves in a manner that is counterproductive to students' academic success (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2016). Thus, although teachers have potential to help students in important ways, if we engage in behaviours that are counterproductive to student learning, we have the potential to harm them as well.

At this point, people may be thinking that teachers rarely do things to disrupt student learning. In reality, research on the subject suggests the opposite: according to Goodboy (2011a), students are frequently dissatisfied with their instructors. Other researchers support his claim and note that only a small portion of students report never having experienced conflict with the instructors (Harrison, 2007; Tantleff-Dunn, Dunn, & Gooke, 2002). What does this mean? Quite simply, it means we can all do something to improve our instruction. Never heard a complaint from your students? That doesn't mean they are satisfied with their educational experiences. In fact, an important idea to keep in mind when it comes to student satisfaction who experience dissatisfaction in their classes never complain to their instructors (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2013).

Teacher pedagogical misconduct refer to behaviours that interfere with instruction, and thus, learning (Kearney *et al.*, 2002). That is, teacher pedagogical misconduct negatively impede effective instructions. In their seminar research on teacher misbehaviours, Kearney *et al* (2002) proposed 28 different categories of misconduct that teachers have the propensity to engage in. these categories of misconduct were inductively derived via student descriptions of teacher misconducts. Through a factor analysis of these categories, three main types of pedagogical misconduct were identified. They were labelled teacher incompetence, teacher indolence, and teacher offensiveness that will define later on.

The centrality of pedagogy to conceptions of teacher misconduct has continued in subsequent studies: a lack of teacher credibility (Banfield *et al*, 2006), and clarity (Toale, 2001), students attributions of teacher misconduct (Kelsey *et al*, 2004) and teacher non-immediacy (Thweatt and McCroskey, 1998), all of which result in the demotivation of learners (Zhang, 2007). Such behaviours form one half of Lewis and Riley's (2009) dichotomy of teacher misconduct between pedagogical misbehaviour and those behaviours defined by legality that concern "physical and sexual misconduct, abuse and harassment, and theft or related financial law-breaking". But teachers are not just classroom practitioners, they are also employees that operate within the full range of interdependencies,

activities, procedures and regulations that exists within institution. While they may spend a large proportion or illegal imitating and exists within the wider organisational literature that defines misconduct as essentially deviant.

### **b. The Types of Teacher Pedagogical Misconduct**

According to Kearney *et al* (2002), teacher's misconduct that considers deviant and results in the classification of teacher pedagogical misconduct into three primary types, they are:

#### 1) Incompetence

The majority of pedagogical misconduct fall into Kearney *et al.*'s (2002) category incompetence. Incompetence in teaching refers to a lack of basic teaching skills. Incompetence in teaching has been defined as a group of behaviours that imply the teacher does not care about the course and/or the students (Kearney, Plax, Allen, 2002). Incompetence teachers fail to learn and use student names, make test too hard, unwilling to help students succeed, and/or present poor lectures. They may bore or confuse students, overload them with information, mispronounce words, or speak with accents that students do not understand (Kearney *et al*, 2002). These characteristics reflect a basic lack of teaching skills. Incompetence behaviours communicate that a teacher does not care about either the course or the students. In fact, student's cognitive learning and enjoyment are highly dependent on the quality of teaching. The reason is that poor teachers decreased students' self-confidence and motivation for learning and increase their anxiety while in the classroom. Kearney *et al.*'s (2002) behaviours theory that indicate incompetence of teacher pedagogical misconduct can be seen as:

- a) Failure to accept advice
- b) Failure to produce gains student achievement
- c) Boring and confusing or unclear lecturer
- d) Administering unfair tests
- e) Apathy to student
- f) Lack of subject matter



## 2) Indolence

Teachers who are considered indolent are often compared to the “absent-minded professor.” Indolent teachers might fail to show up for classes, arrive late, forgetting tests dates, neglect grading, and return papers late. Other behaviours of indolent teachers can include constantly changing assignments, and making classes and tests too easy (Kearney *et al.*, 2002). Not all students would regard indolent teacher behaviours as negative, but others will recognize that indolence can interfere with their learning. These kind of behaviours are listed below to show the behaviours clearer:

- a) Not showing up to class
- b) Coming late to class
- c) Not giving assignments or tests dates
- d) Failing to grade assignments in time manner
- e) Changing assignments every time

