STUDENTS' EXPECTATION TOWARD TEACHER'S TEACHING STYLE AND CONTRIBUTION TO STUDENTS' ENGLISH PERFORMANCE

Gita Loveta

English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia E-mail: gitaloveta25@gmail.com

Bambang A Loeneto

English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia E-mail: loenetobambang@gmail.com

Machdalena Vianty

English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia E-mail: vianty.unsri@gmail.com

APA Citation: Loveta, G., Loeneto, B. A., & Vianty, M. (2020). Students' expectation toward teacher's teaching style and contribution to students' English performance. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 9(1), 135-144. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v9i1.3786

Received: 17-06-2020 Accepted: 15-09-2020 Published:11-12-2020

Abstract: Students' expectation of their teacher's teaching style is one of the factors that can affect academic performance. However, it is unclear how much students' expectation affects the English academic performance of students. The objectives of this study were: (1) to find the students' expectation on their English teacher's teaching style, (2) to find whether the English teacher's teaching style matches with the students' expectation, and (3) to find the contribution of students' expectation toward teacher's teaching style toward their English academic performance. The study's sample was one English teacher from each public senior high school in Sukarami District, SMA N 13, SMA N 17, and SMA N 21, along with 11th-grade students they taught. This research used descriptive quantitative design. The data were collected by questionnaire and documents as quantitative data, and interview as qualitative data. Pearson Product Moment correlation and regression were used to analyze quantitative data while transcribing was used to analyze qualitative data. The findings showed that (1) the students expected their English teacher to use Expert and Facilitator teaching style, (2) the student's expectation is not perfectly fulfilled as the teachers prefer Expert and Formal Authority teaching style, and (3) there was no contribution of students' expectation toward their English teacher's teaching style to their English academic performance.

Keywords: students' expectation; teaching style; English academic performance

INTRODUCTION

Students, in the process of learning, are affected by internal and external factors to ensure that they absorb the material given, especially in learning language, in this case, the English language (Edmondson, 1999). Mahmoudi and Mahmoudi (2015) explained that internal factors, also known as internal variables consist of motivation, intelligence, anxiety, risk-taking ability, and several other factors from the students themselves. On the other hand, external factors, also known as external variables include social class, first language, early curriculum, and teacher. As stated, teacher is one of the external factors that may affect students' achievement in learning process. Mahmoudi and

Mahmoudi (2015) stated that teacher influences all kinds of learning and affect the students' enthusiasm. Teachers, in order to be able to affect students' achievement effectively, are recommended to have interpersonal skills that enable them to understand what the students want from them. To sum up, teachers as one of the students' learning external factors should take students' expectation into account to ensure successful teaching and learning process, as students' expectation is part of the motivation that affect students learning internal factor.

Students have expectations and preferences regarding how the teacher should be when teaching them, which affects their enthusiasm in learning. When entering a class, students may have with them some kind of images that they want to happen for them to fully enjoy the teaching and learning process. This expectation may or may not be met by teachers. This, in turn, might impact the students in their willingness to participate effectively in the classroom. This is because teachers' teaching style determines the responses the students will give in teaching and learning process. According to Grasha (1994), teaching style is a representation of a teacher's way in presenting information, interacting with their students, managing classroom tasks, supervising coursework, socializing students to their field, and mentoring students. Teachers develop teaching style based on their beliefs about what forms good teaching, as well as the teachers' personal preferences, their abilities, and the norms of their particular discipline (Aldajah, Haik, & Moustafa, 2014). Grasha (1994) grouped teaching styles into five styles, which are expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. Expert style puts the teacher's position as the transmitter of information; formal authority style puts the teacher's position as someone who sets standards and defines acceptable ways of doing things in teaching and learning process; personal model style puts the teacher's position as someone that teaches by illustration and direct example; facilitator style puts the teacher as guide and director of students by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternatives; and delegator style puts the teacher as someone who develops students' ability to function autonomously (Grasha, 1995). However, despite the grouping, Grasha himself explains that all teachers possessed all the qualities, only that some are more apparent than the other. These teaching styles may help or disrupt students' ability in acquiring content and skills taught as the students' expectation may be fitting or contradicting what the teacher does in the class.

