

# Principals' and teachers' views on performance expectations for teachers.

## An exploratory study in Flemish secondary education.

L. Van den Ouweland, J. Vanhoof en P. Van den Bossche

### Abstract

Research suggests that defining and communicating performance expectations for teachers can have important benefits for schools. However, teacher performance is a complex construct, and schools in Flanders have substantial autonomy in defining performance expectations, but research on performance expectations held by principals and teachers is scarce. Therefore, the aim of this study is to explore what principals and teachers expect of teachers, and whether principals' expectations are clear to teachers. The findings of our interviews with principals and teachers in four secondary schools in Flanders indicate that expectations are context-dependent and subjective. In general, expectations regarding teaching are similar for all teachers, while expectations of school team performance are more teacher-dependent, debatable and diverse. Moreover, certain expectations of principals remain unclear to teachers, especially to more experienced teachers. Finally, teachers themselves also influence expectations in their schools. We discuss important aspects of managing performance expectations, as well as implications for educational policy, research and practice.

**Keywords:** teacher performance; performance expectations; performance management; school leadership

### 1 Introduction

Extensive educational leadership research has found that successful school leaders impact school effectiveness and teachers' performance (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Effective school leaders set directions

for teachers, i.e. create a clear vision, shared goals and high performance expectations for teachers (Kelchtermans & Piot, 2010; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Setting directions establishes a shared purpose in the team, and stimulates teachers' work (Leithwood et al., 2008). Research shows that direction-setting practices have important benefits for teachers and schools as a whole. They enhance teachers' job satisfaction, commitment, self-efficacy, and empowerment. They also benefit the principal-teacher relationship, teachers' perceptions of school leaders' effectiveness, teachers' trust in others, and focused instruction. Moreover, direction setting supports a positive working environment and culture, shared and aligned learning and teaching goals, collaborative knowledge sharing and creation, and shared decision-making (Price, 2012; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Through these positive outcomes, establishing goals and performance expectations for teachers benefits student learning (Hallinger, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Leo and Roberts (2015, p.468) state that: "Schools are more effective when collective expectations are important to everyone, and the organization does not just consist of a collection of individuals". In addition, in organizational research, the performance management literature also emphasises the importance of defining and communicating performance expectations for workers (Buchner, 2007; Kinicki, Jacobson, Peterson, & Prussia, 2013). Aguinis and Pierce (2008, p.139) define performance management as "a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization". Defining the organisation's mission, goals and related performance expectations for the staff is considered to be a crucial first

step in managing individual and organizational performance. Clear organisational goals and expectations can be translated into individualised goals and development plans for workers. Thereby, they provide a foundation for other performance management practices, such as feedback, coaching and performance appraisal, and stimulate personal and organizational development (Aguinis, Joo, & Gottfredson, 2011). In case of underperformance, clear expectations foster the process of identifying and agreeing upon the performance problem (Armstrong & Baron, 2014; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). However, setting expectations is not necessarily a unilateral process, i.e. imposed by managers on workers: dialogue and negotiation benefit performance management (Aguinis & Pierce, 2008).

Concerning performance expectations for teachers, research indicates that teacher performance is a complex, multidimensional, contextual and subjective construct. Therefore, principals and teachers are confronted with diverse, sometimes contradictory, expectations, and both internal and external accountabilities: expectations from school authorities at different levels, school inspections, students, teachers, parents, scholars, and the community (Ehren, Perryman, & Shackleton, 2015; Ingle, Rutledge, & Bishop, 2011; Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi, 2010). The school context may also have specific expectations for teacher performance. In this regard, the limited available research suggests that principals adapt teacher standards to their specific school contexts and student populations, framed by their beliefs, histories, and agendas (Ehren et al., 2015; Ingle et al., 2011). In Flanders, where we performed our study, schools have substantial autonomy in defining performance expectations for teachers. However, research on teacher evaluation in Flanders has found that teachers do not always know what they should do to get a positive evaluation, and job descriptions are often not individualised (Devos, Van Petegem, Vanhoof, Delvaux, & Vekeman, 2013). A study on principals' handling of teacher underperformance in Flanders has also found that some principals perceived unclear

performance standards to be a barrier in dealing with teacher underperformance (Van Den Ouweland, Vanhoof, & Roofthoof, 2016). This research evidence suggests that principals' performance expectations may not be clear to teachers.

In sum, research suggests that defining and communicating performance expectations for teachers can enhance school effectiveness and teacher development. However, teacher performance is a complex construct, which can make defining performance expectations challenging for principals. Therefore, we wish to study performance expectations in schools in-depth. We have studied principals' expectations of teacher performance and the clarity of these expectations for teachers. In addition, we will also study teachers' own expectations, since these could differ from principals' expectations, but have mostly been neglected in research (Kaye, 2004; Menuet, 2007). Thereby, we aimed to obtain better insight in how principals and teachers consider teacher quality, and how issues related to defining and clarifying expectations for teachers are present in schools.

## 2. Conceptual framework

Since our study focusses on the expectations that principals and teachers hold of teacher performance, we start by conceptualising the concept of 'performance expectations', and address challenges related to defining performance expectations in education. Next, we briefly discuss Flemish secondary education and educational policy, since our study should be viewed in light of this context.

### 2.1. Performance expectations

Performance expectations reflect what an organisation expects from its members; how 'good performance' is perceived (Goodhew, Cammock, & Hamilton, 2008; Kirby, 2004; Roe, 1996). Moreover, performance expectations are multiple, since jobs entail diverse tasks and roles (Spain, Miner, Kroonenberg, & Drasgow, 2010). They can be explicated as such (e.g. in job descriptions), on a more or less detailed level. They are also reflected in

(the difficulty of) organizational goals, which represent what is achievable and desirable (Gibbons & Weingart, 2001; Martin & Manning, 1995). On a more implicit level, expectations are present in organizational processes, practices (e.g. work patterns, sanctions) and policies (e.g. work rules, professional development opportunities) (Hora & Anderson, 2012; Sandlund, Olin-Scheller, Nyroos, Jakobsen, & Nahnfeldt, 2011). Social processes are substantial for generating and sharing norms and expectations as well, through informal talks and social comparisons (what others do, which behaviour is disapproved of) (Morris, Hong, Chiu, & Liu, 2015; Rennesund & Saksvik, 2010). In addition, employees' and managers' performance norms and expectations are influenced by their personal beliefs, experiences, and self-images (Earley & Erez, 1991; Gibbons & Weingart, 2001). This means that performance expectations are subjective and context-dependent; they depend upon how 'good performance' is perceived (Goodhew et al., 2008; Kirby, 2004). Performance expectations are also dynamic, since the labour market is changing constantly (e.g. technologies, globalization) (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002).

In education, being a teacher is a comprehensive job (Kelly, Ang, Chong, & Hu, 2008; Yariv, 2004). Student-related roles include, among others, instructional preparation and delivery, student assessment, and class management (Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). Other roles go beyond teaching, such as team work, working with parents, and dealing with curriculum changes and innovations (Cheng & Tsui, 1999). In this way, teachers not only impact students, but also colleagues, classrooms, and the school as a whole (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008). Some models of teacher performance focus on achieving goals, such as learning outcomes, while others focus on teaching processes (Cheng & Tsui, 1999). While educational research provides important insights on teacher quality, and researchers and policy makers have established teacher standards and frameworks, based on learning theories and educational research (e.g. Danielson, 1996; Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, & Tharp, 2002), teachers' work remains sub-

ject to evolving requirements and expectations, e.g. evolutions towards co-teaching and ever changing curricula (Cagle & Hopkins, 2009; Day & Gu, 2007), and controversy remains regarding the nature and objectives of teaching (Harris & Rutledge, 2010). Therefore, 'teacher performance' is a subjective, context-dependent construct, and research suggests that principals, teachers, parents, pupils, scholars and governments all have their own views on good teaching (Rhodes & Beneicke, 2003; Wragg, Haynes, Phil, Wragg, & Chamberlin, 1999; Yariv, 2004), making it challenging to define performance expectations for teachers (Moreland, 2009). Principals play a key mediating role, functioning as a 'buffer' between teachers' own expectations and external expectations (Ehren et al., 2015; Ingle et al., 2011; Leithwood et al., 2010).

