

PPTA

NEW ZEALAND POST PRIMARY
TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

TEWEHENGARUA

www.ppta.org.nz

Behaviour, Positive Learning and all that Jazz



A paper presented to the *APBS 12th International Conference on Positive Behaviour Support*, March 11-14, 2015, Boston, Massachusetts

Presented by Martin Henry, Advisory Officer, NZ Post Primary Teachers' Association

Behaviour, Positive Learning and all that Jazz

Introduction

This paper will seek to map the roots of Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) as a portfolio of initiatives in New Zealand schools and to investigate the unique ways it has grown. While PB4L began in 2009 it is important to understand what conditions led to its adoption and what adjustments have been made to fit the framework within the New Zealand context. Behaviour and control are highly contested concepts. PB4L has been successful because it offers practical and tangible assistance to teachers and schools in minimising problematic behaviours. As a framework founded on culture and values it has proved flexible enough to respond to the cultural conditions that are peculiar to New Zealand. These developments are, of course, not without difficulty. The systems that surround PB4L will be examined for the ways in which they have encouraged or inhibited growth and the 'speciesization' of PB4L into a peculiarly New Zealand form. The paper will also acknowledge the difficulties that remain in delivering a framework that is suited to all schools.

The Murky Past

This section will look at the origins of PB4L across the education sector with particular reference to the PPTA story. PB4L has been implemented in New Zealand using a partnership model that has involved teacher unions and professional associations alongside government. This has been critical to the success of the programme. The history of the adoption of PB4L throws up some questions about the most useful ways that government, unions, professional associations, boards and academics can work together. The archaeology of the framework will help explain how PB4L was able to be flexible enough to adapt to incoming programmes and will help set the scene for exploring the problems that still need to be solved.

Tomorrow's Schools Today

Before we start to grapple with the factors that came together to bring PB4L into New Zealand, it is necessary to look at how schools operate here and how the infrastructure supports them. As Court & O'Neill (2011) point out, 'self-managing schools' became the prevalent model in many developed economies in the last decades of the twentieth century. In New Zealand this trend for self-management took the form of the *Tomorrow's Schools* policy reforms that were introduced into schools in 1989. These reforms ushered in parent-elected Boards of Trustees (BOT) as employers of principals and staff, with responsibility for writing policies and for 'governing', at an oversight level, the operation and functioning of schools. As Wylie points out (Wylie & New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2007, p. 1), "few, if any, other national education systems have given the responsibility of the governance of each school to a largely parent-elected body on which parents of current students currently form the majority."

Much has been written about these reforms and they have attracted a fair degree of criticism, but for the purposes of this paper it is the way in which they characterise the school as an individual site with its own autonomy over student behaviour management and school culture and values that is being investigated. In *Vital Connections* Wylie (2012) gives a clear outline of the pitfalls associated with the reforms and what could be done differently. Nevertheless, schools in New Zealand have been operating under *Tomorrow's Schools* for over twenty years. There are over 2000 Boards of Trustees governing schools of all shapes

and sizes. They each have delegated roles and responsibilities over the operation of the school and were a response to “the concentration of decision-making in the hands of a centralised bureaucracy,” (Openshaw, 2014, p. 191). The social democratic roots of the *Tomorrow’s Schools* reforms should not be lost.

Ten years later, in 1998-99 the government undertook a review of the regulations around education. The consultation document (Wylie & New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2007) originally suggested a system of clustering, but this was not taken up, with schools preferring to go it alone. NZCER conducted national surveys over a number of years that provide a fascinating insight into the development of this policy. The surveys show that BoTs have become “a largely taken for granted part of the school world.” This has led to boards being an accepted part of the school landscape. The focus of boards is described as “very much [on] their own school, and its students, staff, and parents; the Government is seen more as a funder and provider of demands” (p. 2).

It is important to recognise that boards have a major role in defining behaviour management in a school. Suspensions and exclusions must be handled by a board or a delegated disciplinary subcommittee; the theory being that the school community sets the boundaries around the behaviour of its own students, guided by the Education Act. While this fitted into the social democratic driver for the reforms, and many would argue the neoliberal concept of ‘steerage’ from the centre (Court & O’Neill, 2011, p. 122) via language and discourse, it also meant each school was interpreting the Education Act in its own way, which led to tensions with parents.

