

School Principals' Informal Criteria in Assessing Their Teachers: A Comparative Study

Sudeshna Lahiri, Eliezer Yariv, and Simona Butnaru

ABSTRACT

Teacher appraisal is a necessary tool to manage staff, hire new candidates, and develop senior members. Principals use formal quantitative tools that reflect the competitive social environments in which schools operate. This study explores school principals' informal attitudes regarding the personal and professional traits they believe teachers should have or not have. Following Yariv's (2009) study we compare heads in four countries – Botswana, Romania, India, and Israel. Within a non-random convenience sampling, we held a short telephone interview (or written questionnaire) with 132 elementary and high school principals. The two most preferred traits in the entire sample were high motivation and accountability. As it turns out, school principals are less impressed by traits like professionalism or honesty. The two least preferred traits are the poorly motivated teachers and those who lack professional values and conduct. Phi and Cramer's V test indicated a significant association between nationality and the traits of effective and ineffective teachers. The discussion analyzes the hierarchy of considerations principals maintain and the central role of the common characteristics of principalship upon national and cultural influences.

Keywords: Cross-cultural perspective, informal criteria, performance, school principals, teacher evaluation.

Published Online: June 09, 2022

ISSN: 2736-4534

DOI : 10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.3.326

S. Lahiri*

Department of Education, University of Calcutta, India.

(e-mail: sledu@caluniv.ac.in)

E. Yariv

Department of Educational Psychology, Gordon College of Education, Israel.

(e-mail: elyaviv@gmail.com)

S. Butnaru

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania.

(e-mail: scraciun @ uaic.ro)

**Corresponding Author*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Formal and Informal Criteria Applied in Teachers' Evaluation

Many efforts are currently putting by nations and school districts to develop talented teachers and improve their effectiveness (Derrington & Campbell, 2018; Jacob & Walsh, 2011). Sorting out the effective or ineffective teachers is a complex, dynamic, context-related process. The use of formal constructed quantitative tools, including summative and formative procedures is meant to ensure that teachers have the necessary knowledge skills, and attitudes to provide pupils with the best possible teaching (Close *et al.*, 2019).

Historically, ever since the 1950s, when formal Performance Appraisal (PA) systems in the United States were based on personality appraisal tools, the growing competitive pressures on western economies have led to a stronger focus on performance (Fletcher & Perry, 2001; Larusdottir, 2014). However, policy founded on competitive beliefs and values would be markedly different once it is aligned with values of caring and collaboration (Law *et al.* 2003). Cleveland and Murphy (1992) argue that taking social, motivational, and organizational perspectives on PA- rather than an exclusively cognitive one – is likely to be more fruitful for principals and researchers. Recent studies emphasize the need that school effectiveness should be based on mutual trust, cohesion, organizational capacity, and professional accountability (Yi & Kim, 2019).

Due to their close relations and acquaintance with teachers (Jacob & Lefgren, 2008), principals are probably the most knowledgeable persons to evaluate their staff. They assess their teachers' performance according to many aspects, such as professionalism, creativity, demographics - race, gender, religion, and the like (Harris *et al.*, 2010; Engel, 2013; Ingle *et al.*, 2018; West *et al.*, 2018). However, their ability to rate staff members' effectiveness accurately was questioned in many studies (Orphanos, 2014). Much inquiry has been devoted to formal practices and flaws in procedures of teachers' evaluation (Kersten & Israel, 2005). However, some of the recent studies indicated that despite the changes many states have made to their respective teacher evaluation policies and systems, most teachers' evaluation is still largely dependent on the judgment of the principal (or other evaluators) (Steinberg and Donaldson 2016; Reid 2019). Here, we explore the somewhat neglected subject of informal values principals have on their teachers' personalities and performance. We assume that this personal yardstick plays as a powerful motivator or filter, which predisposes principals toward seeing situations in certain ways and taking certain courses of action (Law *et al.*, 2003). These filters can be conceptualized as attitudes – the overall evaluations of people, groups, and objects (Baumeister, & Vohs, 2007). The criteria by which principals evaluate their teachers include not only cognitive component (e.g., how well she teaches) and affective (e.g., favor or dislike her conduct), but also behavioral tendencies. It was found that such attitudes translate into actual human resource practices and influence

mutual relations and her satisfaction and performance (Boies & Fiset, 2019).

Not many studies explore school principals' informal attitudes on teachers' traits and performance. For example, Yariv (2009) interviewed 40 Israeli elementary school principals, asking them two open questions: 'What are the two traits you most appreciate in your staff members?' and 'What are the two traits you mostly preferred they would not have?'. Based on the content analysis he identified eight categories, as antonyms, each for effective and ineffective traits (e.g., sensitivity and love for children, vs. aggressiveness and disrespect for children). The two most appreciated traits were caring for children and high motivation, as stated by 52 and 48 percent of the respondents, respectively. So, conversely, were the most apprehended traits of laziness and aggressiveness toward children (43 and 51 respectively). These findings closely match American principals' perceptions of misconduct among secondary school teachers. The findings reveal that absenteeism, lateness, truancy, and poor-quality teaching were perceived by principals as forms of misconduct (Onoyase 2018). Australian educators also believe that highly accomplished teacher depositions are structured in the following factors: motivation to teach, willingness to learn, conscientiousness, and interpersonal and communication skills (West *et al.*, 2018).

B. The Influence of Culture on School Leadership Practices

Are these beliefs about teachers' qualities influenced by national norms and traditions? Many scholars of school leaders agree that cultures shape organizational practices and leadership behaviors (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010; de Albuquerque Moreira & Rocha, 2018; Dimmock & Walker, 1999; Miller, 2018; Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Shapira-Lishchinsky & Litchka, 2018). Cultures from the context in which schools run and, also, shape how school principals think and act (Dimmock & Walker, 2002, p.70). It is certainly a major challenge to assess the impact of culture on school management (Steers *et al.*, 2010) and it probably can be only interpreted from individuals' and groups' conduct (Dimmock & Walker, 2002).

Some research highlighted the influence of cultural background on school leadership. In a recent study about the role of Brazilian national culture on school leadership, de Albuquerque Moreira and Rocha (2018) showed that the high distance power of Brazilian culture is reflected in school organizational management and leadership as high centralization and reduced autonomy of schools. The authors emphasized that many aspects of national culture such as authoritarianism, personalism, patriarchy, paternalism, hierarchy, the mix between the public and private spheres, and cordiality, result from the historical process of colonization and constitute a consequence of the intercultural contact between three main cultures: Iberian, Amerindian, and African. Miller (2018) and Shapira-Lishchinsky and Litchka (2018) conducted comparative studies which pointed out the coexistence of the universality of some topics in school leadership and the national nuances in the leadership practices and meanings. Miller compared the entrepreneurial leadership among 61 school principals from 16 countries. He found that, in aggression cultures, achievement, competition, and assertiveness are valued, whereas, in consideration cultures, collaborative relationships are emphasized. In

another quantitative comparative study on teachers' perceptions of transformational leadership, conducted among 615 Israeli and 541 US teachers, Shapira-Lishchinsky and Litchka found that some universal leadership aspects, such as dominant practices, appear in both USA and Israel, due to the centralization of both Israel and SUA education systems, but the transformational leadership practices are often nuanced by cultural attributes. For example, Israeli teachers perceive their school principals' transformational leadership to be significantly higher than do US teachers, findings explained by low levels of power distance, individualism, and masculinity in Israel as compared to the USA (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Litchka, 2018).