Because of this complexity of teacher performance, and the professional nature of the teacher's job, critics of teacher performance standards (cf. the accountability discussion in education (Forrester, 2011; Futernick, 2010) argue that unitary scales and decontextualised, depersonalised standards do not grasp the quality of teachers (Ceulemans, 2014). Moreover, professional standards are feared to lead to bureaucratic control and accountability, which is in tension with teachers' autonomy, professionalism and individual responsibility, and may be detrimental to their intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction (Fitzgerald, Youngs, & Grootenboer, 2003; Gleeson & Husbands, 2003; Pelletier, Séguin-Lévesque, & Legault, 2002). Therefore, scholars have suggested that performance standards should be flexible, debatable and/or generic (Ben-Peretz, 2012; Sachs, 2003), focused on generating useful feedback and professional development (Firestone, 2014; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001), and constructed in dialogue with teachers (Decramer, Smolders, & Vanderstraeten, 2013; Hughes & Pate, 2012). Others state that performance expectations should be individualised and personally meaningful (Hardre & Kollmann, 2012). Finally, it appears crucial that performance expectations are aligned with HR practices (e.g. professional development and

recruitment) (Heneman & Milanowski, 2004), and underpinned by ethical leadership and good management (Eyal & Roth, 2011; Page, 2016). If these conditions are met, clear performance expectations can help teachers to focus on the needs of learners and improve teacher quality (Ben-Peretz, 2012; Sachs, 2003), support reliable performance appraisals (Doherty et al., 2002; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008), foster identification of and consensus on performance problems, and stimulate professional development (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Sachs & Mockler, 2011). They can also support the remediation or removal of teacher underperformance, without harming the autonomy and professionalism of good teachers (Firestone, 2014; Page, 2016). Thereby, teachers' acceptance of performance expectations is enhanced, as well as their job satisfaction, motivation and satisfaction with the appraisal system (Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Kelly et al., 2008).

## 2.2. Research context

In Flanders, the Dutch speaking part of Belgium, deregulation and decentralization are important features of educational policy. The government provides attainment targets for pupils, which define what pupils are expected to learn at different stages during compulsory education (Vanhoof, Vanlommel, Thijs, & Vanderlocht, 2013). There are no mandated central exams or national tests. School boards largely decentralise HRM-responsibilities to individual schools. Principals play a key role in human resource management and managing teacher performance, since other management levels are absent (Vekeman, Devos, & Valcke, 2016). The government obliges schools to have job descriptions (since 2005) for teachers (since 2007), but schools have the autonomy to define the meaning of 'educational quality' and to create evaluation criteria (OECD, 2014; Penninckx, Vanhoof, & Van Petegem, 2011; Zapata, 2014). However, as a guideline for teacher education and schools, the government has introduced a general teacher job profile with teacher roles and related competences. This job profile includes the following domains: the teacher as facilitator of learning and development

processes, the teacher as educator, the teacher as content expert, the teacher as organiser, the teacher as innovator/researcher, the teacher as partner of parents and care givers, the teacher as member of the school team, the teacher as partner of external parties, the teacher as member of the educational community, and the teacher as cultural participant (Aelterman, Meysman, Troch, Vanlaer, & Verkens, 2008). This profile is intended as a frame of reference (it describes the responsibilities of teachers), which can guide the construction of teacher job profiles in schools (Aelterman et al., 2008). As will be discussed in the next section, we studied principals' and teachers' expectations of teacher performance in two domains of this job profile.

Our study was performed in secondary education, which teaches students between 12 and 18 years old. It is part of compulsory education, situated in between primary education (6-12 year olds) and higher education. Secondary education consists of denominational schools, community schools and city/provincial schools, which each have their own curricula, but work towards the same student attainment targets imposed by the government. Students choose between general secondary studies (preparatory for higher education), technical studies (preparatory for work life or higher education), vocational studies (preparatory for work life), and art studies (preparatory for work life or higher education).

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Participants

Since this is a first exploratory study of performance expectations of principals and teachers, we opted for qualitative research with semi-structured interviews (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). We composed a diverse sample of four secondary schools, since research has suggested that expectations may depend on the school context and student population (Ehren et al., 2015; Ingle et al., 2011). Therefore, we selected two denominational and two community schools, of which two schools are located in a rural area and two

schools in an urban area. The schools offer diverse study programs and qualifications, i.e. general, arts, vocational and/or technical studies (or a combination). School sizes vary from 402 to 1496 students, and 56 to 330 teaching staff. This heterogeneous sample could give us an explorative picture of performance expectations in schools. In each school, we interviewed one principal and two language teachers. We opted for teachers from the same discipline, teaching similar age groups (16-18 year olds) to make answers more comparable, and we chose language teachers since these teachers are present in all schools, in each educational program, and form a considerably large group, which facilitated finding respondents. However, we did not discuss expectations specifically for language teachers, but for secondary school teachers in general. Since performance norms and expectations can be influenced by work experience (Earley & Erez, 1991; Gibbons & Weingart, 2001), we selected teachers with diverse years of experience (1-25 years), in consultation with their principals. Participation was anonymous and voluntary, and participants signed an informed consent stating the purpose and method of the study, as well as participant rights. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Antwerp.

**3.2. Method**

Each interview lasted forty-five to seventy minutes. First, we asked about respondents' expectations towards teachers in general, to obtain an insight into which tasks/roles they prioritised. After that, we focused on expectations in two domains of the job profile (Table 1): 'the teacher as facilitator of learning and development processes' and 'the teacher as member of the school team', to facilitate the comparison of respondents' answers for these distinct roles. While the first role contains core teaching tasks, the second role refers to non-teaching, school team roles such as collaboration with other teachers, and tasks at the school level. Previous research on performance evaluations in Flemish secondary schools has shown that these domains are generally considered the most important in schools (Devos et al., 2003).

Table 1  
Two domains of the teacher's job profile

---

*Domain 1: The teacher as facilitator of learning and developmental processes:*

- *Determining the initial situation of the learner and the group.*
- *Selecting the learning content and learning experiences.*
- *Determining an appropriate methodical approach or grouping formation.*
- *Creating an adequate learning environment with emphasis on the heterogeneity within groups of learners.*
- *Observing and evaluating the learning process and outcome.*

---

*Domain 2: The teacher as member of the school team:*

- *Participating in the development of the school strategy/plan.*
- *Participating in collaborative structures.*
- *Consulting within the team about and complying with the work organization.*
- *Discussing one's pedagogical and didactic role and approach within the team.*

---

*Note. Taken from: Aelterman et al. (2008)*

For each domain, we discussed what respondents considered to be a minimum expectation for teacher performance, what respondents perceived to be the origins of their expectations, and whether they thought that other teachers in their schools shared their expectations. In addition, we asked teachers about the clarity of their principals' expectations in these domains.