Wylie’s report tells us that suspensions and exclusions were the main reasons for complaints to the Ombudsman in 2005-06 (Wylie & New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2007, p. 48), even though in real terms the number of suspensions and exclusions were declining. She goes on to cite the Office of the Commissioner for Children which stated that most of the complaints were about “the process used in suspensions, stand-downs, expulsions and bullying and the devastating effect this can have on children” (p. 49). This presented conditions both in the political world and in the media which meant a response from the centre was required.

The PPTA Story

The history of behaviour amongst teenagers and the moral panic that swirls around the issue is well documented. The 2000’s were no stranger to this discourse. While severe incidents of behaviour problems peaked and began to decline during this decade, concerns amongst teachers about the unruly mob of students they were teaching continued to rise. PPTA had a number of conference papers brought to their annual conferences about the issue. These papers invariably drew media attention, particularly where teachers were cast as the victims of violent student behaviour. This led to PPTA commissioning *Best Practice Behaviour Management*, a research report from Patty Towl (Towl, P. & New Zealand Post Primary Teachers’ Association, 2007).

The PPTA’s structure involves 24 autonomous geographical ‘regions’, and concern within these regions about the safety of teachers still ran high despite the production of this report. As a result, in 2008 the Hutt Valley and Wellington regions teamed up to commission NZCER to undertake a piece of research into the issue.

The Hutt Valley had been the subject of the Mazengarb Report (Taonga, n.d.) in the 1950s, which documented the unusually high incidence of violent teenage behaviour amongst the bodgies and the widgies, who were early versions of teenage gangs. There was a perception that the Hutt Valley continued to have a high proportion of violent incidences. NZCER had done a small survey in the Hawkes Bay with Primary principals which had thrown up a surprisingly large number of incidents of violent behaviour directed at teachers. Sandie Schagen, who was a visiting academic from the UK working with NZCER, was commissioned to do the work. The Hutt Valley region teamed up with the Wellington region to broaden the population base of the survey and spread the cost. The results proved fascinating.

Of the 756 (out of 1660) teachers who responded ("Incidence of severe behaviour in Hutt Valley and Wellington schools," n.d., p. 2). 45% of men and 37% of women reported encountering severe behaviour at least sometimes. Severe behaviour was experienced by 26% of senior managers, 39% of middle managers, 41% of specialist classroom teachers and 45% of classroom teachers (p.12). This was interpreted by the Hutt Valley as setting up a clear need for action. They in turn wrote a conference paper to take to PPTA's annual conference in 2008: *Disruptive Anti-Social Behaviour in Secondary Schools* (PPTA, 2008), which was followed the next year by *80,15,5 per cent: what we know; what they need* (PPTA, 2009). The growing requests for better behaviour management support were met by the government setting up a behaviour summit, Taumata Whanonga, in 2009.

According to Johansen, Little and Akin-Little (2011), PB4L as a framework of initiatives was agreed to by 150 attendees at the summit, an overwhelming majority. While this might be contested by some of the attendees, the plan that emerged from the Taumata recommended, according to the conference paper from 2009 *80,15,5 per cent* (PPTA 2009, pp. 8–9):

- evidence-based programmes that are shared to stop inefficient and fragmented approaches;
- more money on teacher education to manage the 80%; and
- a review of the RTLB system to give them a greater role

This led to cohesion around the adoption of PB4L. Dr George Sugai, a prominent US academic and one of the founding fathers of Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports (PBIS) ("PBIS.org Home Page," n.d.), had delivered a keynote via web at the Taumata and had underlined the importance of having a system that was not fractured, national in reach and supported by intensive research and evaluation. This made PB4L the obvious choice of coherent interventions. While research has begun on PB4L in New Zealand it is nowhere near intensive.