According to Rubie-Davis, Peterson, Irving, Widdowson, and Dixon (2010), the expectation of students toward teachers has a positive effect on student attitudes to school and possibly motivation to learn. Students are more academically active toward teachers who are caring toward the students' achievements and use facilitator style to support student achievement. Moreover, according to Shishavan and Sadeghi (2009), students prefer their teacher to have a good personality rather than pedagogical, in which pedagogical style is reflected mainly in expert and formal authority teaching styles while

personality is reflected by personal model, styles. facilitator, and delegator teaching Ibrahim and Ahmad Furthermore, (2016)explained that students generally prefer facilitator teaching style from their teacher as it keeps the students accompanied during teaching and learning process as well as discusses the students' problem in the classroom. On the other hand, Beyhan (2017) found that the student teachers who are preparing to be teachers prefer expert teaching style which focuses on lectures and explanation of detailed knowledge, in which this is due to the classical educational philosophies in the place they learn to be a teacher. Furthermore, Grasha (1995) found out from his research that teachers prefer expert and formal authority teaching styles, which takes 38% of 761 classrooms. This means that there is a discrepancy in the students' expectation, which prefer teachers with facilitator teaching style, and teachers' preference, which is leaning toward expert and formal authority teaching styles.

In Indonesia, English is one of the main subjects of final exam of junior and senior high school. For this reason, the students are expected to have a good score on English academic performance. Academic performance refers to how well or bad the person in doing something especially in English. The students' exam score of English or the note that the teacher writes in the students' report book is one of the descriptions of students' academic performance. However, EF English Proficiency Index (2018) shows that Indonesia is ranked 51 among 88 countries in the world and 13 among 21 countries in Asia, with average score of 51.58 and categorized as low proficiency in terms of English language. The result of the index implies that there might be a possibility of the students having problem in following the teaching and learning process of English language. The writer wonders whether the students' expectation toward particular teacher's teaching style contributes to their English academic performance, as the expectation is prone to mismatch with the real classroom situation. Based on this question, this research intended (1) to find the students' expectation on their English teacher's teaching style, (2) to find whether the English teacher's teaching style matches with the students' expectation, and (3) to find the contribution of students' expectation toward teacher's teaching style toward their English academic performance.

METHOD

This research used quantitative research design supported by qualitative data collection to answer the research questions. Creswell (2012) explains that quantitative research design is done to examine relationships between and among variables to answer questions through surveys experiments. This research and/or uses quantitative data to provide numbers to be analyzed statistically, while the qualitative data are used to offer the perspective on the topic studied as supporting data for the quantitative. The data for this research were gathered by using

questionnaire and interview, which serves as the quantitative and qualitative data respectively. The data were further supported by documents in the form of students' score of English test.

Population and sample

The population of this study was all public senior high school (SMA) in Sukarami District, Palembang, which are SMA Negeri 13 Palembang, SMA Negeri 17 Palembang, and SMA Negeri 21 Palembang. The following table shows the detail of the population of study:

Table 1. Distribution of English teachers and students in the population

| No. | School | Number of English Teachers | Number of 11th Grade Students |
|-----|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | SMA Negeri 13 Palembang | 5 | 423 |
| 2 | SMA Negeri 17 Palembang | 5 | 440 |
| 3 | SMA Negeri 21 Palembang | 5 | 320 |

Source: http://sekolah.data.kemdikbud.go.id

The sample taken was one civil servant English teacher along with the classes he/she teaches. The sampling method used is probability random sampling. This decision was made with consideration that the teacher is professional and possesses the four standard competences set by the government. The second-grade students were picked with the reasoning that the students already have some experiences with the teacher, in which the experiences come in the form of interaction inside of the class as the academic experience and outside of the class as social experience. Despite having more experience, the third-grade students cannot be picked since they were preparing for the national exam and were not allowed to be observed.