C. National Culture and Performance Appraisal

Due to the increasing internationalization of educational systems, national culture emerges as an important factor that influences managing these organizations. Various studies identified systematic differences in work-related values across countries (Hostede, 2001; Javidan *et al.*, 2006; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2011). These values may influence the performance expectations employees to develop. Here, we adopt the most parsimonious and cited theoretical model of Dutch sociologist Geert Hofstede (Nardon & Steers, 2009). It includes the themes of power relationships between individuals and groups, differentiation of sex roles, treatment of uncertainty, relationship with the past, and attitude toward pleasure (Hofstede, 2001; Dimmock & Walker, 2002; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). The perspective on power is commonly treated, as a preference for centralization vs. decentralization of power. The relationship between the individuals and social groups is polarized between preference for groups-oriented (collectivism – loyalty to group, teamwork, politeness, obedience, self-discipline, honoring parents) and self-oriented communities (individualism – independence, creativity, assertiveness). The perspective on the differentiation of sex roles is focused on the differences between males and females roles and male or female dominance in social life – there are masculine societies (preferences for differentiated masculine and feminine roles, competition, achievement, success) and feminine societies (preferences for the quality of life, well-being, caring for others, equality, solidarity, harmony, family, compassion for weak, compromise). Cultures are also classified as to how they treat uncertainty, with a need for rules, an urge to be busy, a need for precision, and punctuality. Orientation toward short or long-term divides societies into normative (with respect to customs, traditional culture, or religion) and pragmatic (oriented to new ideas, and ways of working). The extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses divides societies into high indulgent (hedonism, leisure time, the gratification of desires, pleasure, enjoying of life) and low indulgent (refusing of pleasure, skepticism, negativism, and being pessimistic about facts).

In one of the studies, Fletcher and Perry (2001) apply Hofstede's theoretical framework to the performance appraisal processes. For example, in organizations with high levels of power distance, it is always the superiors who evaluate their workers, most often in a direct manner. In low-level power distance organizations, the assessment is carried

out in participatory two-way communication, and information is provided by several sources (peer, subordinate). In individualistic-oriented organizations, performance appraisal assumes that most of the variance in job performance depends on individual factors, with little consideration given to situational and group factors. Hence more emphasis is given to professional quality and motivation. In a collectivist organization, less attention is given to personal achievements and performance, while greater emphasis is given to the relationship with colleagues and superiors. For example, Smith *et al.* (1996) study on work-related values across 43 countries suggests that in collectivist cultures, loyalty and seniority considerations are the focus of evaluation and the basis for personnel decisions. In a collectivist society like Kenya, the identification and response to workers' wrongdoing are rationalized according to parochial social ideologies, which tend to override instrumental accountability norms (Onyango 2017). These aspects of collegiality, trust, motivation and other values were found by Yariv (2009).

D. Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation in Four Cultures

Relatively, few studies have compared the cultural differences regarding school administration practices among the countries in this research, and none of them include Botswana (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010). These differences are often discussed as per the taxonomy suggested by Hofstede. Addressing the power distance and uncertainty avoidance, Indian and Romanian people manifest high power distance and Israeli people show a low level in this dimension (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Rahman, 2006; Shapira-Lishchinsky & Litchka, 2018). Higher power distance suggests an increase in teachers' tendency to obey their supervisors' instruction and less favorable group attitudes towards the principal job of teachers' evaluation among Romanian and Indian teachers (Rahman, 2006). Lower power distance in Israeli culture indicates a prominently informal school climate, with direct principal-teacher communication, on a first name basis (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Litchka, 2018). Romanian and Israeli obtain high scores in uncertainty avoidance, while Indians have a moderate score in this dimension (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Rahman, 2006). Based on these indicators, it is expected from Romanian, and Israeli has a higher need for rules and regulations, more need for precision and punctuality, and reject of a stranger and unknown thing, than Indians. Moreover, India and Romania have low and similar values in the indulgence index, indicating accentuated attitudes of skepticism, negativism, refusal of pleasure, and pessimism about facts (refer to Table I).

TABLE I: COMPARATIVE INDEXES OF NATIONAL CULTURES DIMENSIONS (HOFSTEDE *ET AL.*, 2010)

Index *	India	Romania	Israel
Power distance index	77	90	13
Individualism index	48	30	55
Masculinity index	56	42	48
Uncertainty avoidance index	40	90	81
Long term orientation index	51	52	38
Indulgence vs. restraint index	26	20	

*Index values for Botswana are not available.

Comparing other cultural dimensions (Table I) there are relatively moderate and similar scores on masculinity, individualism, and a long-term orientation, with the following exceptions: Romania has a more feminine and collectivistic culture; and Israel has a predominantly short-term orientation (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010). Principal-teacher relationships in such contexts may be focused on the quality of relationships and may be represented by a more caring approach to leadership, motivating others, being an example to follow, treating others with trust and dignity, recognizing teachers' efforts, and accepting challenges (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Litchka, 2018). Hence, the principal may provide their teachers' indirect feedback, implicit manner, through another person, or some consequences at the organizational level (Walker & Dimmock, 2000).

1) Teacher appraisal in Botswana

Since the expansion of the education system of Botswana in the 1970s and 1980s, several measures got introduced to improve learners' outcomes. These include the Performance Management System (PMS), and quality assurance measures of teacher appraisal. In 1992, Botswana introduced the current appraisal scheme as a non-threatening, valid, and extensive system to develop the individual and the school. Teacher appraisal is enacted by a Senior Management Team (SMT) that observes the teacher and provides the proper feedback. The procedure is meant to ensure that teachers do their work effectively. Although teachers' perceptions of the scheme were rather positive (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006), many said its goals are not clear. Both the appraisees and appraisers lacked adequate training on the appraisal process (Monyatsi, 2009) and almost half of high school teachers felt the procedure is abused, serving only the interests of favoritism and public relations of the SMT.

2) Indian Appraisal System

The educational administration in a large country such as India is regulated both by the central government and the states. The responsibility to evaluate teacher performance and progress has been assigned to school principals. The duties are based on various legal and administrative schemes. For example, the Revised Education code for Kendriya Vidyalaya Sanghathan (KVS) entails the principal/ vice principal to observe the teaching of at least one class each every day, covering all teachers and classes over a certain period, regularly (Murthy, 2013). The National Programme on School Standards and Evaluation (NPSSE) gives the school Head the responsibility to inspect teachers' performance, check their attendance, and provide them feedback (NUEPA 2015). Each year an annual performance report is prepared by the principals, including a self-appraisal section filled up by the teachers and endorsed by their superiors. Besides, the appraisals are conducted by block-level officers and panel inspection teams (Rajput & Walia, 1998). The World Bank Scheme, i.e., Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (Education for All) requires monitoring teachers' performance filled up by Cluster Resource Centre (CRC) or Block Resource Centre (CRC).

