



Teacher's Punishment in Teaching Writing Recount Text at the Eight Grade of SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan

Agnes Berliana Hutagaol¹, Anni Holila Pulungan²

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Correspondence E-mail: agnesberlianaaurellia20@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed teacher punishment in teaching writing recount text at the eighth grade of SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan. The objectives of this study were to identify the types of teacher punishment used by the English teacher and to analyze the process of teacher punishment during recount text writing instruction. This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design based on Creswell (2014), which focuses on exploring and understanding social phenomena in natural settings. The data were collected through classroom observation, video recording, documentation, and interviews. The data sources were the English teacher and students of class VIII-2. The findings showed that four types of punishment were found based on the theory of Charles M. Charles and Gail W. Senter (2006), namely verbal reprimands (100%), non-verbal reprimands (80%), loss of privilege (40%), and physical punishment (80%), while time-out was not found (0%). The findings also

revealed that the process of teacher punishment generally followed Lee Canter's theory, consisting of establishing clear classroom rules, identifying student misbehavior, giving clear warnings, applying punishment, and monitoring students' behavioral changes. This study concluded that verbal reprimands were the most dominant type of punishment used by the teacher and that punishment functioned as a classroom management strategy to maintain discipline and support the teaching and learning process of writing recount text.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 20 June 2026

Revised 23 June 2026

Accepted 25 June 2026

Keywords

Teacher's Punishment, Writing, Recount Text, Classroom Management

Hutagaol, A. B., & Pulungan, A. K. (2026). Teacher's punishment in teaching writing recount text at the eighth grade of SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan. *TRANSFORM: Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*. 15(2), 94-103. <https://doi.org/10.24114/tj.v15i2.77006>

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the important skills in English Learning (Al-Jiboury, 2024). Writing is a productive skill used to express ideas, thoughts, and feelings in written form (Axelrod & Cooper, 2010). In learning English, students are expected to be able to develop their ideas

into words, sentences, paragraphs, and complete texts. Writing is not only about producing written language, but also about organizing ideas systematically so that messages can be understood clearly.

In junior high school, students are introduced to several types of texts, one of which is recount text. Recount text is a text that retells events or experiences that happened in the past in chronological order (Cahyono et al., 2025). Recount text consists of three generic structures, namely orientation, events, and re-orientation (Derewianka & Jones, 2016). In addition, recount text uses language features such as past tense, action verbs, specific participants, time connectives, and adverbs of time and place. Therefore, writing recount text requires students to organize ideas systematically and apply appropriate language features.

However, the process of teaching writing is not always easy. In classroom practice, students often face difficulties in generating ideas, organizing paragraphs, and using appropriate grammar (Asror & Sari, 2024). Besides academic difficulties, teachers also encounter classroom management problems during the teaching and learning process. Some students may talk during explanation, ignore instructions, disturb their classmates, cheat, or refuse to complete assignments. These behaviors can disrupt the learning process and create problems in classroom discipline.

Teacher punishment is one of the disciplinary strategies used to manage student misbehavior in the classroom. According to Charles and Senter (2006), punishment is an integral component of educational discipline aimed at correcting student behavior, maintaining classroom order, and supporting academic learning objectives. Punishment is not viewed merely as a punitive action, but as a structured and instructional response applied when students violate classroom rules or fail to fulfill academic responsibilities. Charles and Senter classify teacher punishment into five types, namely verbal reprimands, non-verbal reprimands, loss of privilege, time-out, and physical punishment.

In addition to identifying the types of punishment, understanding how punishment is implemented is also important. The process of teacher punishment in this study is analyzed based on Canter's theory (Canter & Canter, 2001). The punishment process includes

establishing clear classroom rules, identifying student misbehavior, giving clear warnings, applying punishment or consequences, and monitoring student response and behavioral change. Understanding how punishment is carried out is essential because the way punishment is applied, whether it is proportional, consistent, educational, and clearly explained to students, determines its impact on the learning environment.

Several previous studies discussed reward and punishment in English learning (Afriyeni & Zaim, 2023). However, most previous studies focused on classroom management in general, students' perceptions, or the use of reward and punishment broadly. Only limited studies specifically discussed teacher punishment in teaching writing skills, especially in recount text writing. Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing the types of teacher punishment and describing the process of teacher punishment in teaching writing recount text at the eighth grade of SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design. Creswell (2014) states that qualitative research is an approach used to explore and understand the meaning that individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. In qualitative research, the researcher collects detailed information from participants in natural settings and interprets the meaning of the collected data. The data are presented in the form of words, actions, and documents rather than numerical data.

This research focused on analyzing teacher punishment in teaching writing recount text to eighth-grade students at SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan. The data used in this study were qualitative data in the form of words, sentences, actions, photos, and recordings obtained during the research process. The data were collected through classroom observation, observation checklist, video recording, interview, and lesson plans.