Technique for collecting the data

The data used in this study were collected by using questionnaire, interview, and English test score This questionnaire used in this study was a ready-made questionnaire designed by Grasha and Hruska-Riechmann (1996) known as Teaching Style Survey. There are 40 items in this questionnaire, which are measured in Likert Scale with five levels. As the questionnaire is designed for teachers, an adaptation is made to be given to students by modifying the items to address the students' expectation. The following table shows the questionnaire specification and the interval score of the questionnaire:

Table 2. Specification of teaching style survey questionnaire by Grasha and Hruska-Riechmann (1996)

| | by Grasia and Hraska-Recimania (1990) | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No. | Teaching Style | Items | | | | | |
| 1 | Expert | 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36 | | | | | |
| 2 | Formal Authority | 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37 | | | | | |
| 3 | Personal Model | 3, 5, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38 | | | | | |
| 4 | Facilitator | 4, 10, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39 | | | | | |
| 5 | Delegator | 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 | | | | | |

Table 3. Interval score of teaching style survey questionnaire by Grasha and Hruska-Riechmann (1996)

| No. | Teaching Style | Preference Score | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--|
| | | Very | Low | Medium | High | Very | |
| | | Low | | | | High | |
| 1 | Expert | ≤10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 40-50 | |
| 2 | Formal Authority | ≤10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 40-50 | |
| 3 | Personal Model | ≤10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 40-50 | |
| 4 | Facilitator | ≤10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 40-50 | |
| 5 | Delegator | ≤10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 40-50 | |
| | | | | | | | |

The interview used in this study was general interview guide approach with one-on-one interview process. One-on-one interview is a data collection process in which the researcher asks questions to and records answers from only one participant in the study at a time (Creswell, 2012). The interview guide is based on the theory

of five teaching styles by Grasha (1994), which states the strength and weaknesses of each style to find out the basis of the teacher's tendency in choosing a particular style. The interview consists of 15 items. The following table shows the questionnaire specification:

Table 4. Specification of teaching style interview by Grasha (1994)

| | | 8 2 2 2 1 |
|-----|------------------|------------|
| No. | Teaching Style | Items |
| 1 | Expert | 1, 2, 3 |
| 2 | Formal Authority | 4, 5, 6 |
| 3 | Personal Model | 7, 8, 9 |
| 4 | Facilitator | 10, 11, 12 |
| 5 | Delegator | 13, 14, 15 |

As for the document, the students' English test score is used. The English test score was obtained from the school. The score used was the result of the students' English semester examination.

Technique for analyzing the data

The questionnaire is analyzed according to the Likert style interval score. As for the correlation and regression, Pearson Product Moment correlation and stepwise regression were used to analyze the data. Transcribing was used to analyze interview which is the qualitative data to support the quantitative data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Students' academic performance

The English semester score of the students from each school was used as their English academic performance for this research. The score obtained from the school is cognitive aspect without taking into account the affective as well as the psychomotor, in which this helps to show their English academic performance purely.

Table 5. Summary of students' English academic performance

| School | N | Average Score |
|----------|-----|---------------|
| SMA N 13 | 183 | 50 |
| SMA N 17 | 174 | 86 |
| SMA N 21 | 176 | 50 |
| Total | 533 | 62 |

Table 5 shows the average scores for each school as well as in total. SMA N 13 and SMA N 21 both have an average score of 50 although the number of the students differs. As for SMA N 17, the average score is quite high, which is 86.

Students' expectations toward English teacher's teaching style

To get the information about the students' expectations toward their English teacher's teaching style, a questionnaire was distributed to the students. Table 3 shows a summary of the students' responses.

Table 6. Summary of students' expectation toward English teacher teaching style

| Teaching | SI | SMA N 13 | | SMA N 17 | | MA N 21 | Total | |
|-------------|----|-----------------|----|-----------------|----|---------|---------|--|
| Styles | N | Average | N | Average | N | Average | Average | |
| Expert | 39 | 30 | 35 | 30 | 36 | 32 | 30.7 | |
| Formal | 32 | 28 | 33 | 28 | 33 | 29 | 28.3 | |
| Authority | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | 38 | 31 | 35 | 30 | 35 | 30 | 30.3 | |
| Model | | | | | | | | |
| Facilitator | 38 | 32 | 36 | 31 | 36 | 31 | 31.3 | |
| Delegator | 36 | 30 | 35 | 29 | 34 | 30 | 29.7 | |