## 3) Offensiveness

Offensiveness behaviour generates insulting messages. Offensive teachers are mean and cruel because they can be verbally abusive and unreasonable. Classroom problem such as humiliation occur when the teacher mention his or her name as an example of bad student. For instance, “Study hard and don’t be like Paul.” Offensive teachers are those who humiliates students, blame students for problems in the classroom and engage on sarcasm. Moreover, behaviours that indicate teacher offensiveness follow:

- a) Failure to treat students properly
- b) Failure to teach the subject matter
- c) Involve sarcasm and putdowns
- d) Verbally abusive behaviours
- e) Unreasonable arbitrary rules
- f) Negative personality
- g) Showing favouritism and prejudice

### **c. The Reasons of Teacher Pedagogical Misconduct**

Teacher actions designed to facilitate the quality and level of student engagement and on-task behavior, and therefore learning are plentiful. Less common are studies of teacher misconduct leading to increased levels of student disengagement in the classroom, and with education as a whole. In clarifying the causes of teacher pedagogical misconduct, three potential theoretical explanations will be proposed. Philip Riley and Ramon Lewis (2009) propose the reasons or causes why teacher misconduct in teaching following as:

#### **a. Attribution**

At its core, attribution theory assigns internal or personal attributions to people as an explanation for external actions and behaviors. For example teachers who yell at a student to “be quiet” because of a classroom disruption are using attribution theory if they think that the student is a “trouble maker” (negative other attribution) or “I don’t deserve to be treated like this” (positive self-attribution). Multiple attributions are possible for any single act or behavior. The attributions go beyond the actual behavior to the make up of the personality of the student and the teacher. The essential elements of attribution theory in terms of how behaviors are shaped are that both the person making and the person receiving the attribution are thinking about the situation at hand and the attribution addresses internal factors of the person rather than outward behavior. “She did this because she is a good person”. “He did that because he is a bad person”. This form of labelling may be used by teachers to reinforce pro-social behavior but can also be used to label students with personalities that deserve to be punished, or at least to justify the teacher’s own misbehavior. The theory places the blame for a teacher’s misbehavior on the students because the teacher is only reacting to provocations.

According to this explanation, students who deny a teacher’s legitimate authority by acting in a way which they clearly understand is both irresponsible and unfair, deserve (and may well need) to be put in their place. Any resistance from challenging students justifies an angry response from the teacher. Similarly, any class that acts in a manner that is clearly irresponsible deserves to be punished as a group. Even if there were a number of students who weren’t directly involved

in the misbehavior “they didn’t try to prevent it”. The idea is that “no one can be expected to cope with these kinds of kids”. Teachers are forced to use aggressive response techniques with such children because kids like this don’t, and can’t be expected to, understand, appreciate or respond to more reasonable classroom management techniques.

In summary, teachers who think in terms of attribution theory will see the reason for their own misbehavior residing in the challenging students’ nature or upbringing. Consequently, when a student exhibits behavior that teachers find confronting and challenging, some respond by giving the student what “kids of this kind” deserve. This mindset discourages teachers from attempts to shape more pro-social behavior in their students and may lead to a sense of powerlessness in the teacher. This in turn will have an effect on the teacher’s stress levels.

b. Efficacy

A second theoretical explanation for why teachers misbehave or misconduct relates to the levels of efficacy the teachers perceive in the aggressive response techniques or in themselves as people.

c. Attachment

Attachment theory is the most complex theory that may account for teacher misbehavior. According to attachment theory, the fundamental difficulty that leads to misbehavior from teachers lies in the underlying attachments formed between teachers and students rather than in student provocation of the teacher. Attachment “styles” of the teachers are likely to predict the management techniques employed; both appropriate and inappropriate. The theory predicts that teachers who are insecurely attached will be more likely to behave aggressively in classrooms as they possess less well developed emotional resources to deal with relationship difficulties. Like efficacy theory, attachment theory is a two-person model of interpersonal interactions. When applied to the classroom it is the teacher’s *internal working model* of self and other that determines the level of aggressive behavior by teachers. The concept of the internal working model is crucial to the understanding of adult attachment and will be outlined in more detail below,

however it is important to understand the nature of the student/teacher relationship in attachment terms first.