The data sources of this study were Miss V as the English teacher and students of class VIII-2 at SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan. The researcher selected class VIII-2 because this class was known as the noisiest and laziest class in doing exercises or assignments.

During initial observation, the researcher also found that the teacher applied punishment in this class, which was relevant to the focus of this study. Therefore, this class was considered suitable for providing the necessary data related to teacher punishment in teaching writing recount text.

The techniques of data collection in this research were observation, video recording, documentation, and interview. Observation was used to directly examine how the English teacher implemented punishment during recount text writing instruction. Through classroom observation, the researcher recorded the types of punishment applied, the situations in which punishment occurred, and the interaction between teacher and students during the learning process. Video recording was used to analyze classroom discourse in depth during the data processing stage. Documentation consisted of field notes, lesson plans, observation checklists, and photographic evidence obtained during classroom observation. Interviews were conducted with the English teacher using a semi-structured interview technique to obtain deeper information related to teacher punishment.

Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) propose an interactive model of qualitative data analysis consisting of three concurrent activities: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. In data condensation, the researcher selected, focused, simplified, and transformed raw data obtained from observation and documentation. In data display, the organized data were presented in descriptive forms and tables to facilitate interpretation. In conclusion drawing and verification, the researcher interpreted the analyzed data and re-examined the collected data to ensure consistency and credibility.

RESULTS

Types of Teacher's Punishment

The data were analyzed using the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), which consists of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. The analysis used Charles and Senter's (2006) theory to identify the types of teacher punishment and Lee Canter's theory to examine the process of teacher punishment

(Canter & Canter, 2001) during the teaching of writing recount text. The findings showed that four out of five types of teacher punishment were found during classroom observation.

Table 1. Types of Teacher's Punishment Found in the Classroom

No	Types of Punishment	Frequencies	Percentages
1	Verbal Reprimands	5	100%
2	Non-Verbal Reprimands	4	80%
3	Loss of Privilege	2	40%
4	Physical Punishment	4	80%

The findings showed that verbal reprimands were the most dominant type of punishment, with a frequency of 5 occurrences (100%). This indicates that verbal reprimands were consistently applied by the teacher in all observation sessions. The teacher frequently addressed students' inappropriate behavior directly through oral warnings, corrections, and reminders during the teaching and learning process.

Non-verbal reprimands and physical punishment each obtained a frequency of 4 occurrences (80%). These findings indicate that both types of punishment were frequently implemented, although not in every observation session. Non-verbal reprimands were used through eye contact, facial expressions, and gestures to remind students about inappropriate behavior without disrupting the classroom atmosphere. Physical punishment was applied when students repeatedly ignored the teacher's instructions or continued misbehaving after receiving warnings.

Meanwhile, loss of privilege obtained a frequency of 2 occurrences (40%), indicating that it was used less frequently than the other types of punishment. This type of punishment was only applied in particular situations, especially when students violated academic rules such as cheating during classroom activities. In contrast, time-out was not found during the observation period, with a frequency of 0 occurrences (0%). This finding indicates that the teacher did not use temporary removal from classroom activities as a disciplinary strategy.

Process of Teacher's Punishment

Table 2. Process of Teacher's Punishment

No	Process of Teacher's Punishment	Frequencies	Percentages
1	Establishing clear classroom rules	5	100%
2	Identifying student misbehavior	5	100%
3	Giving a clear warning	4	80%
4	Applying punishment (Consequences)	5	100%
5	Monitoring student response and behavioral change	5	100%

The findings revealed that establishing clear classroom rules, identifying student misbehavior, applying punishment, and monitoring student response and behavioral change each appeared 5 times (100%). These results indicate that these stages were consistently implemented throughout the observation sessions and became an integral part of the teacher's classroom management practices.

The stage of giving a clear warning appeared 4 times (80%), indicating that warnings were generally provided before punishment was administered. This finding shows that the teacher gave students an opportunity to correct their behavior before applying disciplinary consequences. The use of warnings also reflects the teacher's effort to maintain discipline through a gradual process rather than immediately imposing punishment.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that teacher punishment remains an important classroom management strategy in the teaching of writing recount text. The implementation of verbal reprimands, non-verbal reprimands, loss of privilege, and physical punishment demonstrates that the teacher used different disciplinary responses according to the type of student misbehavior. These punishments were not applied randomly, but were directed toward behaviors that disrupted the learning process, such as talking during explanations, ignoring instructions, cheating during assignments, and repeatedly making the same mistakes after receiving correction.

The dominance of verbal reprimands suggests that the teacher preferred an immediate and practical disciplinary strategy. In recount text writing instruction, students are required to pay attention to explanations related to generic structure, language features, and the use of past tense forms. Therefore, verbal reprimands functioned not only to stop inappropriate behavior but also to restore students' attention to the learning material. This finding supports Charles and Senter's (2006) view that verbal reprimands serve as a direct response to student misbehavior and can be used to maintain classroom order without significantly interrupting instructional activities.