3) Teacher Appraisal in Israel

Throughout their career, Israeli Teachers are assessed several times. The evaluation or appraisal covers topics like teacher-pupil relations and command in the taught subject

matter. The assessment tool has been developed according to international examples and standards. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Israel is the only country that uses national standards of teaching for the purpose of promotion (OECD, 2013). In their first year, for the purpose of granting a teaching license, the school principal initiates a formal assessment procedure. After granting the teaching license, the principal leads a similar procedure for a tenure track. Within the next two years, the principal observes the teacher's lessons three times, and they meet for a discussion after each visit. Once the three years get completed, teacher performance is evaluated for purposes of professional development and promotion (Ministry of Education, 2019), and this formative evaluation is carried out every third year by the school's principal or the preschool teacher's inspector. The assessment is based on the National Authority for Assessment scheme with four dimensions the teacher and principals are asked to focus their attention. They discuss and agree on what are the teacher's strengths and what may be the (at least) one aspect, which requires improvement. These formative procedure outcomes do not serve any formal administrative goal (e.g., dismissal) and promotions are mainly based on the required number of years from the last promotion.

4) Teacher Appraisal in Romania

As an important component, Teacher appraisal or evaluation is considered in assuring the quality of teaching processes (Bădescu *et al.*, 2018; Ghiatau, 2016). The Romanian educational system has focused its efforts on standardization. School administrators develop criteria and tools for a unitary objective and transparent evaluation scheme. Based on the American model of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards-NBPTS (Gliga, 2002), the new Romanian tools are geared to help administrators with decisions on career entry, career promotion, and salary payments. Once a year, school principals are asked to observe their staff members and evaluate teaching activities, classroom management, and pupils' learning outcomes. They are also asked to consider the teacher's career management, personal development, and institutional development. The performance is evaluated according to the teacher's acquaintance and willingness to assist their pupils, their command of the taught subject matter and its didactic methods, promoting values, and being an active member of the community. The current Romanian teacher evaluation system is considered highly formalized, compared with other national education systems (Ghiatau, 2016; Kitchen *et al.*, 2017).

Hence, the research questions are:

1. What are the informal values principals maintain regarding the personal and the professional traits that they believe teachers should have or not have?
2. To what extent, do these preferred traits follow the general requirements and realities in school management or shaped by cultural norms?

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study explores what are the attitudes school principals hold about the positive and negative professional traits teachers should have (or not). More specifically, are these

attitudes evolving from the professional and sociological nature of the school. If so, we may expect that all the principals, regardless of the type of school, nationality, or other variables, would agree on which are the desired traits. This study also explores the possible influence of the national culture on the principals' attitudes. Four countries from the continents of Africa (Botswana), Asia (India and Israel), and Europe (Romania) were selected. Although conveniently sampled, based on the national identity of the researchers, the unique characteristic of each nation almost simulates a random sampling: The languages (Setswana, English, Hebrew, and Romanian) and population size (2.2M', 1.4 B', 9 M' and 19M') for Botswana, India, Israel, and Romania, respectively. The demographics of the countries include varied religions (Christian Protestants, Mostly Jewish, Mostly Hindu and Christian orthodox, respectively) and the like. Comparing the principals' attitudes by their nationality, especially when certain values of those who live and work in one nation differ significantly from their colleagues in other nations, may point to the impact of their own culture. Researchers have taken two general cautions about the interpretations of the findings (Fletcher & Perry, 2001): first, the need to avoid overgeneralization when only a few studies have conducted in each country; second, the need to be mindful that studies may be time-sensitive when countries undergo rapid political and economic changes.

A. Sampling

The school principals were sampled non-randomly. The convenient sampling thus selected was on the basis of availability and on referral. The sample comprises of school principals pooled as 26.9 % (N=36) from Botswana; 25.4% (34) from India; 23.1% (31) from Israel and 24.6% (33) from Romania. There were 40.2% male principals and 59.8 % female principals in overall sample comprising from Botswana (male= 16.7%; female =83.3); India (male=58.8%; female= 41.2); Israel (male= 44.8 %; female= 55.2%); and Romania (male= 42.4; female= 57.6). The sample revealed the educational qualification of Principals varying in School level (16.4 %); Bachelor's degree (51.5 %); Master's degree (28.7%); and PhD (3.7%). The experience as school principal ranges from 1 to 27 years with an average of 6.88 years (Botswana= 5.58 years; India= 6.65 years; Israel= 6.26 years; and Romania= 9.12 years). All the principals selected were from Government aided or public schools from primary, secondary, and senior secondary levels.

B. Research Tool

Since the information we sought was relatively limited and school principals were interviewed telephonically or met face-to-face. The interview had three sections: First, an opening explanation of the study and collecting some demographic data. Second, based on Yariv's (2009) methodology, the principals were asked what two traits they most appreciate in their teachers and what were the two least preferred ones. The concluding section was more specific for the identification of individual teachers' levels of performance as average, above average, and below average (not included here). Keeping into consideration of multi-ethnicity of the countries and multi-linguistic groups within the country, the interview schedule had been kept, mainly, in communication language within each country (English in

Botswana and India; Hebrew in Israel; Romanian in Romania). The school principals were interviewed over the telephone or in face-to-face meetings.

C. Procedure

Leading a comparative study entailed to follow with several guidelines (Brislin 1993; Maxwell 1996) that determine the proper item formation and concept equivalence across languages, as suggested by Dean *et al.* (2005). To ensure proper validity and reliability in each stage of the study – developing the tool, collecting responses, and categorizing the data were translated forward to and backward to the native tongue. After developing the research tool, the principals were approached either by a telephone (Romania) or face to face (India, Israel, Botswana) for a short 20-30-minute interview. The second section with its open-ended questions required some reflections that took some effort and time.

D. Data Analysis

The first step towards this was to assign codes to various categories and sort the Principals' selection of traits to appreciate and preferred least among teachers into various groups having similar meanings. Using Yariv's (2009) methodology, including the research tool and content analysis, has led us to adopt the eight categories (positive and negative) he found. Efforts and time were needed to overcome the linguistic and cultural obstacles in coding their responses. In a few cases using a dictionary to translate words to English appeared inaccurate and missed the original meaning. To reach an agreed reliable translation the researchers spent time explaining to each other what the cultural roots and organizational norms and realities behind certain phrases are. In a few cases, we stumbled upon words that contained different meanings during the interpretation of the narratives. For example, "modesty" in India was found as an appreciable value, but negative criteria in Israel and Romania. While proceeding with that procedure it became clear that terms used by Yariv (2009) need to be elaborated to accommodate synonym words that carry other nuances and clarify the category itself. For example, to the category 'high motivation' we added 'enthusiasm', 'commitment', 'ambitiousness', 'dedication' and 'persistence'. Since each response, not only, carried an individual expression of personal attitude, but also a linguistic and cultural weight, the researchers decided to code together and reach a full consensus (inter-rater agreement) regarding each response. The tedious route hence taken helped to preserve a high level of inter judges reliability and confirms content validity. In this research, the multi-method employed the axial coding that had managed to cove the lions' share of the participants' responses. However, to accommodate the few words that could not be categorized, we applied a grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) that helped to capture some cultural-linguistic nuances. A couple of words that could not be fit into eight categories of appreciated or least preferred complying with the axial coding were not included in the overall sample of data.

To find out whether the criteria stated by principals had any association with the nationality, non-parametric statistics (Chi-square tests) have been computed as test of independence between two categorical variables (criteria and

nationality). Descriptive statistics employed frequencies for criteria preference for each enlisted eight positive and negative criteria as perceived by principals for effective and ineffective teachers are summarized against each nation. For any significant association, post hoc analysis had been done to find out the association among the cell frequencies.

III. RESULTS

The association of nationality with the principal preference of criteria for effective and ineffective teachers has been analyzed separately. A spread of 32 cells for the principal criteria for effective teachers (refer to Table II) gives a two-way panoramic view.