Power behaves in predictable ways, and the adoption of PB4L was seen as a response to the needs of the 80% of student who do not have conduct disorders and are largely manageable through whole school programmes with the potential to reach higher into the triangle of behavioural intervention to the 5% who need specialist services (PPTA, 2009, p. 8). However, the professional development that was requested to support the implementation of PB4L has been slower to arrive. Initial adoption of PB4L was eyed with distrust by some within the union movement, certainly within PPTA. It was deemed necessary for schools to have buy in from 80% of staff, via an anonymous survey, before

they could enter the programme. While this makes good sense with change initiatives which depend upon a high level of staff acceptance, the buy in also became highly dependent on convincing presentations from Ministry personnel in the early days and had to be taken on trust as well as in response to the evidence. This was hampered by anecdotal feedback that the presentations were poor and the personnel and the resourcing insufficient.

These barriers were partly overcome by partnership at the governance level and by responsiveness at the practical level. This did not mean that all PPTA members were rushing to embrace the new way of working. In fact, with secondary schools much harder to move than primary schools, they lagged behind in their adoption of the programme. By 2013 there were 408 PB4L School-Wide schools. Of these, 51% were primary where the fit seemed to work well, 15% intermediate and 34% secondary schools (Ministry of Education, New Zealand, 2013, p. 16). There was a growth trajectory across all sectors, but it was uneven. This was offset by support from PPTA at a national level for the programme and the development of positive stories and policies to support PB4L. Engagement at the structural level helped and this will be teased out further later in the paper.

Quality Teaching

As a concept, quality teaching had been applied to education throughout the last decade and into this decade and had become associated by some with a discourse that was critical of teachers and tended to 'blame' them for lack of student success. As Snook et al point out in *The Assessment of Teacher Quality* (Snook, O'Neill, Birks, Church, & Rawlins, 2013, p. 9) there was an assumption made in Treasury's policy advice that "variations in teacher quality strongly influence variations in student achievement." This had become common thinking in the Ministry of Education and led to two types of policy initiatives: those focused on lifting student achievement by supporting teachers, such as Te Kotahitanga, and those focused on lifting student achievement by setting targets, such as He Kākano. While both of these programmes are focused on Māori student achievement it is no surprise to those in the profession that it was Te Kotahitanga that was the most successful. This can be seen clearly from both (Bishop et.al., 2014) and from the evaluation (Greenfield, P.M. & Quiroz, B. 2013). However, both operate on the understanding that improving the quality of instruction improves student results.

It is the writer's contention that programmes that sit alongside quality teaching discourse can be more or less useful depending on the actual support they offer teachers. Programmes such as Achievement Retention and Transition (A.R.T.) (National workshops on achievement, retention, and transitions / News / Kia ora - NZ Curriculum Online, n.d.) that ran a number of national and regional workshops followed up by intensive work in targeted schools around lifting student results are less useful than programmes such as Te Kotahitanga and PB4L that provide frameworks of support for teachers. Quality Teaching, as pointed out by Snook et al (2013), has led to a simplistic and narrow response to achievement where teachers need to be 'fixed' in order to get the desired results. Compare this to Early and Shagoury (2010, p. 1049) who expound on the "focus on the identity of teachers as change agents in classrooms, schools and communities."

It is into this shadow land that PB4L emerged as the programme of choice for New Zealand in providing a response to teacher unions' and professional associations' requests for more support in behaviour management. The need for an evidence-based response sat squarely

within quality teaching discourse. The question remained, would this be a programme of the myopically data-focused type or would it be a programme that provided actual support for teachers? The answer has taken time to emerge, and it is still relatively early days with the programme, but there are a range of indicators that suggest the programme is wider than a narrow focus on student academic improvement. The focus of PB4L on a school's culture, similar to Te Kotahitanga, allows an understanding of the context the student and teacher are operating within and makes the work of the programme as much about developing a school's culture as it is about improving an individual student's statistics.

None of this suggests that statistics are not important. However, the focus on the "long tail of underachievement" and the often repeated truth that "there is more variation in teaching and results within a school than between schools," has led to a myopic focus on student achievement data as exemplified by the A.R.T. approach (Snook et al., 2013, p. 27). Indeed, as Snook et al point out "most research on teacher quality is narrowly focused on test scores and readily measurable teacher characteristics. Characteristics that are harder to measure, but may be just as vital to student learning (such as clarity, enthusiasm, creativity, warmth and the ability to create effective learning environments and relations), are typically not measured." PB4L provided an opportunity to develop a different strand within quality teaching discourse that was more interested in the softer aspects of the development of an effective learning environment.