## **2. Teaching English**

### **a. Nature of Teaching**

Teaching is human engineering and soul doctoring. Teaching refers to the multiple tasks carried out by teacher for leading the learners to the expected learning. This shows that teaching is both technical and noble. The term 'human engineering' means the possibility of modifying and constructing human behavior in intended ways on the basis of certain technical procedures. The term 'soul doctoring', means providing better nourishment to the development of the soul.

According to S. Raj Kumar (2019), teaching is the process of attending people's needs, experiences and feelings, and making specific involvement to help them learn particular things. Teaching is a process of educating a person with theoretical concepts is a kind of a knowledge transfer between a teacher and student. The role of the teacher is to act as a facilitator of learning by leading discussions, providing opportunities to ask open-ended questions, guiding the processes and tasks and enabling the active participation of learners and to engage with ideas. Teachers are occupied in schools with the main purpose of educating the children to grow as good citizens in the world. Children today are the future leaders of society. Therefore, teaching can be considered as an important concept.

### **b. Definition of Teaching**

According to Tyson in Mustofa (2015:194) "Teaching is a process of interaction, the teacher does something to a student; the student do something in return". From this definition a reflected that teaching is a way and an active-bilateral process between students and teachers.

Tardif as quoted by Mustofa (2015:195) "Teaching in principle is any action performed by an individual (the teacher) with the intention of facilitating learning in another individual (the learner)". It means that teaching is an act under taked by a teacher to help and facilities students in learning activities (process learning)

### **c. Components of Teaching**

Robert Coe *et al* (2014) state that schools currently use a number of frameworks that describe the core elements of effective teaching. The problem is

that these attributes are so broadly defined that they can be open to wide and different interpretation whether high quality teaching has been observed in the classroom. It is important to understand these limitations when making assessments about teaching quality.

Below they list the six common components suggested by research that teachers should consider when assessing teaching quality. They list these approaches, skills and knowledge in order of how strong the evidence is in showing that focusing on them can improve student outcomes. This should be seen as offering a ‘starter kit’ for thinking about effective pedagogy. Good quality teaching will likely involve a combination of these attributes manifested at different times; the very best teachers are those that demonstrate all of these features.

- a. (Pedagogical) content knowledge (Strong evidence of impact on student outcomes). The most effective teachers have deep knowledge of the subjects they teach, and when teachers’ knowledge falls below a certain level it is a significant impediment to students’ learning. As well as a strong understanding of the material being taught, teachers must also understand the ways students think about the content, be able to evaluate the thinking behind students’ own methods, and identify students’ common misconceptions.
- b. Quality of instruction (Strong evidence of impact on student outcomes). Includes elements such as effective questioning and use of assessment by teachers. Specific practices, like reviewing previous learning, providing model responses for students, giving adequate time for practice to embed skills securely and progressively introducing new learning (scaffolding) are also elements of high quality instruction.
- c. Classroom climate (Moderate evidence of impact on student outcomes). Covers quality of interactions between teachers and students, and teacher expectations: the need to create a classroom that is constantly demanding more, but still recognizing students’ self-worth. It also involves attributing student success to effort rather than ability and valuing resilience to failure (grit).
- d. Classroom management (Moderate evidence of impact on student outcomes). A teacher’s abilities to make efficient use of lesson time, to coordinate

classroom resources and space, and to manage students' behavior with clear rules that are consistently enforced, are all relevant to maximizing the learning that can take place. These environmental factors are necessary for good learning rather than its direct components.

- e. Teacher beliefs (Some evidence of impact on student outcomes). Why teachers adopt particular practices, the purposes they aim to achieve, their theories about what learning is and how it happens and their conceptual models of the nature and role of teaching in the learning process all seem to be important.
- f. Professional behaviors (Some evidence of impact on student outcomes). Behaviors exhibited by teachers such as reflecting on and developing professional practice, participation in professional development, supporting colleagues, and liaising and communicating with parents.