Table 6 shows that the students' expectation toward their English teachers' teaching style is mixed. SMA N 13 students leaned their preference toward the Facilitator teaching style,

with average score 32, followed by Personal Model with average score 31. SMA N 17 students leaned their preference toward the Facilitator teaching style, with average score 31,

followed by Expert and Personal Model with average score 30. SMA N 21 students leaned their preference toward the Expert teaching style with average score 32, followed by facilitator with average score 31. From this result, it can be concluded that Facilitator teaching style is a bit more favorable with average score of 31.3, which is considered high based on the interval.

English teacher's teaching style preference

To get the information about the English teacher's teaching style, a questionnaire was distributed to the English teachers. Table 7 shows a summary of the teachers' responses. As only one teacher was taken for each school, N represents the number of items in the questionnaire:

Table 7. Summary of English teachers' teaching style preference

| Teaching Style | SM | IA N 13 | N 13 SMA N 17 | | SMA N 21 | | Total | |
|----------------|----|---------|---------------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|--|
| | N | Average | N | Average | N | Average | Average | |
| Expert | 40 | 35 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 34 | 36.3 | |
| Formal | | 32 | | 39 | | 33 | 34.6 | |
| Authority | | | | | | | | |
| Personal Model | | 33 | | 34 | | 34 | 33.6 | |
| Facilitator | | 30 | | 38 | | 35 | 34.3 | |
| Delegator | | 33 | | 36 | | 33 | 34 | |

Table 7 shows that the teachers' teaching style preference is quite balanced. SMA N 13 teacher leaned her preference toward the Expert teaching style, with average score 35, followed by Personal Model and Delegator with average score 33. SMA N 17 teacher leaned her preference toward the Expert teaching style, with average score 40, followed by Formal Authority with average score 39. SMA N 21 teacher leaned her preference toward the Facilitator teaching style with average score 35, followed by Expert and Personal Model with average score 33. From this result, the average result of the teaching style preference showed that Expert teaching style is a bit more favorable with average score 36.3, meaning the teachers prefer to be in control of the classroom.

The results of interview

The results of the interview are presented to support the teachers' responses in their questionnaire. The interview functions as information on how the teachers are doing and their common preferences in teaching method. These common preferences and method were used to find out where the actions are represented in the teaching style. Four points can be concluded based on the teachers' interviews: detailed explanation, guideline, leadership, and moral supports.

Detailed explanation

Detailed explanation refers to the professional competence of the teacher. As Mulder (2014) explains, professional competence is explained as generic, integrated and internalized capability to

deliver sustainable effective (worthy) performance (including problem-solving, realizing innovation, and creating transformation) in a certain professional domain, job, role, organizational context, and task situation. Detailed explanation means that the teacher is obliged to explain materials as interesting and clear as possible to the students for the students to achieve their learning goals. All of the teachers think that it is crucial to explain the materials in detail to the students. For example, the English teacher of SMA N 13 states the following,

> "It is important for teacher to explain material in detail because if not explained in detail, the students will not understand the material and are not able to do the task correctly. Explaining in detail is part of teacher's duty."

As the English teacher of SMAN 17 said, if the materials are not explained in detail, the students cannot work on the task given correctly. SMA N 17 English teacher also followed this by stating that detailed explanation is important for students to reach the lesson's goal. Meanwhile, SMA N 21 English teacher stated that detailed information serves as a way to allow students to have information to compare with what they found.

Detailed explanation is an apparent method used by Expert and Formal Authority teacher as this method is teacher-centered teaching method where teachers give materials as detailed as possible to avoid misconception. Thus, it can be said that the sample teachers have preference toward teacher-centered teaching styles.