As Snook et al (2013) pointed out, the hard focus on student achievement often masked a number of influential factors, where the effectiveness of the teacher was seen as the only influence. While teacher effectiveness is certainly a significant factor in student achievement, it is also influenced by a myriad of other, often unmeasurable, conditions such as how many books there are in the home, or what is discussed at the dinner table. This is not to mention the factors that come into play within the classroom, which for one student might be sensitivity to noise and for another, the colour of the text on the whiteboard. As Schochet and Chiang say, "90% of the variation in student gains scores is due to student level factors which are not under the control of the teacher" (Schochet, Peter Z. & Chiang, Hanley S., n.d., p. v); or factors within schools such as resources, access to technology, temperature, environment and the quality of the leadership.

Against this oversimplification PB4L works in an inside-out manner. That is, the school must set school-wide values and culture statements before it sets its goals, and before it analyses its own student data. The focus of PB4L is not on student gain scores alone but more strongly on the evidence of improved behaviour practices within the school environment. Data is mainly used to inform the practices and systems schools focus on.

The Ministry of Education states that:

- Positive behaviour can be learnt and disruptive behaviour can be unlearned.
- Individual children are not the 'problem' – we need to change the environment around them to support positive behaviour. (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 4)

While on the surface this feeds into the quality teaching discourse that the problem might be located in the environment rather than the child, especially if this environment is the sole responsibility of the teacher, it also allows for a wider view as to what constitutes success within a school. This tension remains in the balance and depends on the shape that PB4L in

New Zealand takes on. If 'speciesization' has really occurred and the New Zealand version is distinct from its North American relative, the focus of the programme on developing cultures that refuse to blame teachers is crucial. PB4L must develop a vocabulary based on using data to support teachers to act within this New Zealand context.

Quality Teaching and Effective Teaching are discourses that were running before the advent of PB4L. You could say receptivity to the PB4L framework was assisted by the concept of Quality Teaching. This paper argues that we are at a critical point in the development of PB4L in deciding how helpful this way of working will be. The relationship between Audit Cultures, Neoliberalism and Good Teaching laid out by Thompson and Cook sets up one possible future (Thompson & Cook, 2013). In a dystopic future the individual teacher will be carrying the burden of student behaviour directly related to the academic results of a whole class, drowning under a neoliberal tide of risk sweeping relentlessly and inevitably from government to the individual.

Alternatively we could dismantle the neoliberal model and the individual teacher could use data responsibly and easily gathered by the school and shared with government to choose strategies and approaches that are more likely to be successful with the particular students in their class. Here a focus not on what is measured, but on the culture of the school and the needs of the individual could produce a result that positions the teacher as a change agent as described by Early & Shagoury (2010) rather than a dispenser of value added measurement (VAM) as described by Snook et al. (2013). Instead of constantly trying to imagine what good teaching should look like for particular students, teachers would be supporting their craft practice with useful information about the student and themselves to adjust to fit with the culture of the school.

Values and Culture

PB4L has been positioned in New Zealand as a portfolio of programmes and initiatives to "help parents, teachers and schools address problem behaviour, improve children's wellbeing and increase educational achievement," (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 4). While this is fine in principle, the methods used to do this are integral to the values and culture of the programme and this in turn is influential in how schools create values and culture. While the banner in the 2013 update (Ministry of Education, 2013) is about addressing problem behaviour, improving wellbeing and increasing educational achievement which could easily fit into a Quality Teaching, Audit Culture (Thompson and Cook, 2013) perspective, there is evidence to suggest there is more work to be done here. The Ministry is obliged to show the link between expenditure on behaviour support and educational achievement, and it clearly does this. This enables a cynical reading of the approach taken, as is picked up by Johansen, Little and Little (Johansen et al., 2011, p. 9) in their comments about the 'lack of intervention integrity'. The authors suggest that more could be done in this regard, particularly around the professional learning and development of the teachers.