All interviews were voice-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The software package Nvivo10 was used for analysis. The coding process was partly deductive and partly inductive, following the guidelines of the thematic analysis approach by Braun and Clarke (2006). In the first step, the data were carefully examined, in a search for meanings and patterns, by which first ideas for the coding arose. In the second phase, the initial code tree was constructed. In the third phase, themes and sub-themes were constructed by sorting and combining codes. In the fourth step, these themes were reviewed and refined, by re-reading the coded extracts. A final code tree was constructed, which represented the data as a whole. These codes can be found in

Table 2  
Code tree

| Codes  | Sources | References |
|--|---------|------------|
| <i>Content of expectations</i>                   |         |            |
| • <i>facilitator of learning and development</i> | 12      | 72         |
| • <i>member of the school team</i>               | 12      | 52         |
| • <i>innovator/ researcher</i>                   | 10      | 16         |
| • <i>content expert</i>                          | 9       | 9          |
| • <i>educator</i>                                | 7       | 13         |
| • <i>partner of parents and care givers</i>      | 1       | 1          |
| <i>Applicability of expectations</i>             |         |            |
| • <i>absolute</i>                                | 9       | 19         |
| • <i>relative</i>                                | 12      | 34         |
| <i>Influences on expectations</i>                |         |            |
| • <i>curriculum, learning goals</i>              | 9       | 18         |
| • <i>personal vision, personality</i>            | 8       | 9          |
| • <i>experiences with students</i>               | 7       | 10         |
| • <i>school context, student population</i>      | 6       | 7          |
| • <i>colleagues</i>                              | 5       | 6          |
| • <i>experiences as a student</i>                | 3       | 5          |
| • <i>teacher education</i>                       | 2       | 2          |
| • <i>parents as role models</i>                  | 1       | 1          |
| • <i>other work experiences</i>                  | 1       | 1          |
| • <i>limits of personal situation</i>            | 1       | 1          |
| <i>Communication of school expectations</i>      |         |            |
| • <i>HR practices</i>                            | 12      | 38         |
| • <i>Policies, practices, structures</i>         | 9       | 43         |
| <i>Clarity of school expectations</i>            |         |            |
| • <i>Clear</i>                                   | 5       | 7          |
| • <i>Unclear</i>                                 | 8       | 14         |
| <i>Perceived agreement in school</i>             |         |            |
| • <i>Agreement</i>                               | 10      | 21         |
| • <i>Disagreement</i>                            | 12      | 48         |

Note. Sources = number of interviews coded per item, references = number of interview fragments coded per item.

Table 2. In the fifth phase, each theme was thoroughly analysed and four overarching themes were identified. These are used in the next session to present our findings. To promote a reflexive and thorough analysis, a methodological report (audit trail) was kept with first impressions of the interviews, reflections on the interview questions and evolving interpretations, as well as remarks on the analysis. Tentative codes and complex interview fragments were thoroughly discussed in the research team, thereby increasing the quality and credibility of the findings (King, 2004; Mortelmans, 2007).

#### 4. Findings

The interview data provided an in-depth, nuanced understanding of performance expectations in schools. Our findings are presented along four main themes that emerged from the interviews:

- The content and origins of performance expectations
- Teaching versus non-teaching expectations
- The clarity and communication of performance expectations
- Teachers' influence on performance expectations



#### 4.1. The content and origins of performance expectations

In Table 3, an overview of our respondents' performance expectations is provided. When discussing domain 1, i.e. expectations regarding teaching, student learning was considered the main goal by all respondents. Looking at our respondents' answers, it appears that certain expectations are shared amongst (almost) all respondents, i.e. the importance of adapting learning content and/or teaching methods to students, and motivating or activating students. Appropriate student evaluation, remediation, teaching style and enthusiasm, and classroom management were also mentioned often.

We found that some expectations were more prominent in some schools than in others, but expectations also differed within schools. Concerning differences between schools, we found that in school 1, both the principal and teachers emphasised the importance of activating students and motivating them, by adjusting context and methods to their interests and lives. In school 2, both the principal and the teachers put more emphasis on remediating students who were lagging behind, on differentiation not only for class groups but also for individual students, and on contextualising learning. In school 3, there was not one clear school focus, but there was some emphasis on creating maximal learning opportunities for students. In school 4, there was not one clear school focus either, but there was some focus on developing one's own teaching style, and differentiation also for gifted students. Concerning differences within schools, we found that some expectations were only mentioned by two out of three respondents (by the two teachers, or one teacher and the principal), or only by one respondent. For example, in school 1 only the principal emphasised the importance of a goal-oriented, systematic approach of evaluating students and monitoring student development. In school 2, it was also the principal who put more emphasis on thorough evaluation and feedback, and one teacher put more emphasis on clarifying expectations to students. In school 4, the two teachers put more

emphasis on setting clear boundaries for students. However, only in school 3, there was a clear difference between the principal's and the teachers' expectations: the principal had a more cognitive, academic focus on student learning, while the teachers put more emphasis on differentiation and remediation.

Both principals and teachers primarily referred to the curriculum and student learning goals as origins of their expectations in domain 1. In addition, principals explicitly stated that their expectations were school-dependent, i.e. determined by the school context and student population, and that teachers should therefore 'fit' their schools:

*"The student diversity in this school makes a great need for differentiation, and I'm extremely alert that this does not lead to a quality reduction, so it is not lowering expectations, but rather the contrary ... but it does take a differentiated approach... Teachers must be aware that their students do not necessarily understand the course material, understand all the questions... or can talk about it with each other. So it actually is a necessity." (Principal, school 2)*

Principals mentioned that their expectations were also influenced by their personal visions on teaching quality, their professional training, or their own experiences as students. Teachers related their expectations in domain 1 to a great extent to their personal visions on education, their personalities (e.g. being a perfectionist), collegial influences (e.g. arrangements made in departmental meetings) and teaching experiences with their students.

Concerning teachers' school team performance (domain 2), teachers' departmental work, and a certain degree of collegiality and collaboration, were expected of all teachers by all respondents. In contrast to domain 1, our respondents expressed more diverse goals and related expectations in this domain, i.e. collegiality; knowledge exchange, collegial discussion and/or collaborative learning with colleagues; making arrangements (e.g. to create uniformity for students) and sharing workload with other teachers; teacher colla-

Table 3.  
*Overview of respondents' performance expectations*

|  | <b>Domain 1: Teaching performance</b>  | <b>Domain 2: School team performance</b>  |
|--|--|---|
| School 1: urban community arts school, 779 students, 184 teachers                            |  |   |
| Teacher 1  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conveying enthusiasm</li> <li>- Activating students by adapting learning content to students' interests</li> <li>- Differentiation and remediation</li> <li>- Diverse teaching methods</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Giving and receiving feedback from colleagues</li> <li>- Creating uniformity in what is offered to students, and how students are approached</li> <li>- Handling problems together</li> <li>- Respecting consensus</li> <li>- Collegiality</li> <li>- Departmental work</li> </ul>   |
| Teacher 2  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conveying enthusiasm</li> <li>- Adapting learning content and teaching methods to class groups</li> <li>- Accurate student evaluation</li> <li>- Suitable didactics</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating uniformity in what is offered to students, and how students are approached</li> <li>- Collaborative decision making</li> <li>- Discussing ideas with colleagues</li> <li>- Departmental work</li> </ul>   |
| Principal  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing students' talents</li> <li>- Engaging students by adapting learning content and teaching methods to students</li> <li>- Goal-oriented, systematic approach of evaluating students and monitoring student development</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sharing knowledge with colleagues, shared professional development</li> <li>- Team reflection</li> <li>- Collaboratively formulating goals and developing teaching methods</li> <li>- Supporting co-workers</li> <li>- Departmental work</li> <li>- Taking part in one working group or project work</li> <li>- Knowing and supporting school policy (but: no need to make school policy)</li> </ul> |
| School 2: urban community school, general and technical education, 402 students, 56 teachers |  |   |
| Teacher 1  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Differentiation and remediation</li> <li>- Clarifying expectations to students</li> <li>- Motivating students by contextualizing learning content</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inspiring colleagues</li> <li>- Aligning the approach and evaluation of students</li> <li>- Collegiality</li> <li>- Departmental work and grade meetings, but also informal talks to tackle problems together</li> <li>- Efforts for non-classroom activities of one's own students</li> </ul>   |
| Teacher 2  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive teacher attitude, building students' self-confidence</li> <li>- Motivating students by showing enthusiasm, and clarifying the learning content's value</li> <li>- Adapting learning content and teaching methods to the needs and nature of the class group and individual students</li> <li>- Activating students by presenting learning content in an authentic context</li> <li>- Providing structure</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning from each other</li> <li>- Making arrangements</li> <li>- Collegiality</li> <li>- Departmental work, but mostly also informal discussions</li> <li>- Contribution to non-classroom student activities</li> <li>- taking part in 1-2 work groups</li> </ul>  |
| Principal  | Achieving student learning goals by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individualisation, differentiation</li> <li>- Thorough evaluation and feedback</li> <li>- Raising students' interest through authentic, concrete learning content, creating context</li> <li>- Appropriate teaching methods</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning from colleagues</li> <li>- Evaluating and ameliorating one's own work and the team's work</li> <li>- Reflection, working out ideas together</li> <li>- Departmental work (but should not be overestimated) and grade meetings</li> <li>- 2-3 work groups</li> </ul>   |