Gita Loveta, Bambang A Loeneto, & Machdalena Vianty

Students' expectation toward teacher's teaching style and contribution to students' English performance

Guideline

In teaching and learning process, a guideline is a must for teacher and students to understand the importance of learning something. The guideline is set to make clear learning goal for the students. As the Education Hub (2018) explains, setting the guideline with clear learning goal can help students engage in learning better. All of the English teachers from the sample schools agreed that students should be given guidelines in learning activity. For examples, teacher of SMAN 17 and SMAN 21 state the following,

"The purpose of giving guideline to students is to help them achieve the goal of learning more accurately." (Teacher of SMA N 17 Palembang)

"Giving guideline is very important in order for the students to understand what they should do" (Teacher of SMA N 21 Palembang)

Both the teacher of SMA N 17 and SMA N 21 explained that providing guidelines allow students to achieve the learning goal easier. The teacher of SMA N 13 further stated that providing guidelines also allows the student to relate the material with daily activities.

Teaching guideline is undoubtably inherent in all teaching styles. However, providing the guideline to the students is more apparent in Expert teaching style and Formal Authority teaching style as the other three teaching styles stimulate the students by providing a more flexible and general idea which opens the chance to approach the goal in dynamic manner. The sample teachers' act of providing guideline shows that they prefer teacher-centered teaching style.

Leadership

In teaching and learning process, a teacher should be able to lead the classroom in order to be successful. This stems from the personality competence points from *Permendiknas no 16 in 2007*, specifically point three which states that a teacher should show himself or herself as a steady, stable, mature, wise, and authoritative person. All of the English teachers agreed that teachers should assume the position as leader both in and out of class. SMA N 21 and SMA N 13 English teachers explained that assuming the position of leader helps coordinating the students in order for them to not only achieve the learning

goal but also be disciplined. This is in line with the teacher questionnaire result, which shows a bit more preference toward Expert teaching style followed by Formal Authority teaching style.

Moral supports

Moral supports are part of a teacher job as according to Permendiknas no 16 in 2007, teacher should possess pedagogical competence including understanding learners. The Education Hub (2018) states that creating authentic relationship with students can improve students' academic and social progress. The interview showed that the teachers agreed that teacher cannot only monitor the student activities. Teachers should also support their students morally. The teacher from SMA N 13 stated, "Teacher should be able to ignite the learning spirit of the students", while the teachers from SMA N 17 and SMA N 21 explained that teachers should be the motivator of students and build the interaction and communication during teaching and learning process. These statements showed that the English teachers are capable of adjusting their teaching style according to what the students need at certain moments as moral supports reflect Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator teaching style better.

The contribution of teacher's teaching style toward students' English academic performance

To find out the contribution of teaching style with English academic performance, a regression analysis was conducted. However, first of all, a correlation analysis was done in order to find out which teaching styles correlated significantly with English academic performance. The correlation analysis used in this study is the Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis. As all students possess preference in all teaching style albeit there is a higher preference to certain style, all students were taken into account in this correlation, hence the N is 533. Table 8 shows the result of the correlation analysis.

| Table 8. Correlation analysis between English academic performance and teaching style expectat | Toble & Correlation | analysis between | English academic | narformance and | I togohina style expectation |
|--|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| | Table 6. Correlation | anaiysis beiween | Engusu acaaema | , perjormance ana | leaching style expectation |

| Teac | Teaching Style Score | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Expert | Pearson Correlation | ,095* | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,029 | | | | |
| | N | 533 | | | | |
| FormalAuthori | Pearson Correlation | ,124* | | | | |
| ty | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,004 | | | | |
| | N | 533 | | | | |
| PersonalModel | Pearson Correlation | ,032 | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,468 | | | | |
| | N | 533 | | | | |
| Facilitator | Pearson Correlation | ,024 | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,577 | | | | |
| | N | 533 | | | | |
| Delegator | Pearson Correlation | ,017 | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,688 | | | | |
| | N | 533 | | | | |
| *. Correlation is s | ignificant at the 0.05 level (| 2-tailed). | | | | |

Table 8 shows that Expert and Formal Authority had significant correlations with the students' English academic performance with p-values lower than .05.

Based on the result of the correlation analysis, the regression analysis was conducted by including variables Expert and Formal Authority in the analysis (stepwise regression analysis).