TABLE II: NATIONALITY DETERMINING PRINCIPAL'S CRITERIA OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER

Principal's criteria	Nations under study				
	Botswana	India	Romania	Israel	Average
Professionalism	4.3%	16.4%	24.2%	12.9%	14.4%
High motivation, initiative, enthusiasm	34.8%	6.0%	21.2%	25.8%	22.0%
Honesty, integrity, dependability, loyalty	8.7%	3.0%	13.6%	8.1%	8.3%
Sensitivity and love for children	13.0%	13.4%	10.6%	19.4%	14.0%
Collegiality, good relations with staff	18.8%	14.9%	3.0%	1.6%	9.8%
Responsibility, accountability	17.4%	34.3%	16.7%	17.7%	21.6%
Wisdom, knowledge	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	1.1%
Willing to change and learn new methods, creativity	1.4%	10.4%	9.1%	14.5%	8.7%
Pearson Chi-Square			58.69		
df			21		
Asymptotic Significance (2-sided), p			0.000*		

*0.05 level of significance.

The two most preferred traits are high motivation and accountability. As it turns out, school principals are less impressed by traits like professionalism or honesty. The Pearson Chi-square coefficient, $\chi^2(21) = 58.69$; $p=0.00$, tells the statistically significant association between nationality and principal criteria at a 0.05 level of significance.

TABLE III: PHI AND CRAMMER'S V FOR NATIONALITY DETERMINING PRINCIPAL'S CRITERIA OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER

Statistics	Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Phi	0.471	0.000
Nominal Cramer's V	0.272	0.000

*0.05 level of significance.

The Phi and Crammer's V coefficient may be the next level of confirmation of the test of independence analysed through the statistical package. While Phi coefficient in Table III shows a strong positive association between nationality and Principal Criteria, Cramer's $V \geq 0.25$; $k=4$ (k is the minimum number of categories) reveals the large association, i.e., Principal criteria may be different with its nationality.

The results of Chi-square test of independence between nationality and principal criteria for effective teachers needs further elaboration. The Post hoc tests for 32 cells (8 rows X 4 columns) may be explained by Agresti (2007) as a cell-by-cell comparison of observed and estimated expected

frequencies for a better understanding of the nature of the evidence. For country wise type I error may be controlled by dividing the total risk (0.05 level of significance) with a total number of chi-square tests performed as $1/32 (0.05) = 0.00$ after rounding off to double decimal points. The adjusted residual in Tables IV and VII contribute to a standardized score that is the difference between observed and expected outcomes divided by the square root of the expected counts.

TABLE IV: POST HOC CHI-SQUARE TEST FOR NATIONALITY DETERMINING PRINCIPAL'S CRITERIA OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER

Principal's criteria	statistics	Nations under study			
		Botswana	India	Romania	Israel
Professionalism	Adjusted Residual (AR)	-2.8	.5	2.6	-.4
	χ^2	7.84	0.25	6.76	0.16
	p- value	0.01	0.62	0.01	0.69
High motivation, initiative, enthusiasm	AR	3.0	-3.7	-.2	.8
	χ^2	9.00	13.69	0.04	0.64
	p- value	0.00*	0.00*	0.84	0.42
Honesty, integrity, dependability, loyalty	AR	.1	-1.8	1.8	-.1
	χ^2	0.01	3.24	3.24	0.01
	p- value	0.92	0.07	0.07	0.92
Sensitivity and love for children	AR	-.3	-.2	-.9	1.4
	χ^2	0.09	0.04	0.81	1.96
	p- value	0.76	0.84	0.37	0.16
Collegiality, good relations with staff	AR	2.9	1.6	-2.1	-2.5
	χ^2	8.41	2.56	4.41	6.25
	p- value	0.00*	0.11	0.04	0.01
Responsibility, accountability	AR	-1.0	2.9	-1.1	-.8
	χ^2	1.00	8.41	1.21	0.64
	p- value	0.32	0.00*	0.27	0.42
Wisdom, knowledge	AR	.3	.3	.3	-1.0
	χ^2	0.09	0.09	0.09	1.00
	p- value	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.32
Willing to change and learn new methods, creativity	AR	-2.5	.6	.1	1.9
	χ^2	6.25	0.36	0.01	3.61
	p- value	0.01	0.55	0.92	0.06

* $p \leq 0.00$.

Rows= $i_{1, \dots, 8}$ =Criteria.

Column= $j_{1, 2, 3, 4}$ =nationality.

Null Hypothesis= $H_0 = p_{ij}$.

For the interpretation of the results, Tables II and IV require to be read together. The null hypotheses H_0 : $p_{2.1}$ (row=2; column= 1) and H_0 : $p_{2.2}$ (row=2; column= 2) stand not accepted for nationality and remain independent from a principal preference for the criteria for teacher evaluation. Botswanan principals rate motivation as a very important positive trait of teachers ($AR=3.0$, $\chi^2=9.00$, $p=0.00$), more than principals from the other countries. Meanwhile, significantly fewer Indian principals mentioned motivation as a positive teacher trait ($AR=-3.7$, $\chi^2=13.69$, $p=0.00$). Principals from Romania find collegiality and wisdom not so important traits. Collegiality is appreciated as a positive trait of teachers mostly by Botswanan principals ($AR=2.9$, $\chi^2=8.41$, $p=0.00$); responsibility is significantly more frequently chosen as desirable trait of teachers by Indian principals ($AR=2.9$, $\chi^2=8.41$, $p=0.00$). A more interesting outcome of crosstab analysis and post-hoc chi-square tests reveals that the principal has the least preference for teachers' wisdom in every nation.

The multi-sample of principals from four nations under study was subjected to the question regarding, what may be the traits they do not like to see in a teacher or that make a teacher ineffective? The narratives were coded (as i = Criteria

=11, ..., 18) and placed in matching dimensions for ineffective teachers. The data is subjected to frequency count (as a percentage) in crosstab and subsequently, the overall chi-square is computed (refer to Table V).

TABLE V: NATIONALITY DETERMINING PRINCIPAL CRITERIA OF AN INEFFECTIVE TEACHER

Principal's criteria	Nations under study				
	Botswana	India	Romania	Israel	Average
Lack of professionalism	9.1%	26.5%	21.0%	15.5%	18.5%
Low motivation, lack of initiative and enthusiasm	40.0%	14.7%	27.4%	15.5%	23.9%
Dishonesty, lack of dependability, disloyalty	9.1%	0.0%	6.5%	25.9%	9.9%
Lack of sensitivity, aggressiveness, disrespect for children	10.9%	20.6%	9.7%	12.1%	13.6%
Lack of collegiality, bad relations with staff	10.9%	11.8%	21.0%	10.3%	13.6%
Lack of responsibility, accountability	20.0%	11.8%	8.1%	8.6%	11.9%
Lack of wisdom, lack of values and culture	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	3.4%	1.6%
Rigidity, lack of willingness to change and learn new methods	0.0%	11.8%	6.5%	8.6%	7.0%
Pearson Chi-Square			59.660		
df			21		
Asymptotic			0.000		
Significance (2-sided)					

*0.05 level of significance.

The two least preferred traits are the poorly motivated teachers and those who lack professional values and conduct. The overall Pearson Chi-square coefficient, $\chi^2(21) = 59.66$; $p < 0.05$, reveals the statistically significant association between nationality and principal criteria at 0.05 level of significance. The significant association may be further be substantiated with Phi and Crammer's V coefficient in Table VI.