Table 3 continues

| School 3: rural denominational school, general and arts education, 799 students, 112 teachers                   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher 1   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Observing colleagues  |
|   | - Creating learning opportunities for all students                        | - | Giving and receiving feedback                                       |
|   | - Adapting learning content to the level of the class                     | - | Working out methods and implementing curricula with colleagues      |
|   | - Differentiation and remediation, (also at the individual level)         | - | Collegiality  |
|   | - Keeping appropriate professional distance                               | - | Departmental work   |
|   | - Adequate class management   | - | Project work  |
|   | - Focus on product and process of learning                                |   |   |
| Teacher 2   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Collegiality  |
|   | - Creating learning opportunities and challenging students                | - | Departmental work   |
|   | - Differentiation in learning content and teaching methods                | - | Taking part in one work group                                       |
|   | - Adapting learning content to the level and interests of the class       |   |   |
|   | - Remediating and individual guidance when possible                       |   |   |
|   | - Positive attitude and attention to all students, involving all students |   |   |
| Principal   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Observing colleagues  |
|   | - Getting the most out of each student                                    | - | Following professional development courses together with colleagues |
|   | - Creating maximal learning opportunities                                 | - | Sharing knowledge and materials                                     |
|   | - Getting to know new students' situation and needs                       | - | Allocating tasks in the team  |
|   | - Preparing students for higher education                                 | - | Planning together   |
|   | - Developing one's own teaching style                                     | - | Obtaining uniformity for, and broad support from parents            |
|   |   | - | Departmental work   |
|   |   | - | Taking part in one work group                                       |
|   |   | - | Reflecting on school policy and strategy                            |
| School 4: rural denominational school, general, technical and vocational education, 1496 students, 330 teachers |   |   |   |
| Teacher 1   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Being open to feedback from colleagues                              |
|   | - Providing structure, clarity and boundaries                             | - | Collegiality  |
|   | - Remediation, without lowering expectations                              | - | Departmental work   |
|   | - Differentiation, keeping the bigger picture in mind                     | - | Working on the school vision together                               |
|   | - Developing one's own teaching style                                     |   |   |
| Teacher 2   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Learning from colleagues  |
|   | - Observing students  | - | Creating consensus/uniformity for students                          |
|   | - Conveying enthusiasm  | - | Making arrangements in the team                                     |
|   | - Differentiation   | - | Collaboration to make more individualization for students possible  |
|   | - Ensuring that students respect school rules                             | - | Departmental work   |
| Principal   | Achieving student learning goals by:                                      | - | Creating consensus regarding expectations towards students          |
|   | - Conveying enthusiasm  | - | Organizing extra, challenging school activities for students        |
|   | - Taking into account students' learning styles and motivation            | - | Departmental work   |
|   | - Focus on process and product of learning                                | - | Voice in school policy  |
|   | - Remediation and differentiation, also for gifted students               |   |   |
|   | - Appropriate, creative teaching methods                                  |   |   |
|   | - Developing one's own teaching style                                     |   |   |

boration to create extra learning opportunities for students; developing teaching methods and school projects with colleagues; and teacher involvement in school policy, working groups and innovations.

Similar to domain 1, we found that some expectations were more prominent in some schools than in others, but there were also differences within schools. Concerning similarities within schools; we found that in school 1, both the principal and the teachers expected a lot of teachers' departmental work and meetings. In contrast, in school 2, both the principal and teachers emphasised that informal discussion was at least as important as formal meetings. In school 3, all respondents expected teachers to take part in working groups and/or school projects, while in school 4, all respondents considered this to be voluntary. Concerning differences within schools, some aspects were mentioned by only two out of three respondents, or only by one respondent in the school. For example, in school 1, only the teachers emphasised the importance of collegial arrangements to create uniformity for students. The teachers of school 2 emphasised the importance of extra-classroom efforts for students. In school 3, teacher 1 and the principal agreed more on the importance of collegial consultation and learning from each other, as well as teacher involvement in school vision/policy, while teacher 2 emphasised departmental work, teacher meetings, and collegiality. In school 4, teacher 1 and the principal expected teacher involvement in school vision/policy, and teacher 2 and the principal talked about the importance of working groups, project work, and teacher collaboration to facilitate differentiation for individual students. However, the only clear difference between teachers and principals was found in school 1, where the principal expected all teachers to participate in one or two working groups or school projects, while the teachers considered this to be voluntary.

Expectations in domain 2 were mostly related to respondents' opinions on teachers' non-teaching responsibilities (i.e. should teachers be involved in school policy?), principals' experiences with managing non-teaching expectations, and collegial influen-

ces on teachers (e.g. other team members school team efforts). This will be explained further in the next sections.

#### 4.2. Teaching versus non-teaching expectations

In general, teaching expectations (i.e. domain 1) appeared to be focused on one clear goal: student learning (see 3.1.). Moreover, principals and teachers agreed on the fact that expectations regarding teaching should be absolute (i.e. similar for all teachers): they strongly emphasised that teachers should perform well for their students, no matter what (e.g. despite high workload or personal problems). The only reasons why these expectations could differ in their opinion, were student-related: for instance, some class groups need more differentiation than others, and certain subjects require particular teaching methods. Only one respondent, the principal of school 3, indicated that her expectations regarding differentiation depended upon the capacities of the teacher, since not all teachers were as competent in differentiation. In addition, three respondents (the principals of schools 3 and 4, and teacher 2 of school 4) mentioned that teachers were allowed to develop a personal teaching style, in which they felt comfortable to teach. On the other hand, expectations regarding non-teaching tasks were more diverse, debatable, and teacher-dependent. Only teachers' departmental work, and a certain (vague) degree of collegiality and collaboration were expected of all teachers by all respondents. Concerning other school team tasks, opinions differed about the extent to which they were a teacher's responsibility. Must teachers also participate in working groups for example? Should teachers be involved in school policy issues? Most teachers considered these to be 'extra-role', and felt that they were not paid for non-teaching tasks. This teacher talks about 'voluntary work':

*"That's something I find important, but I'm glad that I can choose myself. For example, I've chosen to organise the London-trip because it is something that suits me. Such a commitment must be close to the heart, because ultimately that's voluntary work."* (Teacher 2, school 4)

Second, all respondents shared the conviction that expectations in this domain were allowed to be more relative (i.e. teacher-dependent) and flexible, dependent on a teacher's enthusiasm, talents and competences, but also his/her personal situation or resilience in coping with a certain workload. For this reason, the principal of school 4 chose not to make expectations absolute:

*"We no longer have mandatory working groups. We had those once... we put up a list of all working groups and teachers signed up for one or two. But their actual effort in the group, that was a different story. So paper members are of no use, or even counterproductive. Nowadays, we have working groups where people are engaged in... with enthusiasm, with passion. Which does not prevent that there are some who never engage themselves and just limit themselves to their teaching jobs." (Principal, school 4)*

In addition, in schools 1 and 3, the principals did not expect beginning teachers to participate in working groups and school projects, allowing them to focus on their work with students. At the same time, both teachers and principals felt that teachers' school team performance was essential for their schools' functioning. Therefore, three principals (schools 1,2,3) and three teachers (teacher 2 of school 2, and both teachers of school 3) expected all teachers to participate in one or two working groups or school projects of their own choosing. The principal of school 2 for example, stated that he attempted to maintain a balance of effort between teachers by expecting a minimum amount of non-teaching performance of all teachers. Some teachers also wished for clearer minimum expectations for all teachers in this domain, to make teachers' performance more balanced, and less dependent on teachers' goodwill.