Table 9. Stepwise regression analysis of correlated data

| Model Summary ^b | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------|----------|---------------|--------|--|--|
| Model | R | Cha | nge Statistic | S | | |
| | | R Square | F | Sig. F | | |
| | | Change | Change | Change | | |
| 1 | ,124 | ,015 | 8,311 | ,004 | | |
| | a | | | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), FormalAuthority

b. Dependent Variable: Score

| Excluded Variables ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|----------|---------|---------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Model Beta T Si Partial Collinearity Statistics | | | | | | | | | |
| In g. Correlati Toleran VIF Minimum | | | | | | | | | |
| on ce Tolerance | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Exp .024 ^b .42 .6 .018 .576 1.73 .576 | | | | | | | | | |
| ert 5 71 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: Score | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Predict | ors in the N | Model: (| Constar | nt), FormalAu | thority | | | | |

The stepwise regression analysis shows that the r-square change for the Formal Authority teaching style is 0.015, which means that the contribution of this teaching style is 1.5% toward the students' English academic performance. As for the Expert teaching style contribution, it was considered as excluded variable as its beta value is very close to zero, showing that it virtually does not affect the English academic performance.

Discussion

Based on the findings, some interpretations were drawn. First, based on the results of the questionnaire, the students prefer varying teaching styles in practice, which means that the students like if the teachers teach according to the situation in the classroom at the specific moment of the class. However, there is a preference for certain styles to be used more than the other albeit not too distinct. The students are expecting more toward Facilitator teaching style, which answered the first research question. This is in line with what Bullock (2015) found that students

have stronger preference toward teachers with a more positive character. Korthagen (2004) also states that teachers who stimulate the students to be active in teaching, which is done by Facilitator teachers, and learning process are preferable as they affect the motivation of students in participating in classroom activities.

The second interpretation is focused on the result of questionnaire and interview from the teachers. The result shows that the teachers adjust themselves in teaching their students according to the classroom condition, with Expert style being the more preferable in the common situations. This is in line with Grasha's (1995) statement that teachers possess all the qualities of teaching style with only one or two is more apparent. However, the students themselves are expecting Facilitator style to be more apparent as well, which is more toward student-oriented where the students possess more freedom with the teacher as someone who supports them. This result shows that the teachers' teaching style preference does not match the students' expectation which answers the second research question.

The third interpretation focuses on the teaching style expectation contribution to the students' English academic performance. The correlation analysis shows that among the teaching style, Expert teaching style has a significant correlation with the students' academic performance. Surprisingly, Formal Authority affects the academic performance higher than the other styles. As for the regression analysis, it shows that Formal Authority teaching style affects the students' English academic performance by 1.5%. This showed that teaching style does not contribute even a quarter of students' English academic performance. This result is similar to what Shaari, Yusoff, Ghazali, Osman, and Dzahir (2013) found that the contribution of teaching style affects the students' academic performance modestly. The regression result answers the third research question that students' expectation in their English teacher's teaching style does not affect their English academic performance highly. This is probably because many factors affect English academic performance. Shahzadi and Ahmad (2011) explain that home environment, study habit. learning strategies, and academic interaction are the four factors that affect students' academic performance, which can be deduced that home environment, study habit, and learning strategies are more prominent compared to the interaction itself. Home environment does

not only about the psychological factor of the students but also the economic state of the students, both provides great influence on the emotional state of the students. Hussain and Suleman (2017) explain that subfactors of home environment that particularly plays more critical role are lack of parental attention on children, tension between parents, death of parents or guardian, parental illiteracy, and poverty. These subfactors affect students in scholastic and behavioral aspects, in which the mental of students may keep focusing on familial matter instead of academic matter, thus reducing their focus when learning (Alami, 2016).

As for study habit, this factor is usually hindered by the lack of favorable studying environment, which in turns affect students' motivation. The lack of opportunity to apply what they learned from the class may cause students to perform poorly academically since this affected their study habit to be pessimistic (Amua-Sekyi and Nti, 2015). Availability of facilities that support teaching and learning process such as books also affects the study habit because lack of facilities means that the students lost means to explore the materials which in turn lower the students' eagerness to improve themselves (Mosha. 2014). Lastly, learning strategies developed by teacher also affected the students' study habit. The more interesting the material was delivered by the teacher, the more the students feel eager to explore the material further (Mosha, 2014).

