Australian and English approaches to expectation damages in contract have diverged. It will be argued that Australian cases such as Commonwealth v Amann Aviation Pty Ltd (1991) 174 CLR 64, Tabcorp Holdings Ltd v Bowen Investments Pty Ltd [2009] HCA 8, (2009) 236 CLR 272 and by Clark v Macourt [2013] HCA 56 have emphasised that the aim of such damages is to compensate for performance. By contrast, English law tends to view expectation damages as being for financial loss. In White Arrow Express Ltd v Lamey’s Distribution Ltd (1996) 15 TLR 69, Lord Bingham MR stated that the Robinson v Harman formulation assumes ‘that the breach has injured [the claimant’s] financial position; if he cannot show that it has, he will recover nominal damages only.’ The Australian approach is preferable. The interest being protected by expectation damages is always the plaintiff’s interest in performance. Sometimes this is measured by looking to the financial losses suffered as a result of the breach of the contract, but as Amann Aviation makes clear, this is simply the best measure of the value of performance in the circumstances, and still represents compensation for the plaintiff’s loss of performance.