This paper would like to present a counter narrative. On the next page of the 2013 update Angela Roberts, PPTA President is quoted:

Partnership with the sector in programme development, particularly with the teacher unions and representative groups, produces the best results for students. (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 5)

Cooperation has been one of the values that underpin this work. That in turn has set up an expectation for regional teams and for those implementing the framework. Schools, too, have embraced the cooperative process of establishing values and culture that make sense to them. In New Zealand that has meant schools acknowledging and responding to the indigenous culture of Aotearoa in establishing values that reflect their students.

As Christine Sleeter says in her foreword to Bishop et al. (2014, p. x), the fourth way of educational reform involves “various sectors of society learning to collaborate to give substance to a compelling vision of learning, achievement and wellbeing of children and youth.” However, she also points out that if this approach does not include an understanding of how professional educators can work with ‘minoritised students’ and their whānau (family) it is bound to fail. The same challenge stands true for PB4L.

Embracing the values and culture of Aotearoa has been part of the early foundation phase. While the Ministry of Education has been clear about its partnership approach it has laid down a challenge for the sector to take some leadership over injecting a post-colonial theoretical flavour into the framework. As Bishop et al. (2014, p. xiv) tell us, theoretical reform that is understood by teachers is going to have a much bigger impact on students, especially Māori students. For PB4L to reach its maximum impact it must include a theoretical position relevant to Māori and diverse students and must convince teachers of its efficacy. While this is implied by the previously mentioned 80% support, it must also be supported by visible values and cultural connections. These can be seen in mottos and acronyms that schools develop at the first stage of their PB4L engagement. The Wellington High example of WERO (WERO web page, n.d.) shows how a school has incorporated school values and culture into the approach they have taken to PB4L. They have taken the ideas of whānau, excellence, respect and ora (vitality) and defined what it means for their school community.

This set-up of culture and values at a school level, as described in the evaluation (Boyd, Dingle & Herdina, 2014, p.10) as a “set of three to five whole-school positive behaviour expectations” inevitably shape themselves into culture and values statements. While this happens at the school level, the national picture takes a bit more navigating. The evaluation completed by NZCER focused more at school and data level, so despite having the cultural question coded into the evaluation design it doesn’t appear to have played out clearly in the findings. There remains a question for New Zealand: How does the cultural content obvious in an individual school’s values statement, become mirrored in the national presentation of PB4L? In what ways is the uniqueness of living in Aotearoa reflected in the shape PB4L has taken on from PBIS, its American parent?

If School-Wide (SW) teams are to become adept at teaching staff how to interpret school cultural concepts they need to have a theory of action worked out. If, as Bishop suggests (Bishop et al., 2014, p. 9), we need to care for students as “culturally located individuals,” then positive behavioural instruction must also be culturally located. Building shared expectation and beliefs and resistance to change is reported by Boyd et al. (2014) as being one of the most common things that did not work so well for their school particularly when trying to sustain the School-Wide initiative. That shared expectation and belief can be seen as shorthand for culture and values. Student management that follows can work best if the foundations are well laid. There has to be a large measure of agreement around the cultural

context of a school and the desire to work with students as culturally located individuals before 'shared expectation and beliefs' can be aligned.

This runs alongside the difficulties secondary schools have in teaching desired behaviours. Primary schools are much more comfortable in this territory. Even once cultural location has been tackled PB4L SW remains engaged in helping teachers learn how to teach and reinforce desired behaviours in the classroom, in the corridors and around the school.

Interestingly enough, Spanish researchers (Miravet & García, 2013, p. 1373) came to similar conclusions about the need for school-wide "modifications from staffing and curriculum to assessment and instructional practices" in order to recognise diversity as an asset. They argue that equality policies should come from a community approach not from a "deficit or special educational need". PB4L SW similarly works on the basis that the culture and values of the school are shared by all and that they are taught, with problem behaviour dealt with as a transgression against the school community, as opposed to against an individual. Thus, the triptych of 'quality, equity and social justice' all come into play around the universal process the schools go through. "Learning communities strive to spread quality education for all" (Miravet & García, 2013, p. 1375) as the SW teams work to unify the school community around the agreed values. It is clear that by the use of 'quality education' as opposed to 'quality teaching' there has been a subtle shift in the emphasis of the approach being advocated. The discussion which moves from 'school improvement' to the ideal conditions for embracing diversity covers remarkably familiar territory. The overarching factors for success pointed to are: "a set of objectives agreed to by the educational community" and "shared values". This allows teachers and students to move towards a 'common language'.