#### **d. Purpose of Teaching**

Melissa Kelly (2019) states that there are 7 core purpose of teaching, which are:

- a. Knowledge to get by. Imbuing students with the knowledge to get by is an old school belief. It's the idea that schools need to provide students with the knowledge they need to be functional adults in their day to day lives. They need to know how to read, write and do arithmetic.
- b. Knowledge of subject matter being taught. The purpose of teaching to some teachers are to impart knowledge about the subject matter they are teaching without much thought to other classes.
- c. Creating thoughtful citizens. Students will someday be a part of community and need to skills to exist within that society as thoughtful citizens.
- d. Self-esteem and confidence. While the self-esteem movement often gets ridiculed, teacher do want their students often feel confident about their learning abilities.
- e. Learn how to learn. Learning how to learn is one of the key elements of teaching, schools need to teach students how to find the information they will need once they leave school.
- f. Lifelong habits for work. Many of lessons that schools teach are necessary for success in their student's future lives.

- g. Teach students how to live. Not only do students learn information from their individual subjects, they also learn life lesson in and out of class.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

A descriptive qualitative design was used in this study. According to Polkinghorne (2005: 137), “Qualitative research is inquiry aimed at describing and clarifying human experience as it appear in people’s life and writers using qualitative methods to gather data serve as evidence for their distilled description”. It means qualitative is a research design where the writer presenting the data with using description.

Qualitative research has natural setting as the direct source of data and the key of instrument of this research is the researcher itself. In addition, descriptive qualitative design is chosen in order to explore and understand the social phenomenon (Creswell, 2009:32).

The researcher recorded the audio of teacher answer to interview questions related to the reasons of teacher pedagogical misconduct while questionnaire was administering to students provided questions of indicating the types of teacher pedagogical misconduct.

The data were in form of transcriptions consists of the result of recording the interviewing English teacher and the result of administering questionnaire to students and teacher related to teacher pedagogical misconduct. The source data of this study was an English teacher of SMP Swasta Josua Medan.

The data obtains from audio recording and questionnaire. The recording in form of audio was used to record the teacher’s answer of interview questions related to the cause of teacher pedagogical misconduct. The questionnaire was used to gain and find out information in depth from the teacher about what had been always performed the teaching and learning process. The questionnaire consisted of some relevant questions to be asked to students due to the interaction while conducting the classroom activities.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

### *Research findings*

There are three types of teacher pedagogical misconduct in teaching English that teacher conducts in SMP Swasta Josua Medan. Those types are indolence, incompetence, and offensiveness. In indolence, teacher conducts categorize of not showing up to class, coming late to class, not giving assignments, failing to grade assignments and changing assignments every time. While in incompetence, teacher conducts failure to accept advice, failure to produce gains student achievement, boring lecturer, unfair and sudden test, also being apathy to student. In offensiveness, teacher conducts failure to treat students properly, failure to teach subject matter, involve sarcasm and putdowns, verbally abusive, unreasonable arbitrary rules, and showing favouritism.

In term of dominance for indolence type of teacher pedagogical misconduct, categorize that teacher dominates conducting is changing assignments every time, where 95.23 % students answer yes. In term of dominance for incompetence type of teacher pedagogical misconduct, categorize that teacher dominates conducting is giving unfair tests where about 42.85 % students agreed that teacher ever gives sudden and unfair tests. In term of dominance for offensiveness type of teacher pedagogical misconduct, categorize that teacher dominates conducting is about 51.14 % students agreed that teacher was involving sarcasm and putdowns in teaching English.

There are three reasons why teacher pedagogical misconduct happens in teaching English. Those reasons are attribution where indicated by different method is adjusted by student's personality, efficacy indicated by teacher is being more restricted to hard-taught students, and attachment indicated by teacher is releasing anger to student, hard to braid good relationship and comparing student's ability.



## *Discussion*

Based on this study, the researcher only looked at the types of teacher pedagogical misconduct and why teacher conducted teacher pedagogical misconduct, so the results of the study shows the types of teacher pedagogical misconduct and the reasons of teacher pedagogical misconduct. According to Kearney (2002), he found that there are 3 types of teacher pedagogical misconduct which are indolence, incompetence and offensiveness. In this research, researcher strengthen the theory but finding that there are 3 types of teacher pedagogical misconduct that happen in teaching English at SMP Swasta Josua Medan. But in incompetence type, Kearney (2002) also found that *lack of subject matter* also one of categorizes that indicates teacher pedagogical misconduct, meanwhile in this study researcher does not find during teaching and learning process. It can be happened because of teacher's knowledge and ability in teaching English that may different.