The presence of non-verbal reprimands also shows the teacher's effort to maintain discipline while preserving the flow of instruction. Through eye contact, facial expressions, and gestures, the teacher was able to remind students of inappropriate behavior without stopping the explanation. This finding reflects the practical value of non-verbal disciplinary strategies in supporting classroom management during writing activities.

Another important finding is the continued use of physical punishment. Although physical punishment was implemented less frequently than verbal reprimands, its presence indicates a discrepancy between classroom practice and contemporary discipline theories that emphasize educational and non-physical approaches. The finding confirms that traditional disciplinary practices may still be used in certain classroom contexts when teachers perceive other disciplinary measures as insufficient to control repeated misbehavior. This condition highlights the need for continuous reflection on the application of punishment in educational settings.

The findings further reveal that punishment was implemented through a structured process consisting of establishing classroom rules, identifying student misbehavior, giving warnings, applying consequences, and monitoring behavioral change. This pattern reflects Canter's Assertive Discipline framework (Canter & Canter, 2001), which emphasizes that punishment should be systematic rather than emotional. The implementation of warnings before punishment demonstrates that students were given opportunities to correct their behavior before disciplinary consequences were imposed.

Furthermore, punishment in this study functioned as a corrective strategy rather than merely as a means of creating fear. The observation data showed that students generally became more attentive, focused, and responsible after receiving disciplinary actions. This finding suggests that punishment, when applied carefully and proportionally, may contribute to maintaining classroom discipline and supporting student participation during recount text writing activities.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the types of teacher punishment used in teaching writing recount text and the process of implementing punishment in class VIII-2 at SMP Swasta Free Methodist 2 Medan. The findings indicate that the English teacher applied four types of punishment proposed by Charles and Senter (2006), namely verbal reprimands, non-verbal reprimands, loss of privilege, and physical punishment, while time-out was not observed during the teaching sessions. Among these, verbal reprimands were the most frequently used form of punishment and were consistently applied throughout classroom activities to manage student behavior during writing tasks.

The results also show that non-verbal reprimands and physical punishment were used with equal frequency, although they served different purposes in classroom management. Non-verbal reprimands were mainly used as immediate, non-disruptive signals to correct student behavior, while physical punishment was applied in situations where students repeatedly ignored previous warnings. Loss of privilege appeared less frequently and was primarily associated with violations of academic rules, such as cheating. Overall, the findings suggest that punishment in this classroom was mainly used as a corrective tool to maintain discipline and support learning activities rather than as a purely punitive action.

In terms of process, the implementation of teacher punishment followed the stages of Assertive Discipline as proposed by Canter (Canter & Canter, 2001), including setting classroom rules, identifying misbehavior, giving warnings, applying punishment, and monitoring student responses. These stages were generally applied consistently, although the frequency of giving warnings was slightly lower compared to other stages, indicating that

students were sometimes directly corrected after initial identification of misbehavior. The overall process shows that punishment was implemented in a structured and controlled manner rather than spontaneously.

However, this study is limited to a single classroom setting with a relatively small scope of observation. It only focused on one grade level and one subject, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. In addition, the study primarily relied on classroom observation, interviews, and documentation, without incorporating students' emotional responses in depth.

Despite these limitations, the study highlights that teacher punishment, when applied in a structured and measured way, can contribute to classroom discipline and improve student focus during learning activities. It also emphasizes the importance of teachers using appropriate forms of punishment that support, rather than hinder, the learning process.

Future research is recommended to explore teacher punishment in broader educational contexts, including different school levels, subjects, and teaching approaches. Further studies may also investigate students' perceptions and emotional responses toward punishment to gain a more comprehensive understanding of its impact on learning behavior and classroom interaction.

REFERENCES

- Afriyeni, C., & Zaim, M. (2023). The students' perception toward reward and punishment to increase their motivation in learning English. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(3), 703-714. <https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/124448>
- Al-Jiboury, T. H. (2024). Teaching four skills of English language writing, reading, speaking, and listening through literature. *South Asian Research Journal of Arts, Language and Literature*, 6(5), 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.36346/sarjall.2024.v06i05.001>
- Asror, K., & Sari, D. P. (2024). Lifting eighth-grade students' recount text writing skills through mind mapping. *Academy of Education Journal*, 15(1), 430-437. <https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v15i1.2221>
- Axelrod, R. B., & Cooper, C. R. (2010). *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Cahyono, D., Palupi, R. E. A., & Sunardi, A. I. (2025). Teacher's feedback to improve students' writing recount text at first semester students of English letters department UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta in 2024-2025. *Dimensi Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 13(1), 109-121. <https://doi.org/10.24269/dpp.v13i1.10730>

- Canter, L., & Canter, M. (2001). *Assertive discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classroom* (3rd ed.). Solution Tree.
- Charles, C. M., & Senter, G. W. (2006). *Building classroom discipline* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2016). *Teaching Language in Context* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.