#### **4.3. The clarity and communication of performance expectations**

Principals indicated that they explicated performance expectations in human resource practices such as performance appraisals, and

ad hoc talks with teachers (in which principals attempted to motivate teachers or gave feedback). Expectations were also reflected in school policies, practices, rules and agreements. For example, the principal of school 2 explained that the creation of remedial classes for students created high expectations for teachers at the same time. In school 3, the policy of attending courses in teacher duos reinforced expectations of collegial discussion and collaborative learning among teachers.

However, principals mentioned more ways in which performance expectations were communicated in their schools, compared to teachers, and some of the principals' expectations remained quite unclear to teachers, in domain 1 and/or 2 (with differences between schools). For example, in school 1, the teachers said that the principals' expectations in domain 1 were unclear, while in school 2, the teachers said that expectations were unclear in domain 2. The explicit communication of expectations through HR-practices was mostly mentioned by younger teachers. Performance expectations were clarified to them in selection interviews, performance appraisals and the initiation program. More experienced teachers indicated that when their principals clarified expectations, this happened more 'ad hoc', whilst providing feedback about specific incidents or events. The most experienced teacher in our sample stated that performance expectations were quite unclear:

*"What our principal wants exactly, I do not know so well... But maybe it's me and I have not read certain documents. I don't know... Because we did receive a job description, that, we do have. But what is expected, is... it is not very detailed, really." (Teacher1, school 1)*

In addition, two of the more experienced teachers (from schools 3 and 4) indicated that the performance of experienced, tenured teachers received little attention from their principals. Similarly, principals stated that they focused on the performance of beginning, pre-tenured teachers to make sure that only

good teachers would receive tenure, and three principals (school 1, 2 and 4) mentioned that they were short of time to monitor the performance of all teachers.

More in general, principals indicated that they struggled with the idea of explicating expectations. For instance, is it advisable to make performance expectations very specific? Principals sometimes deliberately chose not to explicate or specify performance expectations too much, based on the conviction that this could work counterproductively and teachers' intrinsic motivation was essential (e.g. for working groups), because they considered it to be impossible (e.g. how to specify 'collaboration' expectations), or unnecessary since some expectations were 'obvious' to them (e.g. taking on school tasks). The principal of school 2 for example, talked about his expectations regarding teachers' extra-classroom activities for students:

*"If I were a teacher, I would find it obvious to... Maybe that is the reason why I find it difficult to impose such things on teachers. I expect it from teachers, but I feel that it would be obvious for them to also expect this from themselves... While it is not obvious for all teachers."* (Principal, school 2)

Some teachers did not consider it to be a problem that (some) expectations were rather vague or unspecified, saying that they appreciated the autonomy of their work. Others wished for clearer expectations: one teacher explained that clear expectations would make her feel more confident about her performance, and three other teachers explained that clear expectations would benefit the detection of underperformance. However, some teachers struggled with explicating expectations as well (both teaching and non-teaching expectations), largely related to the feasibility of these expectations (cf. what is a realistic, achievable expectation, given the workload of teachers?), as well as the complex nature of 'good teaching'. For example, this teacher struggled with explicating her expectations regarding student differentiation:

*"That is a question that has been bothering me for some time now and I still haven't found the answer. Sometimes I think no, I should not do that [differentiate in learning goals], I should... do what I intended for this class, what I wanted to achieve. But, sometimes, when the students sit before me, and I see that they are really trying... I think, isn't it more important to lower expectations a bit and focus on what they are able to achieve? That way, they are more involved, and... When they make a test... they enjoy it when they actually succeed. Maybe that's better, more motivating... but I consider this an eternal dilemma."* (Teacher 2, school 1)

#### **4.4. Teachers' influences on performance expectations**

Although principals' expectations were not always clear to teachers, teachers indicated that expectations arose from within the team. Six teachers explained that their performance expectations were influenced by their colleagues, e.g. through discussions with colleagues, agreements made in departmental meetings, the collegial atmosphere among teachers, and other teachers' special efforts for students:

*"When I think of our school, that's something every one of us does actually, realizing that... for example, searching for teaching methods, using varied methods, to ensure that children who need more attention receive extra support."* (Teacher 2, school 3)

The principal of school 1 said that he trusted his teachers to discuss expectations in departmental meetings, since they were the teaching experts. Both principals and teachers also talked about expectations that 'existed' within the school team. For instance, one principal indicated that it was obvious for his teachers that meetings were planned outside school hours:

*"Expectations are very high here. We hold meetings from 5 until 9.30pm. When I mention this to other principals, they say: "when I want to organise a class meeting, nowadays I have to keep the students at home for the day*

*to have the meeting during daytime. Otherwise, they don't show up." .... So the commitment here is high... and a culture of... you should go for it and work hard." (Principal, school 1)*

The principal of school 3 stated that all teachers in her school were driven 'to get the most out of students'. The principal of school 2 indicated that his teaching team considered it an obvious task of all teachers to work with 'the child behind the student' and his or her personal context. Teacher 1 in school 1 said that all teachers were proud of their jobs and attempted to perform well. The teachers of school 2 emphasised that the need for differentiation was obvious for the teachers in their school. The teachers of school 3 said that all teachers were prepared to tailor learning content to students, and to do extra efforts to create learning opportunities for all students.

At the same time, all respondents expressed their doubts about whether all teachers in their schools agreed with their expectations. They all supposed that some teachers had different or lower expectations, since they did not meet these expectations. This concerned various issues in both domains, e.g. not attending departmental meetings, insufficiently preparing classes, never leaving one's classroom, or a lack of differentiation for students. In addition, some respondents (both teachers and principals) explained that they did not really know whether their expectations were shared, because the work of teachers was too invisible to them. One teacher (school 2) indicated that teachers in her school did not often talk about their performance.

In sum, our findings indicate that performance expectations are school-dependent, but also subjective. In general, expectations regarding teaching are similar for all teachers in schools, while expectations of school team performance are more teacher-dependent, debatable and diverse. Moreover, certain expectations of principals remain unclear to teachers, especially to more experienced teachers. Finally, our findings indicate that teachers themselves also influence expectations in their schools.

## 5. Conclusion and discussion

We studied principals' and teachers' expectations of teachers' teaching performance and school team performance, as well as the clarity of principals' expectations for teachers. The performance management literature and educational leadership literature indicate that defining performance expectations for teachers, and having shared expectations in schools, can have important benefits for schools, teachers and students (Price, 2012; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Performance expectations also form a basis for other performance management practices, such as performance appraisal and professional development (Aguinis & Pierce, 2008, Armstrong & Baron, 2014).

Concerning our respondents' expectations regarding teaching, we found that certain expectations were shared by (almost) all respondents (i.e. activating and motivating students by adjusting learning content and teaching methods to their interests and lives). Other expectations appeared to be school-specific, and shared within schools to a certain extent. For example, in school 2, with an urban and diverse student population, remediating students, differentiation for individual students, and contextualising learning were expected of teachers. Principals also explicitly related their expectations to the school context and student population, and emphasised the importance of the fit between the teacher and the school (cf. Ehren et al., 2015; Ingle et al., 2011). Teachers mentioned influences from discussions with and observations of colleagues, and teaching experiences with students, which are also school-related influences, and help to explain the similarities found within schools. In domain 2, we also found that certain expectations were shared by all respondents (i.e. teacher collaboration, collegiality, and departmental work), while other expectations appeared to be more school-related. Next to opinions on teachers' non-teaching responsibilities, teachers also mentioned collegial influences on their expectations in this domain. This may help to explain certain similarities found within schools, and is in line with studies that point

out the role of social processes in establishing, disseminating and reproducing performance norms and expectations (Gibbons & Weingart, 2001; Stewart, Courtright, & Barrick, 2012). Braxton (2010) indicates that these norms offer moral boundaries and a collective conscience, which is especially important given the autonomy and ambiguity of teachers' work. Next to these school-related influences, both principals and teachers also related their expectations to their personal visions (cf. Rhodes & Beneicke, 2003; Yariv, 2004), which is probably one of the reasons for the different expectations found within schools.