TABLE VI: PHI AND CRAMMER'S V FOR PRINCIPAL CRITERIA OF AN INEFFECTIVE TEACHER

Statistics	Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Phi	0.495	0.000
Nominal Cramer's V	0.286	0.000

The principal preference for the criteria that should not have a teacher, further analyses Phi coefficient (Table VI) showing a strong positive association between nationality and Principal Criteria. Similarly, Cramer's $V \geq 0.25$; $k=4$ (k is the minimum number of categories) shows the large association, i.e., Principal criteria may be different with its nationality.

The overall Chi-square coefficient (χ^2) needs cell-to-cell comparison of association and test of independence (Table VII) for ineffective teachers or the traits that are not preferred by principals to have in teachers.

It is interesting to note that principals in Botswana have shown high ($AR=3.2$; $\chi^2= 10.24$; $p= 0.00$) disapproval for poor motivation. While Indian principals do not consider dishonesty ($AR=-3.2$; $\chi^2=10.24$; $p= 0.00$) as "not preferred trait", Israeli principals highly disapprove that trait ($AR=4.7$; $\chi^2= 22.09$; $p=0.00$). Principals, in general, do not find a lack of wisdom, lack of values, and culture as necessarily traits of an ineffective teacher. Concerning most of the negative traits, no significant cultural differences were found. The chi-square

tests do not indicate significant differences among the Romanian principals' preferences for positive and negative traits, compared with the responses of principals from the other countries.

TABLE VII: POST HOC CHI-SQUARE TEST FOR NATIONALITY
DETERMINING PRINCIPAL'S CRITERIA OF AN INEFFECTIVE TEACHER

Principal's criteria	Statistics	Nation under study			
		Botswana	India	Romania	Israel
Lack of professionalism	Adjusted Residual (AR)	-2.0	2.0	.6	-.7
	χ^2	4.00	4.00	0.36	0.49
	p- value	0.05	0.05	0.55	0.48
Low motivation,	AR	3.2	-2.1	.8	-1.7
lack of initiative	χ^2	10.24	4.41	0.64	2.89
and enthusiasm	p- value	0.00*	0.04	0.42	0.09
Dishonesty, lack	AR	-.2	-3.2	-1.0	4.7
of dependability,	χ^2	0.04	10.24	1.00	22.09
disloyalty	p- value	0.84	0.00*	0.32	0.00*
Lack of	AR	-.7	2.0	-1.0	-.4
sensitivity,	χ^2	0.49	4.00	1.00	0.16
aggressiveness,					
disrespect for	p- value	0.48	0.05	0.32	0.69
children	AR	-.7	-.5	2.0	-.8
Lack of	χ^2	0.49	0.25	4.00	0.64
collegiality, bad					
relations with	p- value	0.48	0.62	0.05	0.42
staff	AR	2.1	-.1	-1.1	-.9
Lack of	χ^2	4.41	0.01	1.21	0.81
responsibility,	p- value	0.04	0.92	0.27	0.37
accountability	AR	-1.1	1.0	-1.2	1.2
Lack of wisdom,	χ^2	1.21	1.00	1.44	1.44
lack of values	p- value	0.27	0.32	0.23	0.23
and culture	AR	-2.3	1.8	-.2	.6
Rigidity, lack of	χ^2	5.29	3.24	0.04	0.36
willingness to					
change and learn	p- value	0.02	0.07	0.84	0.55
new methods					

*p \leq 0.00.

Rows= i₁, ..., i₁₈= Criteria.

Column=j₁, 2, 3, 4=nationality.

Null Hypothesis= H₀=p_{ij}.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Informal Teacher Evaluation

School principals in many countries (Close *et al.*, 2019), including the four nations being surveyed here, use formal constructed quantitative tools. Being accustomed to the formal terminology of assessment (e.g., level of education) (McDonald *et al.*, 2019), our principals faced difficulties to reflect on which teachers' traits they consider desirable or undesirable, how each trait helps them, or set obstacles in managing the school. As in earlier studies, the principals tended to use formal aspects, such as level of education, professional development, retention, and the like (McDonald, DiBiase & Triplett, 2019). These criteria are commonly used during the process of hiring teachers (Liu *et al.*, 2016).

Values have been defined by Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) as "broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others, feelings with an arrow to it: a plus and minus side" (p. 8). For the sake of analysis, the positive side resembles the contribution of a certain trait to the school, while the negative ones are perceived as potentially damaging the organization's climate and achievements. When both sides of a certain value are equally ranked, it probably fully represents its essence and importance. For example, Botswanan principals agreed that teachers should be highly motivated and show no signs of laziness (40% and 34%, respectively). When the positive and negative traits are not equally ranked, it may carry a different message. For example, only 3 percent of the Romanian principals hailed collegial conduct, while 21 percent said the lack of collegiality is a major source of concern. Collegiality influences the relationships between the teachers and the social climate in the school, in which the effects may or may not be manifested. The role of collegiality and accountability is emphasized more in low power distance and feminine cultures like in Norway, for example (see Mausethagen *et al.*, 2019), which is not the case in Romania, has a very high score of 90 in power distance and a medium score of 42 in Masculine dimension (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010). In the Romanian context, collegiality seems to be more a background facilitating factor, necessary but not sufficient for teacher effectiveness. This may be the reason why the Romanian Principals do not mention collegiality as the desired trait of effective teachers but mention the lack of collegiality as the undesirable teacher trait.

B. The Traits Principals Appreciate (or Not)

The respondent answers can be analysed along two dimensions, i.e., professional and cultural. In the first dimension, the principals' attitudes are taken beyond their national affiliation. For that sake, all the 132 questionnaires are combined to search the respondents' general preferences (see Table VIII).

Some traits, like motivation, are more favored than others (e.g., "wisdom"). As it turns out, with small nuances between the negative and positive traits' ranking, the overall picture depicts three clusters: The most valued group are the engaged and motivated teachers, which confirm previous research results on the importance of motivation in obtaining professional performance within teaching career (Yariv, 2009; West, 2018). A second favored group of teachers is those who present good (or poor) interpersonal skills. The third and least valued group refers to teachers with good (or poor) capabilities to learn new materials and develop their professional skills.

TABLE VIII: RANKING AN AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLED PRINCIPAL POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE VALUES

Positive values			Negative values		
	Average percent	Ranking		Average percent	ranking
Motivation	22.0	1	Low motivation	23.9	1
Responsibility	21.52	2	Lack of professionalism	11.9	2
Professionalism	14.4	3	Not collegial	18.5	3
Sensitivity	14.0	4	Insensitiveness	13.6	4
Collegiality	9.57	5	Irresponsibility	13.6	5
Willing to change	8.3	6	Dishonesty	9.9	6
Honesty	8.7	7	Stiffness	7.0	7
Wisdom	1.1	8	Stupid	1.6	8

1) Teachers Who 'Come to Work'

School principals appreciate the hard-working teachers and condemned staff members who lack initiation and enthusiasm. The values ranked second and third refer to professional competencies and responsibility that help them bring about the expected results. High or low motivation may provide direct benefits or damages. For example, when teachers arrive on time, the principal is confident that he or she will not have to search for a replacement every morning. Hard-working teachers enable principals to achieve their goals and the good example transmits to other staff members the importance of dedication and engagement. As a mirror image, the less enthusiastic and committed teachers represent in the principals' eyes, a threat to the organization. Not only do they neglect their duties, but their low motivation provides the wrong model to the pupils and staff. These findings match several earlier studies. For example, Israeli elementary school principals mostly appreciated their motivated and caring teachers (Yariv, 2009). School leaders in Belize, according to Ingle, Thompson, and Abela's (2018), preferred highly motivated and compassionate teachers who have a good command of subject matter knowledge and good teaching skills. Motivated teachers are also sought among Indian principals, who face the common problem of lack of accountability and poor motivation (Ramachandran *et al.*, 2006). Local administrators are caught in the peculiar trajectory taken by the education system with the declining standards of public schools. Lack of accountability, as exemplified by teachers' absenteeism and low accountability is perceived as a major problem that damages the learning achievements of children (Kremer *et al.*, 2005; Ramachandran *et al.*, 2006; Majumdar, 2001).