This 'common language' can of course, also become a limiting and debilitating factor if the language chosen is not agreed, or shared, or based on values. The teacher's "experience, gender and type of subject taught" (Miravet & García, 2013, p. 1377) presumably mixed with sexuality, ethnicity and other factors that are influential in the context of intersectionality (Syed, 2010) also come into play. This is where the culture of the school both mediates and supports an inclusive message, or not. In the Spanish study teachers are seen to learn from each other if the opportunity exists, rather than from the community, which is similar to the observations made in the PB4L SW evaluation. This is particularly true of secondary schools where, in New Zealand, the challenges of implementation experienced by SW teams are significantly greater than for their primary counterparts. The finding that "27% of secondary and intermediate coaches involved parents and whānau as opposed to 58% of primary coaches" (Boyd et al., 2014) makes this point quite clearly. Secondary schools are larger, more complex and more tied up in their traditions and peculiar histories.

The role of professional learning and development (PLD), like the Spanish 'learning communities', cannot be underestimated here. Where the PLD aspect of cultural change and development is missed inconsistencies are likely to emerge. These are likely to be amplified by the size and scale of the action in a secondary school. There is also more to change in a secondary environment where larger rolls mean up to 3000 students and large numbers of staff can be involved. There is also more of a 'cringe factor' amongst secondary teachers in teaching school behaviour expectations within the classroom programme (Boyd et al., 2014, p. 51). High school teachers, in many cases, are familiar with using school

based expectations for classroom behaviour, but the more esoteric job of teaching how to walk down the corridors is far harder to approach with teenagers who are trying to 'own' the space outside. This is not to say it can't be done as there is evidence in the evaluation that lower decile (lower socio-economic band) secondary schools which implement more slowly, yet more thoroughly, are having success.

"59% of secondary and intermediate coaches held regular PLD sessions for their staff as opposed to 74% of primary coaches.... 19% of secondary and intermediate coaches regularly sought staff input to improve student behaviour as opposed to 48% of primary coaches...."(Boyd et al. 2014, p. 51). The list goes on. The only 'leading the whole community' area where secondary and intermediate schools (38%) scored higher than in primary schools (19%) was in involving student input into team meetings.

The differences Boyd et al (2014) point out between levels of schooling are significant in developing our understating of the differences 'culture and values' are likely to be shaped by in the various settings. Each level of schooling has its own intricacies and needs a PB4L SW plan that is tailored to these specific needs. Not surprisingly, in primary schools teachers are closer to the parents, but as students get older they themselves play a greater role in defining what will and won't work. While the American experience may be instructive around overcoming these barriers, the unique and highly individualised environment set up by *Tomorrow's Schools*, requires a unique response from the centre and from the PB4L framework itself.

Structural Matters

Structure clearly matters in PB4L SW. The year levels spanned by the school have a direct influence on the ease and process of implementation. The structural response from the Ministry of Education in the way it has set up PB4L in New Zealand, the framework it has used and the governing process that is being employed will be examined for their influence on the implementation plan. All of this has been set against the broader backdrop of quality teaching discourse and the peculiar arrangements which have led to, on one level, a high degree of autonomy for schools under the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms. While the structure, in these relatively early days, is still emerging, there are a number of identifiable features that can be traced into the implementation. As a politically sanctioned initiative there is also the potential, as was the case with Te Kotahitanga, for the complete abolition of this framework at a later date.

It should be noted that there are competing and sometimes complimentary processes at work in the same student behaviour directed space, that is other programmes like the Intensive Wraparound service (IWS), which leads to discernable effects on structure and form. The framework that makes up PB4L in New Zealand has assimilated some of the programmes from PBIS into its whānau (family) of programmes, of which PB4L SW is one. Others, such as the Finnish anti-bullying KiVa initiative being investigated by the Bullying Prevention Advisory Group, have the potential to run counter to developments in PB4L.