Regarding teachers' teaching performance, both principals and teachers held high expectations for all teachers in facilitating students learning. Concerning school team performance, all respondents expected teachers to collaborate, be collegial, and contribute to departmental work. Research has shown that for contemporary education, this non-teaching performance is essential for the survival of schools (Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders, 2013), and our respondents appeared to share this opinion. But at the same time, school team performance was only seen as an inherent part of teachers' jobs to a certain extent, while other school team tasks were considered extra-role or voluntary, especially by teachers. In this regard, in-role performance entails what is considered the core job of teachers (which is e.g. reflected in the formal job description), while contextual, extra-role performance involves contributions which are not part of the job itself, such as volunteering to take on additional tasks, or helping co-workers (Motowildo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Principals were struggling with formulating expectations in this domain as well. This possibly stems from the teacher's job assignment in Flanders: working hours only include teaching hours (Aelterman, 2007). However, the teacher job profile suggests that being a teacher is more than teaching, and that school team performance is expected of all teachers. This could be regarded as a lack of alignment between expectations and working conditions (cf. Heneman & Milanowski, 2004), making it harder for principals to define expectations

in this domain. Of course, school team performance requires different competences from teaching. While teachers are educated for teaching, they may not all have the competencies to, for example, lead departmental meetings, coordinate and organise school activities, or reflect about school policy. Our respondents also perceived that expectations could be more teacher-dependent in this domain (compared to domain 1), dependent on a teacher's motivation, resilience and competences. Together, our findings indicate that, while certain expectations appear to be shared between and/or within schools, the complex, context-related and subjective nature of 'teacher performance' is reflected in teachers' and principals' expectations for teachers (cf. Rhodes & Beneicke, 2003; Wragg et al., 1999; Yariv, 2004).

While we found that, to a certain extent, expectations were shared within schools, and respondents mentioned how certain expectations arose from within the team, it was not always clear to teachers which expectations their principals held exactly, nor were principals and teachers convinced that their expectations were shared by all colleagues. This appears to be partly related to the level of detail or specificity of expectations. In general, expectations were not that detailed. Parallel with this, research on teacher appraisal in Flanders has also found that, while goals and criteria are clear to teachers, it is not always transparent to teachers what 'performing well' on appraisal criteria exactly means (Devos et al., 2013). Moreover, our findings suggest that expectations are not systematically, explicitly communicated to teachers. Our respondents were unsure about whether all teachers in their schools agreed with their expectations, and based their perceptions of this agreement on observations of other teachers' work (i.e. they supposed that some teachers had different or lower expectations, since they did not meet these expectations), which could also indicate that there is little explicit discussion about expectations in school teams, or only in smaller teams such as departmental teams (cf. some respondents mentioned that expectations were related to arrangements made in departmental mee-



tings). In addition, principals found it difficult or unnecessary to translate certain teacher performance into very specific expectations. Moreover, they were concerned that strict, absolute expectations could be counterproductive for teachers' motivation (especially in domain 2) (cf. Pelletier et al., 2002), and teachers liked the autonomy of their work. This appears to be related to the professional nature of the teacher profession, and to related norms and traditions of teacher autonomy and privacy, and limited teacher performance monitoring (at least in Flanders) (Penninckx et al., 2011; Vangrieken, Dochy, Raes, & Kyndt, 2015). At the same time, respondents acknowledged some important benefits of clear expectations: how they can increase one's self-confidence, enable the detection of underperformance, and create a balance of effort between teachers (cf. Hardre & Kollmann, 2012; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001; Sachs & Mockler, 2011).

Next to these benefits of performance expectations, the educational leadership and performance management literature suggests many other benefits of having clear and shared expectations, such as a more motivated team, focused instruction in schools, and shared and aligned learning and teaching goals, which benefit student learning (Hallinger, 2011, Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Defining performance expectations is also considered to be a crucial first step in managing individual and organizational performance (Aguinis & Pierce, 2008). For example, evaluation criteria can be derived from performance expectations. In this regard, research on teacher evaluation has found that when evaluation criteria are clear to teachers, teachers perceive more effects of the evaluation system, and consider this system to be fairer (Devos et al., 2013). Therefore, despite the complexity of translating teacher performance into clear expectations, a minimum of 'direction setting' appears to be required, i.e. to clearly define a minimum of generic performance expectations (e.g. based on the teacher job profile) for both teaching and non-teaching performance, flexible enough to be adapted to the needs of specific students and schools, and to teachers' individual compe-

tences and motivation. Similarly, research indicates that performance is enhanced when expectations are individualised (Bobko & Colella, 1994; Hardre & Kollmann, 2012). Moreover, clarifying these expectations is important for all teachers. Principals stated that they focused on clarifying expectations to beginning, non-tenured teachers. While this suggests a differentiated approach, and principals recognise the professionalism of experienced teachers, expectations evolve throughout a teacher's career, and a teacher's roles and performance can also fluctuate (Cagle & Hopkins, 2009; Day & Gu, 2009; Meng & Munoz, 2016). This suggests that the performance of more experienced teachers also deserves attention and support, and that (changes in) expectations should be clarified to them, to stimulate professional development throughout their careers (Firestone, 2014; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001). In addition, it would be beneficial that teachers are involved in defining expectations, for different reasons: the complexity and diversity of expectations, the professionalism of teachers, and the importance of consensus on expectations, together with our findings, suggest the need to create opportunities for discussion about performance expectations and related doubts and concerns. Previous research also suggested that teachers' involvement in the construction of performance expectations creates goal congruence, shows teachers that the principal believes in their capacities, and enhances their acceptance of these expectations (Hughes & Pate, 2012; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Jantzi, 2002). As Page (2016) suggests, managing teachers' performance is inherently dialectic, balancing teacher accountability and professional autonomy.

Concerning implications for education policy and research on performance expectations, our findings suggest that defining performance expectations is a first, but complex step in managing teacher and school performance. Therefore, it is important not to rush this step, nor to consider this step as obvious or self-evident, since other practices like providing performance feedback and appraisal build on it. While we support schools' autonomy and freedom to define context-related

expectations, our research suggests the need for more support for principals to achieve this. In Flemish education, principals have a substantial workload and are largely on their own when it comes to managing performance expectations, and the quality of HR-practices largely depends on the individual principal (Devos, Bouckennooghe, Engels, Hotton, & Aelterman, 2007; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). Therefore, it would be appropriate to create opportunities for principals to meet and share insights on how to define and manage performance expectations for teachers, and to include performance management in principal training courses.

Our study is not without its limitations. First, our findings are closely linked to the Flemish context. Educational management, and perceptions of teacher effectiveness are influenced by educational contexts, practices, policies, standards, and values (Liu, Xu, & Stronge, 2016; Meier, Andersen, O'Toole Jr, Favero, & Winter, 2015, Meng & Munoz, 2016). For example, the fact that we do not have high-stakes testing or national performance standards for teachers, might explain why principals did not put more emphasis on students' learning outcomes than teachers, in contrast to findings of Day, Stobart, Sammons, and Kington (2006), and why principals' 'buffering' function between governments' and teachers' expectations (e.g. Ingle et al., 2011) was not mentioned in our interviews either. Moreover, interviewing only language teachers might have created a potential bias, since teachers mostly communicate and collaborate with teachers from their own departments, forming subcultures within schools (Bidwell & Yasumoto, 1999). Teachers of other disciplines might have different views on teacher performance. Moreover, because of the exploratory nature of our research, differences in expectations between and within schools cannot be fully explained, and our findings cannot be generalised to other contexts. Finally, we did not study the impact of principals' and teachers' performance expectations on performance management practices and the actual performance of teachers. This would be an interesting direction for further research.