2) Well-mannered Workers

Principals appreciate interpersonal skills and traits like honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness. These attitudes help create a warm collegial climate and good relations that may save the aggravation of interpersonal conflicts among staff members. Such relations facilitate the professional development of teaching staff (Lane, 2020). Principals are especially concerned about insensitive and aggressive teachers who may harm pupils and enrage their parents. Further, aggressive and oppositional tendencies may drive an embittered or power-seeking teacher to criticize the principal and raise protests among staff members. Yariv (2004) found that one-fifth of the teachers identified by their principals as "challenging" did not accept their authority and criticized them. Rivalry against the principal's authority was strongly correlated with poor collegial behavior, and with arrogant behavior. Several Romanian principals nominated infatuation, unrealistic high self-esteem, knowledge, and exploitation of laws in their interest, duplicitous character as negative traits of low performance teachers.

3) Capabilities to Learn and Develop

The lowest ranked traits, positively and negatively, are wisdom and willingness to change. Teachers work in a dynamic professional environment that requires them to learn new curriculum and procedures. Conservative or burnout teachers may set an obstacle to the principal's efforts to modernize the school. These traits are also ranked last in Yariv's (2009) study. Ingle, Thompson, and Abela (2018)

found that Belizean school principals considered that intelligence and ability for knowledge are potentially negative characteristics of teachers unless coupled with other characteristics such as strong teaching skills, motivation, caring, or content knowledge, university training/credentialing. It appears that the old image of teachers as wise and educated persons in the community (Lortie, 1975) no longer exists.

C. Cultural and National Differences

In the second dimension, the principals' responses are examined according to their national and cultural backgrounds. Comparing the same trait in each of the four countries reveal significant differences. For example, the frequencies within the positive trait of professionalism are 4.3%, 16.4%, 24.2%, and 12.9%. Yet, due to the small samples this and most of the other comparisons were found statistically insignificant (Table 3 and 6). Probably national culture plays role in shaping the principals' attitudes, but more research in larger samples is needed.

How can we explain the meaning of cultural differences? Using Hofstede 6 D' taxonomy provides some clues. As shown in Table IV, we found many significant differences between national samples, regarding positive traits of an effective teacher, in motivation, collegiality, and responsibility. Fewer significant differences were found in negative traits of ineffective teachers – in low motivation and dishonesty (see Table VII).

Collegiality was more appreciated as a positive trait of efficient teachers by Botswanan principals. Even if the cross-cultural studies (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010) do not include national cultures index values for Botswana, the mean of collegiality, understood as teamwork, cooperation, and respectfulness may suggest a collectivistic and high distance power culture, signalled also by other studies on a principal-teacher relationship in Botswana and Ethiopia (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006; Gedifew, 2014). However, according to Cousins (2019), even in countries with high individualistic and masculine scores, and low distance power, like Great Britain, collegiality (the ability to work as a team, desire for collaboration, and communal interaction between colleagues) is valued by teachers and school principals, as an important trait, but manifested regardless of gender, ethnicity, or other aspects of social identity. In a study conducted in Australia, Gore and Rosser (2020) showed that teachers' collegiality, collaboration, and teamwork flattens power hierarchies within schools.

We found a significant difference regarding the role of motivation, as a characteristic of effective teachers. Since we have not comparative cultural data, it is not clear whether these attitudes stem from historical developments, organizational realities, and economic constraints? Do they reflect local realities? The quest for motivated teachers stems from a shortage of classes, bigger class sizes, and a shortage of teachers in Botswana (Orabile, 2020). This results in hiring temporary high-school graduates who lack any professional preparation. Having any commitment and low motivation drives, these inexperienced teachers leave their jobs as soon as they face difficulties.

What may motivate teachers to teach can be dependent on the various cultural values. The low focus of Indian principals

on the positive role of motivation can be explained the as an expression of the relatively low value of individualism (48) and uncertainty avoidance (40) and by an average score in the masculine dimension (56). Within collectivist cultures will be actualized the interest of honour of the in-group, which may ask self-effacement from many of the in-group members; harmony, and consensus are more attractive goals than individual self-actualization. Modesty, often positively appreciated by Indian principals from this sample, is congruent with a climate oriented toward favouring the in-group. In the Romanian sample, modesty was nominated as a negative trait, respectively, lack of the aspirations to achieve high professional performance (*to settle for less, the fact of losing she's ideals, of not pursuing high performance, or of forgetting why she became a teacher*). The low level of uncertainty avoidance can also explain the significantly lower focus on work motivation, work being seen as a necessity, but not as a goal itself (Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov 2010, p. 344). Masculine and low uncertainty avoidance cultures are oriented more toward achievement and self-esteem, while high uncertainty avoidance and feminine cultures are motivated by security and belongingness (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p. 232). However, the fact that the study was conducted in educational institutions, where most of the employees are women, explains why the tendency towards professional ambitiousness and achievement is lower, even in a mainly masculine culture, because men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success, whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p. 140).

Responsibility was more frequently mentioned by Indian principals, which confirms the type of masculine of Indian culture, with a score of 56 on MAS index (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010). They focused more on the positive role of responsibility and less on the positive role of motivation to perform individually than principals from the other countries. Responsibility included Indian principals' responses like discipline, punctuality, regularity, and dedication to teaching. Our data are congruent with the low score of Indian culture on uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p. 217). According to Hofstede's theoretical framework, Indian teachers tend to work hard only when needed, for the time is a framework for orientation, and rules should be no more than strictly necessary.

Another significant difference is teachers' negative aspects of dishonesty. Fewer principals from India (with low indulgence and UAI, and high-power distance culture), and many principals than expected from Israel (with high UAI and low power distance culture) were concerned about the dishonesty of inefficient teachers. The high score in UAI of Israel could explain the prevailing need for safety and for security, the need to make sure they are not betrayed. We wonder why Romanian principals (within a country with a score of 90 in UAI) had not similar concerns as Israeli principals about the lack of honesty. The lower score of Indian samples in apprehending dishonesty can be an expression of a passive resistance strategy to cope with authority within a culture with a high level of power distance where is emphasized obedience to the authority (Jawas, 2017). The high score in power distance of India and other Asian cultures could explain a surface polite relationship with

the authorities and the tolerance for dishonesty as a sign of passive resistance among school staff (Jawas, 2017). Moreover, to compensate for the low level of people's happiness relied on the lack of indulgence associated with the strong hierarchical type of society (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010), it seems that Indian principals are less bothered by the dishonesty of the teachers than principals from other countries. However, our outcomes do not evidence the same tolerance toward dishonesty within the Romanian sample, also with a low level of happiness related to very high-power distance and low indulgence scores (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010). The present results suggest the role of improving collegial relationships, collaborative leadership to reduce power distance within the educational systems and facilitate a supportive relationship between principals and teachers, and positive changes in the quality of teaching.