In conclusion, the students' expectation toward their English teacher affects their English academic performance modestly at best as there are many factors such as home environment and study habit which affect performance more prominently.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the writer can conclude that students expect that their English teacher should teach them with Facilitator teaching style more compared with other styles although the other styles are not rejected at all, students' expectation toward their English teacher style does not match with the teacher's teaching style, who leans more in using the Expert teaching style. However, the teachers themselves adjust their teaching style with the classroom situation. The last is students' expectation toward their English teacher's teaching style does not contribute their English academic performance highly.

REFERENCES

- Alami, M. (2016). Causes of poor academic performance among Omani students. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(1), 126-136.
- Aldajah, S., Haik, Y., & Moustafa, K. (2014). Compatibility of teaching styles with learning styles: A case study. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 50-58.
- Amua-Sekyi, E. T. & Nti, S. K. (2015). Factors affecting students' performance in English at colleges of education in Ghana. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature, 3*(10), 29-44.
- Beyhan, Ö. (2017). Student perceptions on the teaching styles of their teachers. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Journal of Education*, 33(4), 1038-1048.
- Bullock, M. (2015). What makes a good teacher? Exploring student and teacher beliefs on good teaching. *Rising Tide*, 7, 1-30.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research fourth edition. Boston, Massacchusetts: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Edmondson, W. (1999). Twelve lectures on Second Language Acquisition: Foreign language teaching and learning perspectives. Tubingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.
- EF English Proficiency Index. (2018). *EF English proficiency test.* Retrieved from https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/regions/asia/indon esia.
- Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42(2), 142-149.
- Grasha, A. F. (1995). Teaching with style: The integration of teaching and learning styles in the classroom. *Essays on Teaching Excellence:* Toward the Best in the Academy, 7(5).
- Grasha, A. F. & Hruska-Riechmann, S. (1996). *Teaching Style Survey*. Retrieved from http://longleaf.net/teachingstyle.html.
- Hussain, I. & Suleman, Q. (2017). Factors contributing to students' unsatisfactory academic achievement in English at secondary level. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development,* 35, 22-30.
- Ibrahim, I. & Ahmad, A. (2016). Teaching styles preferred by students on their achievement in history subject. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(5), 47-53.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 77-97.
- Mahmoudi, S. & Mahmoudi, A. (2015). Internal and external factors affecting learning English as a

- foreign language. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(5), 313-322.
- Mosha, M. A. (2014). Factors affecting students' performance in English language in Zanzibar rural and urban secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*(35), 64-76.
- Mulder, M. (2014). Conceptions of professional competence. *International Handbook of Research in Professional and Practice-based Learning*. Dordrecht: Springer. pp. 107-137.
- Peraturan Menteri No. 16 Tahun 2007 Tentang Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Kompetensi Guru. (2007).
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Peterson, E., Irving, E., Widdowson, D., & Dixon, R. (2010). Expectations of achievement: Student, teacher and parent perceptions. *Research in Education*, 83(1), 36-53.
- Shaari, A. S., Yusoff, N. M., Ghazali, I. M., Osman, R. H., & Dzahir, N. F. M. (2014). The relationship between lecturers' teaching style and students' academic engagement. SoLLs.INTEC.13: International Conference on Knowledge-Innovation-Excellence: Synergy in Language Research and Practice. Selangor, Malaysia.
- Shahzadi, E. & Ahmad, Z. (2011). A study on academic performance of university students. *Proceeding of 8th International Conference on Recent Advances in Statistic.* Lahore, Pakistan.
- Sishavan H. B. & Sadeghi, K. (2009). Characteristics of an effective English language teacher as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 130-143
- The Education Hub. (2018). *How to develop high expectations teaching*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Education Hub.

Gita Loveta, Bambang A Loeneto, & Machdalena Vianty
Students' expectation toward teacher's teaching style and contribution to students' English performance