## References

- Aelterman, A. (2007). Een schoolopdracht voor de leraar secundair onderwijs: een gemiste kans? In D. Sandra, R. Rymenans, P. Cuvelier, & P. Van Petegem (Eds.), *Tussen taal, spelling en onderwijs. Essays bij het emeritaat van Frans Daems*. (pp. 487-506). Gent: Academia Press.
- Aelterman, A., Meysman, H., Troch, F., Vanlaer, O., & Verkens, A. (2008). *Een nieuw profiel voor de leraar secundair onderwijs. Hoe worden leraren daartoe gevormd? Informatiebrochure bij de invoering van het nieuwe beroepsprofiel en de basiscompetenties voor leraren*. Brussels: Departement Onderwijs en Vorming.
- Aguinis, H., Joo, H., & Gottfredson, R. K. (2011). Why we hate performance management - And why we should love it. *Business Horizons*, 54(6), 503-507. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2011.06.001
- Aguinis, H., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Enhancing the relevance of organizational behavior by embracing performance management research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 139-145. doi:10.1002/job.493
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2014). *Managing performance: performance management in action*. London: CIPD.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2012). Accountability vs. teacher autonomy: An issue of balance. In C. Day (Ed.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* (pp. 57-66). London/ New York: Routledge.
- Bidwell, C., & Yasumoto, J. (1999). The collegial focus: Teaching fields, collegial relationships, and instructional practice in American high schools. *Sociology of Education*, 72(4), 234-256.
- Bobko, P., & Colella, A. (1994). Employee reactions to performance standards: A review and research propositions. *Personnel Psychology*, 47(1), 1-29. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1994.tb02407.x
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Braxton, J. (2010). Norms and the work of colleges and universities: Introduction to the special issue—Norms in academia. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(3), 243-250.
- Buchner, T. (2007). Performance management the-

- ory: A look from the performer's perspective with implications for HRD. *Human Resource Development International*, 10(1), 59-73. doi:10.1080/13678860601170294
- Cagle, K., & Hopkins, P. (2009). Teacher self-efficacy and the supervision of marginal teachers. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education*, 2(1), 25-31.
- Ceulemans, C. (2014). *Het beroepsprofiel van de leraar als black box. Een analyse van de werking van onderwijsstandaarden (Doctoral dissertation)*. Universiteit Antwerpen / KU Leuven, Antwerpen.
- Cheng, & Tsui, K. (1999). Multimodels of teacher effectiveness: Implications for research. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(3), 141-150. doi:10.1080/00220679909597589
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education. 7th Edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice - A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teachers' professional learning and development: Sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4), 423-443. doi:10.1080/03054980701450746
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Veteran teachers: Commitment, resilience and quality retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(4), 441-457. doi:10.1080/13540600903057211
- Day, C., Stobart, G., Sammons, P., & Kington, A. (2006). Variations in the work and lives of teachers: Relative and relational effectiveness. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 169-192. doi:10.1080/13450600500467381
- Decramer, A., Smolders, C., & Vanderstraeten, A. (2013). Employee performance management culture and system features in higher education: Relationship with employee performance management satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(2), 352-371. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.680602
- Devos, G., Bouckenoghe, D., Engels, N., Hotton, G., & Aelterman, A. (2007). An assessment of well being of principals in Flemish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(1), 33-61. doi:10.1108/09578230710722449
- Devos, G., Van Petegem, P., Vanhoof, J., Delvaux, E., & Vekeman, E. (2013). *Evaluatie van het onderwijspersoneel: beleid en praktijk in het Vlaamse secundair onderwijs, centra voor leerlingenbegeleiding en voor volwassenenonderwijs*. Antwerpen: Garant.
- Doherty, R., Hilberg, R., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R. (2002). Standards performance continuum: Development and validation of a measure of effective pedagogy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 78-89. doi:10.1080/00220670209598795
- Earley, P., & Erez, M. (1991). Time-dependency effects of goals and norms - The role of cognitive processing on motivational models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 717-724. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.76.5.717
- Ehren, M., Perryman, J., & Shackleton, N. (2015). Setting expectations for good education: How Dutch school inspections drive improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(2), 296-327. doi:10.1080/09243453.2014.936472
- Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation: Self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(3), 256-275. doi:10.1108/09578231111129055
- Firestone, W. (2014). Teacher evaluation policy and conflicting theories of motivation. *Educational Researcher*, 43(2), 100-107. doi:10.3102/0013189x14521864
- Fitzgerald, T., Youngs, H., & Grootenboer, P. (2003). Bureaucratic control or professional autonomy?: Performance management in New Zealand schools. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 23(1), 91-105. doi:10.1080/1363243032000080050
- Forrester, G. (2011). Performance management in education: Milestone or millstone? *Management in Education*, 25(1), 5-9. doi:10.1177/0892020610383902
- Futernick, K. (2010). Incompetent teachers or dysfunctional systems? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(2), 59-64.
- Gibbons, D., & Weingart, L. (2001). Can I do it? Will I try? Personal efficacy, assigned goals, and performance norms as motivators of individual performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(3), 624-648.

- doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02059.x
- Gleeson, D., & Husbands, C. (2003). Modernizing schooling through performance management: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(5), 499-511. doi:10.1080/0268093032000124866
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Research Synthesis*. Washington DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Goodhew, G., Cammock, P., & Hamilton, R. (2008). The management of poor performance by front line managers. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(9), 951-962. doi:10.1108/02621710810901291
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142. doi:10.1108/09578231111116699
- Hardre, P., & Kollmann, S. (2012). Motivational implications of faculty performance standards. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 40(6), 724-751. doi:10.1177/1741143212456913
- Harris, D., & Rutledge, S. (2010). Models and predictors of teacher effectiveness: A comparison of research about teaching and other occupations. *The Teachers College Record*, 112(3), 914-960.
- Heneman, H., & Milanowski, A. (2003). Continuing assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17(2), 173-195. doi:10.1023/B:PEEV.0000032427.99952.02
- Heneman, H., & Milanowski, A. (2004). Alignment of human resource practices and teacher performance competency. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 108-125. doi:10.1207/s15327930pje7904\_6
- Hora, M., & Anderson, C. (2012). Perceived norms for interactive teaching and their relationship to instructional decision-making: a mixed methods study. *Higher Education*, 64(4), 573-592. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9513-8
- Hughes, K., & Pate, G. (2012). Moving beyond student ratings: A balanced scorecard approach for evaluating teaching performance. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 28(1), 49-75. doi:10.2308/iace-50302
- Ingle, K., Rutledge, S., & Bishop, J. (2011). Context matters: Principals' sensemaking of teacher hiring and on-the-job performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(5), 579-610. doi:10.1108/09578231111159557
- Ingvarson, L., & Rowe, K. (2008). Conceptualizing and evaluating teacher quality: Substantive and methodological issues. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(1), 5-35. doi:10.1177/000494410805200102
- Kaye, E. (2004). Turning the tide on marginal teaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 19(3), 234-258.
- Kelchtermans, G., & Piot, L. (2010). *Schoolleiderschap aangekaart en in kaart gebracht*. Leuven/Den Haag: Acco.
- Kelly, K., Ang, S., Chong, W., & Hu, W. (2008). Teacher appraisal and its outcomes in Singapore primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(1), 39-54. doi:10.1108/09578230810849808
- King, N. (2004). Using Interviews in Qualitative Research. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential Guide to Qualitative methods in Organizational Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kinicki, A., Jacobson, K., Peterson, S., & Prussia, G. (2013). Development and validation of the Performance Management Behavior Questionnaire. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(1), 1-45. doi:10.1111/peps.12013
- Kirby, J. (2004). Toward a theory of high performance. *Harvard business review*, 83(7), 30-39.
- Kirkpatrick, S., & Locke, E. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), 36-51. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.36
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27-42. doi:10.1080/13632430701800060
- Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 671-706. doi:10.1177/0013161x10377347
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 94-119. doi:10.1177/0013161X02381005
- Leo, U., & Roberts, B. (2015). Professional norms