This is such a busy area of activity because New Zealand continues to show a higher incidence of bullying and problem behaviour than its OECD counter parts. The Best Evidence Synthesis (BES, n.d.) programme cites only one country with statistically more

significant bullying occurring than New Zealand at Year 5, with 68% of pupils in this Year reporting being bullied recurrently during the 2010/11 TIMSS round. Lower secondary (Years 9 and 10) fared slightly better with 45% bullied recurrently. However, New Zealand still compared poorly at this level: 22 of the 41 countries reported less bullying than New Zealand and only 12 reported more.

This combines with high suicide statistics. According to BES, youth suicide among New Zealand males is the highest, and among females the fifth highest when compared with other OECD countries. Among children aged 10-14, approximately one sixth of all deaths are due to suicide. Most are Māori children. Furthermore, “three times as many same or both sex attracted students were bullied weekly at school compared with opposite sex attracted students” (BES, n.d.). This heady data gathered by the Best Evidence Synthesis programme paints a compelling picture. While this clearly supports the aforementioned moral panic and is only one slant on the data there was clearly a need for a structural response.

There were further historical conditions that assisted the growth and development of PB4L. In April 2012 Prime Minister John Key launched his Youth Mental Health Project, which boasted a ‘well-balanced package of initiatives’. He said then that the government was putting an additional \$11.3 million into primary mental health care, which would also benefit young people (“Govt not making Waves,” 2012). This injection of funding, which was termed the Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health Project, provided an ideal opportunity for additional projects to be added into the PB4L whānau. These initiatives were an attempt by the Prime Minister to respond to his own children’s experience of close friends committing suicide and were a pragmatic effort to put more support into young people at a particularly vulnerable time in their lives.

As Professor Rob Horner said on his visit to the New Zealand PB4L SW conference in 2014 (Horner, n.d.), New Zealand stands at a crucial stage of development. The programme has grown, supported by government, and is now available to all secondary schools. About half of secondary schools have actually adopted the programme. The demographics show that a lower proportion of both high decile (higher socioeconomic band) schools and schools in Auckland (New Zealand’s largest city) make up this number. This remains a structural challenge and sits against a backdrop of many of those higher decile schools seeking support to combat bullying. Why would they not access the programme that directly targets school climate and teaches positive behaviour?

There are structural questions of access for each school type with different barriers at each level. Primary schools have embraced the change with just over half of SW schools coming from this sector, but in New Zealand these schools are often small and there is still room for growth in all the sectors. This is something considered by the PB4L Education Sector Reference Group that is made up of sector representatives and Ministry officials. The general consensus has been towards targeting growth, but not forcing the issue: the Ministry does not compel schools to be involved. Schools should want to opt in because it is a successful programme. If high decile Auckland secondary schools are not keen to join, that money can be diverted into the schools that are in the programme. The barriers around perception that a school may have, in not wanting to appear to have a behaviour problem, are slowly breaking down and it is becoming more apparent as wellbeing@school (self-

review) data and the evaluation show, that schools of all deciles benefit from the programme and have a lot to learn from each other.

In the highly politicised landscape of New Zealand education where different unions and professional associations represent different sectors, PB4L has been a rare island of tranquillity. Cross sector co-operation is the norm, with specialised programmes targeted at different levels to ensure everyone gets the right mix of training and support. Of course as a government-led initiative it is not without criticism, from the philosophical critique of the concept of 'positive behaviour' to the resistance in staff rooms to 'more meetings', to schools suffering from the 'Christmas tree effect'. However, the best supports have included the power sharing approach encouraged by the Ministry in the governorship arrangements and demanded by the sector in their engagement with future planning.

This paper has been focused largely on PB4L SW and has not looked in any detail at the related support programmes that give further assistance to teachers and schools, such as the Restorative Practices pilot targeted at secondary schools or the Incredible Years - Teachers programme targeted at the teachers of primary school students, but these extra supports should not be forgotten. The opportunities set up by the Prime Minister's mental health initiative and other governmental processes have allowed New Zealand to shape PB4L to its own needs. The addition of Restorative Practices is a good example of how the specificity of behavioural needs and practices in New Zealand have met a programme that is flexible enough to adjust to change. This has led PB4L within New Zealand to take on a unique form of its own, the so called 'speciation' referred to in the introduction.