This exploratory study is limited by the small sample of principals in each country. A larger-scale sample may provide more concreteness in results and insights into principals' cultural and personal considerations. For example, a careful analysis is needed to explore the 'criteria' in primary versus secondary schools; Do principals have different expectations from different subject specialism make a difference (mathematics teacher expectations versus English teachers)? More information is also needed regarding the relationship between principals' attitudes and hiring practices (Ingle *et al.*, 2018). Such information may later serve as a lens to understand aspects of national cultures and organizational characteristics, including hiring and motivating practices. Also, more efforts are needed to examine to what extent the principal's own values are involved in formal human resource activities such as hiring and promoting their workers.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they do not have any conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Agresti, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley.
https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4394657/mod_resource/content/3/introduction_to_categorical_data_analysis_agresti2007.pdf. (accessed 10 July 2019).
- Baumeister, R., & Vohs, K. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*. SAGE Publications, Inc. (p. 67).
- Bădescu G., Negru-Subțirică, O., Angi, D., & Ivan, C. (2018). Profesor în România. Cine, de ce, în ce fel contribuie la educația elevilor în școlile românești? [Teacher in Romania. Who, why and how teach the students in Romanian schools], Perspective, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Foundation, București.
- Begley, P. (2004). Understanding evaluation processes: exploring the linkage between motivation and action. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32(2), 4-17.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1186522.pdf>.
- Berings, D., de Fruyt, F., & Bouwen, R. (2004). Work, values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(2): 349-364. DOI:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00101-6.
- Boies, K., & Fiset, J. (2019). I do as I think: Exploring the alignment of Principal Cognitions and Behaviors and Its Effects on Teacher Outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(2), 225-252.
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Segall, M.H., & Dasen, P.R. (2002). *Cross-Cultural Psychology, Research and Applications* (2nd ed.) UK: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511974274> (accessed 12 July 2019).

- Branson, C.M. (2005). Exploring the concept of values-led principalship. *Leading & Managing*, 11 (1), 14-31. <https://researchbank.acu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=theses>.
- Branson, C.M., Baig, S., & Begum, A. (2015). Personal values of principals and their manifestation in student behaviour: A district-level study in Pakistan. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(1), 107–128. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22555/joed.v6i1.2288>.
- Brislin, R. (1993). *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*. San Diego, CA, US: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cleveland, J. N., & Murphy, K. R. (1992). Analyzing performance appraisal as goal-directed behavior. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 10(2), 121-185.
- Close, K., Amerin-Beardsley, A., & Collins, C. (October 2019). Mapping America's teacher evaluation plans under ESSA. *Kappan*, 101 (2): 22-26. <https://kappanonline.org/mapping-teacher-evaluation-plans-essa-close-amrein-beardsley-collins/>.
- Cousins, T.A. (2019). Collegiality vs role models: gendered discourses and the 'glass escalator' in English primary schools. *Early Years*, 40(1), 37-51. DOI: 10.1080/09575146.2019.1619671.
- De Albuquerque Moreira, A.M., & Rocha, M.Z.B. (2018). To Understand the "Brazilian Way" of School Management: How National Culture Influences the Organizational Culture and School Leadership. *Education Science*, 8 (88), 2-14.
- Dean, E., Caspar, R., McAvinchey, G., Reed, L., & Quiroz, R. (2005). Developing a low-cost technique for parallel cross-cultural instrument development: *The Question Appraisal System (QAS-04)*, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 10 (3): 227-241. DOI: 10.1080/13645570701401032.
- Derrington, M.L. & Campbell, J.W. (2018). High-stakes teacher evaluation policy: US principals' perspectives and variations in practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(3), 246-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1421164>.
- Dimmock, C. & Walker, A. (1999). A cross-cultural approach to the study of educational leadership: An emerging framework. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(4), 321-48.
- Dimmock, C. & Walker, A. (2002). School leadership in context: Societal and organisational cultures. In: Bush T and Bell L (eds) *The Principles and Practice of Educational Management Series: Educational Management, Research and Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, pp. 70–85.
- Engel, M. (2013). Problematic preferences? A mixed method examination of principals' preferences for teacher characteristics in Chicago. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(1), 52-91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12451025>.
- Fletcher, C. & Perry, E.L. (2001). Performance appraisal and feedback: A consideration of national culture and a review of contemporary research and future trends. In N.D. Anderson et al. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 127-144). London: Sage.
- Gedifew, M.T. (2014). Perceptions about instructional leadership: The perspectives of a principal and teachers of Birakat Primary School in focus. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(16), 542-550. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2014.1841>.
- Ghiatau, R.M. (2016). Evaluarea profesorilor. Evoluții și provocări [Teachers evaluation. Trends and challenges], Institutul European, Iași, Romania.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. London: Aldine Transaction.
- Gliga, L. (2002). Standarde profesionale pentru cariera didactica (Professional standards for teaching career), Romanian Education and Research Ministry, Bucharest.
- Gore, J. & Rosser, B. (2020). Beyond content-focused professional development: powerful professional learning through genuine learning communities across grades and subjects. *Professional Development in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1725904>.
- Harris, D.N., Rutledge, S.A., Ingle, W.K. & Thompson, C.T. (2010). Mix and match: what principals look for when hiring teachers and what this means for teacher quality policies. *Education Finance and Policy*, 5(2), 228-246. DOI: 10.1162/edfp.2010.5.2.5205.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (Vol. 2). New York: McGraw-hill.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ingle, K., Thompson, C.T and Abila, Z.W. (2018). An exploration of preferred teacher characteristics and hiring tools in Belize. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(4), 414-428.
- Jacob, B. & Lefgren, L. (2008). Can principals identify effective teachers? Evidence on subjective performance evaluation in education. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 26, 101-136. DOI: 10.1086/52297.
- Jacob, B.A. & Walsh, E. (2011). What's in a rating? *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3), 434-448.
- Javidan, M., House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Hanges, P. J., & De Luque, M.S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: a comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. *Journal of international business studies*, 37(6), 897-914.
- Jawas, U. (2017). The influence of socio-cultural factors on leadership practices for instructional improvement in Indonesian schools, *School Leadership & Management*, 500-519. DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2017.1366440.
- Kersten, T.A. & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher evaluation: principals' insights and suggestions for improvement. *Planning and Changing*, 36(1&2), 47–67.
- Kitchen, H., Fordham, E., Henderson, K., Looney, A. & Maghnouj, S. (2017). Studii OCDE privind evaluarea și examinarea în domeniul educației. Romania, 2017. (OECD Studies on evaluation and examination in education field. Romania, 2017).
- Kremer, M., Chaudhury, N., Rogers, F., Muralidharan, K., & Hammer, J. (2005). Teacher Absence in India: A Snapshot. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 3(2/3), 658-667. DOI: 10.1162/1542476054473143.
- Lane, J.L. (2020). Maintaining the Frame: Using Frame Analysis to Explain Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1-38. DOI: 10.3102/0002831219848689.
- Larusdottir, S.H. (2014). Educational leadership and market values: A study of school principals in Iceland. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4S), 83–103. DOI: 10.1177/1741143213510499.
- Law, L.Y.S., Walker, A. & Dimmock, C. (2003). The influence of principals' values on their perception and management of school problems. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(5), 498–523. DOI: 10.1108/09578230310489344.
- Liu, S., Liu, C., Stronge, J. & Xu, X. (2016). Teacher characteristics for success in the classroom: Chinese principals' perceptions for hiring decisions. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(1), 107-120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-015-9412-7>.
- Lortie, D.C. (1977). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Majumdar M (2001). Educational opportunities in Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu: Despair and hope. In: A. Vaidyanathan and P. R. Gopinathan Nair (eds.). *Elementary Education in Rural India – A Grassroots View*. Sage Publications. New Delhi, pp. 320-394.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 41. Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McDonald, J.R., DiBiase, W. & Triplett, N. (2019). Principals' Perceptions of GATE Teachers. In *Identifying, Describing, and Developing Teachers Who Are Gifted and Talented*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, pp. 164-174. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5879-8.ch015.
- Miller, P. (2018). 'Culture', 'context', school leadership and entrepreneurialism: Evidence from sixteen countries. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), 76. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8020076>.
- Ministry of Education. (2019). *Teachers Assessment: A guide for school Principals*, Jerusalem. (Hebrew). https://edu.gov.il/sites/Shaar/Teaching-staff/file/Pages/teachers_evaluation.aspx (accessed 2 January 2019).
- Monyatsi, P.P. (2009). A critical analysis of the mechanisms and procedures that facilitate effective teacher appraisal in Botswana schools. *Educational Research and Review*, 4 (4), 183-194.
- Monyatsi, P., Steyn, T., & Kamper, G. (2006). Teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Botswana. *South African journal of education*, 26(3), 427-441. DOI: 10.4314/saje.v26i3.25080.
- Murthy, J.S. (2013). Revision of Education Code for Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan. New Delhi: Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan. <https://dbgyan.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/edu-code-25-04-13.pdf>.
- Onoyase, A. (2018). Principals' Perception of Misconduct among Secondary School Teachers in Delta State: Implications for Counselling Practice. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(5), 150-157.
- Nardon, L., & Steers, R. M. (2009). The culture theory jungle: Divergence and convergence in models of national culture. In R. S. Bhagat & R. M. Steers (Eds.). *Cambridge handbook of culture, organizations, and work* (pp. 3-22). Cambridge University Press.