- guiding school principals' pedagogical leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(4), 461-476. doi:10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0121
- Liu, S., Xu, X., & Stronge, J. (2016). Chinese middle school teachers' preferences regarding performance evaluation measures. *Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(2), 161-177. doi:10.1007/s11092-016-9237-x
- Martin, B., & Manning, D. (1995). Combined effects of normative information and task-difficulty on the goal commitment performance relationship. *Journal of Management*, 21(1), 65-80. doi:10.1177/014920639502100104
- Meier, K., Andersen, S., O'Toole Jr, L., Favero, N., & Winter, S. (2015). Taking managerial context seriously: Public management and performance in US and Denmark schools. *International Public Management Journal*, 18(1), 130-150. doi:10.1080/10967494.2014.972485
- Meng, L., & Munoz, M. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of effective teaching: a comparative study of elementary school teachers from China and the USA. *Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(2), 179-199. doi:10.1007/s11092-015-9230-9
- Menuey, B. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of professional incompetence and barriers to the dismissal process. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 18(4), 309-325. doi:10.1007/s11092-007-9026-7
- Middlewood, D., & Cardno, C. (2001). The significance of teacher performance and its appraisal. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance* (pp. 1-16). London: Rudledge Farmer.
- Moreland, J. (2009). Investigating secondary school leaders' perceptions of performance management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(6), 735-765. doi:10.1177/1741143209345569
- Morris, M., Hong, Y., Chiu, C., & Liu, Z. (2015). Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129, 1-13. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2015.03.001
- Mortelmans, D. (2007). *Handboek Kwalitatieve Onderzoeksmethoden*. Leuven: Acco.
- Motowildo, S., Borman, W., & Schmit, M. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human performance*, 10(2), 71-83. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002\_1
- OECD. (2014). *TALIS 2013 Results. An International Perspective on Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264196261-en> Page, D.
- (2016). Understanding performance management in schools: a dialectical approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(2), 166-176. doi:10.1108/IJEM-06-2014-0087
- Pelletier, L., Séguin-Lévesque, C., & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(1), 186-196. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.186
- Penninckx, M., Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). *Evaluatie in het Vlaamse onderwijs: beleid en praktijk van leerling tot overheid*. Antwerpen: Garant.
- Price, H. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85. doi:10.1177/0013161x11417126
- Rennesund, A., & Saksvik, P. (2010). Work performance norms and organizational efficacy as cross-level effects on the relationship between individual perceptions of self-efficacy, overcommitment, and work-related stress. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(6), 629-653. doi:10.1080/13594320903036751
- Rhodes, C., & Beneicke, S. (2003). Professional development support for poorly performing teachers: challenges and opportunities for school managers in addressing teacher learning needs. *Journal of In-service Education*, 29(1), 123-140. doi:10.1080/13674580300200205
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674. doi:10.1177/0013161x08321509
- Roe, R. (1996). Arbeidsprestaties. In P. J. D. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C. J. de Wolff (Eds.), *Handboek Arbeids- en Organisationspsychologie*. Deventer: Kluwer.



- Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader-member exchange. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 99-108. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.008
- Sachs, J. (2003). Teacher professional standards: Controlling or developing teaching? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9(2), 175-186. doi:10.1080/13540600309373
- Sachs, J., & Mockler, N. (2011). Performance cultures of teaching: Threat or opportunity? . In C. Day (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sandlund, E., Olin-Scheller, C., Nyroos, L., Jakobsen, L., & Nahnfeldt, C. (2011). The performance appraisal interview—An arena for the reinforcement of norms for employeeship. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 1(2), 59-75.
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological Management of Individual Performance* (pp. 5-25). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Spain, S., Miner, A., Kroonenberg, P., & Drasgow, F. (2010). Job performance as multivariate dynamic criteria: Experience sampling and multiway component analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 45(4), 599-626. doi:10.1080/00273171.2010.498286
- Stewart, G., Courtright, S., & Barrick, M. (2012). Peer-based control in self-managing teams: Linking rational and normative influence with individual and group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 435-447. doi:10.1037/a0025303
- Stronge, J., Ward, T., & Grant, L. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 339-355. doi:10.1177/0022487111404241
- Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 499-523. doi:10.1080/09243453.2015.1005106
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2014). The problematic implementation of teacher evaluation policy: School failure or governmental pitfall? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4), 155-174. doi:10.1177/1741143213502188
- Van Den Ouweland, L., Vanhoof, J., & Roofthoof, N. (2016). Onderpresterende vastbenoemde leraren door de ogen van schoolleiders. Een verkennend, kwalitatief onderzoek naar hun visie op onderpresteren, aanpak en ervaren obstakels. *Pedagogiek*, 36(1), 71-90. doi:10.5117/PED2016.1.OUWE
- Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2015). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 15, 17-40. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2015.04.002
- Vanhoof, J., Vanlommel, K., Thijs, S., & Vanderlocht, H. (2013). Data use by Flemish school principals: impact of attitude, self-efficacy and external expectations. *Educational Studies*, 40(1), 48-62. doi:10.1080/03055698.2013.830245
- Vekeman, E., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2016). Human Resource Architectures for new teachers in Flemish primary education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(6), 970-995. doi:10.1177/1741143215587309
- Wragg, E., Haynes, G., Phil, M., Wragg, C., & Chamberlin, R. (1999, 19-23 april). *Managing incompetent teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Yariv, E. (2004). 'Challenging' teachers: What difficulties do they pose for their principals? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32(2), 149-169. doi:10.1177/1741143204041881
- Zapata, J. (2014). *School leadership: An OECD perspective*. Retrieved from [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/inschrijvingen/pdf/OECD\\_School%20LeadershipPpt\\_Zapata.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/inschrijvingen/pdf/OECD_School%20LeadershipPpt_Zapata.pdf)

## Auteurs

**Loth Van den Ouweland** Department of Training and Education Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Antwerp. **Jan Vanhoof** Department of Training and Education Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Antwerp. **Piet Van den Bossche** Department of Training and Education Sciences, Faculty of Social



Sciences, University of Antwerp; School of Business and Economics, Maastricht University.

*Correspondence:* Loth Van Den Ouweland, Department of Training and Education Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Antwerp Gratiekapelstraat 10, 2000 Antwerp, Belgium. Phone: +32 32 65 45 26, E-mail: loth.vandenouweland@uantwerpen.be

## Samenvatting

**De kijk van directeurs en leraren op prestatieverwachtingen voor leraren. Een verkennend onderzoek in het secundair onderwijs in Vlaanderen.**

Onderzoek wijst uit dat het definiëren en communiceren van prestatieverwachtingen voor leraren belangrijke voordelen kan hebben voor scholen. Leraarprestatie is echter een complex construct, en scholen in Vlaanderen hebben autonomie in het definiëren van prestatieverwachtingen, maar onderzoek naar de verwachtingen die directeurs en leraren zelf hebben t.a.v. leraren is schaars. Daarom focust deze studie zich op wat directeurs en leraren van leraren verwachten, en of verwachtingen van directeurs duidelijk zijn voor leraren. De bevindingen van onze interviews met directeurs en leraren in 4 secundaire scholen in Vlaanderen tonen aan dat verwachtingen contextgebonden en subjectief zijn. Verwachtingen op gebied van lesgeven zijn gelijkaardig voor alle leraren in scholen, terwijl verwachtingen van schoolteamprestaties meer leraarafhankelijk, discutabel en divers zijn. Bovendien zijn de verwachtingen van directeurs niet altijd duidelijk voor leraren, in het bijzonder voor meer ervaren leraren. Tenslotte tonen onze resultaten aan dat leraren zelf ook de verwachtingen in hun school beïnvloeden. We bediscussiëren belangrijke aspecten van het managen van prestatieverwachtingen, alsook implicaties voor onderwijsbeleid, -onderzoek en -praktijk.

Kernwoorden: leraarprestaties; prestatieverwachtingen; prestatie management, schoolleiderschap