In addition, they were 5 categorizes of indolence, 5 categorizes of incompetence, and 7 categorizes of offensiveness. In terms of dominant one, the category of indolence mostly happens at changing assignments every time, where 95.23 % students answer yes. In term of dominance for incompetence, categorize that teacher dominates conducting is giving unfair tests where about 42.85 % students agreed that teacher ever gives sudden and unfair tests. In term of dominance for offensiveness, categorize that teacher dominates conducting is about 51.14 % students agreed that teacher was involving sarcasm and putdowns in teaching English.

Meanwhile in study conducted by Isa Yidrim (2016), he was doing a research according to student's perceptions to analyze teacher pedagogical misconduct and the result was quite similar where he found that there 4 types of teacher pedagogical misconduct namely unfair, violence, communicative barriers, and characteristics. Comparing to this study, the scope of Isa Yidrim study was narrow where those 4 kinds of teacher pedagogical misconduct were the categorizations of Kearney (2002) proposing theory. For unfair and

communicative barriers were the types of incompetence while violence and characteristics were the types of offensiveness.

According to Riley and Lewis (2009) proposed there were three reasons of teacher pedagogical misconduct. These reasons were attribution, efficacy and attachment. From the interview result between teacher and researcher, the reasons why teacher conducts pedagogical misconduct is because teacher has method where he teaches differently students who have different personality, being more restricted to hard-taught student, releasing anger to students because of external factor, hard to build good relationship and comparing to students where he believes it can motivate student.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

### *Conclusions*

- 1 The types of teacher pedagogical misconduct in teaching English at SMP Swasta Josua Medan were indolence, incompetence, and offensiveness. The most dominant category of indolence type conducted in teaching English at SMP Swasta Josua Medan was changing assignment every time, the dominant category of incompetence type conducted in teaching English was the teacher conducts unfair tests, meanwhile the most dominant category of offensiveness type conducted in teaching English was involving sarcasm.
- 2 The reasons why the teacher pedagogical misconduct conducted because teacher had method where he taught differently students who had different personality, being more restricted to hard-taught student, releasing anger to students because of external factor, hard to build good relationship and comparing to students where he believed it could motivate student.

### *Suggestions*

- 1 To make further exploration on the type of teacher pedagogical misconduct conducted in teaching English classroom to be more various.
- 2 To make further exploration of the reasons teacher pedagogical misconduct appeared in teaching English conducted by teacher.

## REFERENCES

- Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. 2016. Rhetorical Dissent as an Adaptive Response to Classroom Problems: a Test of Protection Motivation Theory. *Communication Education*. 65. 24-43.
- Bolkan, S., Goodboy, A.K. 2013. No Complain, No Gain: Students' Organizational, Relational, and Personal Reasons for Withholding Rhetorical Dissent from College Instructors. *Communication Education*. 62. 278-300.
- Goodboy, A.K. 2011. Instructional Dissent in the College Classroom. *Communication Education*. 60. 296-313.4
- Kearney, J. W., & Avtgis. 2002. Examining the Relationship Between Organizational Dissent and Aggressive Communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 13. 100-115
- Kearney, P., Plax, T. G. 2002. Understanding Student Reactions to Teachers who Misbehave. *Communication for Teachers*. 127-149.
- Lewis, Ramon., & Riley, Philip. 2009. Teacher Misbehaviour. *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching*. 417-431
- Miles, Matthew B., Huberman, A. Michael., Saldana, Johnny. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: a Method Sourcebook*. California: Sage Publications.
- Tacconelli, Melissa. 2015. Teacher Misbehavior and Its Effects on Student Interest and Engagement. *Communication Education*. 65. (2): 204-212,
- Thweatt, K.S., & McCroskey, J.C. 1998. Teacher Nonimmediacy and Misbehavior: Unintentional Negative Communication. *Communication Research Reports*. 13. 198-204.
- Toale, M.C. 2001. *Teacher Clarity and Teacher Misbehaviors: Relationships with Students' Affective Learning and Teacher Credibility*. Doctoral Dissertation, Morgantown, West Virginia.
- Yidrim, Isa *et al.* 2016. Teacher Misbehavior Unwanted According to Student's Perceptions. *International Education Studies*. 9 (11).

Zhang, Q. 2007. Teacher Misbehaviors and Learning Demotivators in College Classrooms: a Cross-Cultural Investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and The United States. *Communication Education*. 56. 209-227.