- Onyango, G. (2017). Collectivism and reporting of organizational wrongdoing in public organizations: the case of county administration in Kenya. *International Review of Sociology*, 27(2), 353-372.
- Steers, R.M., Sanchez-Runde, C.J., and Nardon, L. (2010). *Management across cultures: Challenges and strategies*. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810510>.
- NUEPA (2015). Evaluation for Improvement: School Standards and Evaluation Framework, New Delhi, India: National University of Educational Planning and Administration. [www.http://14.139.60.151/sse/doc/THREE.pdf](http://14.139.60.151/sse/doc/THREE.pdf).
- OECD (2013). *Teachers for the 21st Century: Using Evaluation to Improve Teaching*. OECD Publishing. <http://www.oecd.org/site/eduistp13/TS2013%20Background%20Report.pdf>.
- Orabile, M. (2020). *Rari explains Botswana's education crisis*, Mmegi online. <https://www.mmegi.bw/index.php?aid=84957&dir=2020/march/20> (accessed 11 April 2020).
- Orphanos, S. (2014). What matters to principals when they evaluate teachers? Evidence from Cyprus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(2), 243-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499262>.
- Rahman, S.A. (2006). Attitudes of Malaysian Teachers toward a Performance-Appraisal System. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(12): 3031-3042. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00141.x>.
- Rajput, J.S. & Walia, K. (1998). Assessing teacher effectiveness in India: Overview and critical appraisal. *Prospects*, 28(1), 137-150. DOI: 10.1007/BF02737785.
- Ramachandran, V., Sharma, J., Pal, M., Jain, S. & Shekar, S. (2006). Teacher Motivation in India. Working Papers http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/PolicyStrategy/3888Teacher_motivation_India.pdf (accessed 23 September 2012).
- Reid, D.B. (2019). What information do principals consider when evaluating teachers? *School Leadership & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2019.1576167.
- Roniger, L. & Feige, M. (1993). The Freier culture and the Israeli identity. *Alpayim* (2000), 7, 118-136. (Hebrew).
- Schwartz, S.H. & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116. DOI: 10.1177/0022022195261007.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. & Litchka, P.R. (2018). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of transformational leadership practices and the social ecological model: Universal versus national culture. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(3), 00-00. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2017-0110>.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 27(2), 231-264.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London, Continuum.
- Steinberg, M. P. & Donaldson, M. L. (2016). The new Educational Accountability: Understanding the Landscape of Teacher Evaluation in the Post-NCLB era. *Education Finance and Policy*, 11 (3), 340-359.
- Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (2011). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Nicholas Brealey International.
- Walker, A. & Dimmock, C. (2000). One Size Fits All? Teacher Appraisal in a Chinese Culture. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(2), 155-178. DOI: 10.1023/A:1008106803772.
- West, C., Baker, A., Ehrlich, J.F., Woodcock, S., Bokosmaty, S., Howard, S.J. & Eady, M.J. (2018). Teacher Disposition Scale (TDS): construction and psychometric validation. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(2), 185-200.
- Yair, G. (2011). *The Code of Israeliness: The Ten Commandments of the 21st Century*. Tel Aviv: Keter-Books.
- Yariv, E. (2009). Principals' informal methods for evaluating poor-performing teachers. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 283-298. DOI: 10.1007/s11092-009-9081-3.
- Yariv, E. (2004). Challenging teachers: what difficulties do they pose to their principals. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 32, 165-184.
- Yi, P. & Kim, H.J. (2019). Exploring the relationship between external and internal accountability in education: A cross-country analysis with multi-level structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 65, 1-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2018.12.007.

Sudeshna Lahiri is working with University of Calcutta (India). Previously, she served in Banaras Hindu University (2004-2007). She has been the recipient of Major Research Projects funded by University Grants Commission (India); and ICSSR; team member of Mega research project launched by NIEPA; and academic partner with University of Glasgow to avail project awarded by The Scotland Asia Partnerships Higher Education Research Fund. Her research areas are 'Teacher Performance Appraisal' and 'Environmental Psychology'. She has received Stipendium Hungaricum Fellowship; Fulbright-Nehru Visiting Lecturer Fellowship and International Visitor Leadership Program by US Department of state, USA.

Eliezer Yariv is a senior school psychologist. He earned his BA and MA degrees in psychology at the University of Haifa. He studied for Ph.D. degree at the education department at the University of Leicester UK (2002). Eliezer is currently a senior lecturer at Gordon College of Education, Haifa, and served as a staff member at the psychological service of the municipality of Keriat Motzkin, Israel. Among his books: 'Discipline conversation' (1996), 'Silence in classroom!' (1999), 'I've got eyes in the back of my head: Dealing with behavioral problems in schools' (2010), and 'Classroom management' (edited with D. Gorev, 2018).

Simona Butnaru is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Sciences at Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania. She received her PhD in educational sciences in 2006 at Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi. She has published papers in Educational Studies, the International Journal of Learning, and the Yearbook of Educational Sciences of Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi. She is author of the book *Intercultural Curriculum, Structure and principles of development* (2009) and co-author of *School performance. Individual and contextual determinants in adolescence* (2013), *Intercultural education. Guidelines for trainers* (2001).