Conclusion

The world of PB4L is adaptive, flexible, and starting to find its place in the New Zealand educational environment. While it has to respond to the atomisation experienced as a result of the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms PB4L SW provides opportunities for schools to work together both within and across sectors. This is something that has been built upon by the recent Investing in Educational Success initiative. The co-operative arrangement with the sector set up by the governorship organisation which oversees PB4L provides opportunity for genuine partnership between government, teachers unions, principals' associations and associated groups. If this is to be a so-called 'fourth way' educational reform, partnership is crucial. It is still early days for PB4L in New Zealand in terms of its cultural adaptations. Lessons are being learnt from Te Kotahitanga and other successful projects influenced and mandated by the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand's founding document of partnership between Māori and the Crown. This is likely to play a bigger part in the next phase of adaptation. Most of all, the development of a programme based on the articulation of human values that is not focused myopically on student tests scores has broadened the educational horizon.

Bibliography

- BES. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/142887/BullyingOne-pagers.pdf
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2014). *Te Kotahitanga : towards effective education reform for indigenous and other minoritised students*. Wellington : NZCER Press, 2014.
- Boyd, S., Dingle, R., & Herdina, N. (2014). *PB4L School-wide Evaluation: Preliminary findings*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Court, M., & O'Neill, J. (2011). "Tomorrow"s Schools' in New Zealand: from social democracy to market managerialism. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 43(2), 119–140.
- Early, J. S., & Shagoury, R. (2010). Learning from the lived experiences of new language arts teachers working in diverse urban schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1049–1058.
- Govt not making Waves. (2012). *Taranaki Daily News*, 02.
- Greenfield, P.M. & Quiroz, B. (2013). Context and Culture in the Socialization and Development of Personal Achievement Values: Comparing Latino Immigrant Families, European American Families, and Elementary School Teachers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 34(2), 108-118.
- Horner, R. (n.d.). *Using Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS/PB4L) to Make Schools more Effective and Equitable*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/2-Horner-Keynote%20%28post%29%20.pptx>
- Incidence of severe behaviour in Hutt Valley and Wellington schools. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/system/files/16706.pdf>
- Johansen, A., Little, S. G., & Akin-Little, A. (2011). An Examination of New Zealand Teachers' Attributions and Perceptions of Behaviour, Classroom Management, and the Level of Formal Teacher Training Received in Behaviour Management. *Kairaranga*, 12(2), 3–12.
- Ministry of Education, New Zealand. (2013). *Positive behaviour for learning: update 2013*.
- Miravet, L. M., & García, O. M. (2013). The role of teachers' shared values and objectives in promoting intercultural and inclusive school cultures: a case study. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(10), 1373–1386.
- National workshops on achievement, retention, and transitions / News / Kia ora - NZ Curriculum Online. (n.d.). Retrieved February 23, 2015, from <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/News/National-workshops-on-achievement-retention-and-transitions>

- Openshaw, R. (2014). Revisiting New Zealand's radical educational reforms: continuities and disjunctures. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 46(2), 190–206.
- PBIS.org Home Page. (n.d.). Retrieved February 23, 2015, from <http://www.pbis.org/>
- PPTA (2008). Disruptive and antisocial behaviour in secondary schools. Retrieved from http://www.ppta.org.nz/resources/publications/doc_download/21-disruptive-and-anti-social-behavior-in-secondary-schools
- PPTA (2009). 80,15, 5 percent: What we know; what they need. Retrieved from http://ppta.org.nz/index.php/annual-conference/conference-papers/doc_download/605-80-15-5-percent-what-we-know-what-they-need
- Schagen, S and Hodgen E (2008), *Incidence of Severe Behaviour in Hutt Valley and Wellington Schools*, NZCER.
- Schochet, Peter Z. & Chiang, Hanley S. (n.d.). Error Rates in Measuring Teacher and School Performance Based on Student Test Score Gains. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104004/pdf/20104004.pdf>
- Snook I, O'Neill J, Birks S, Church J and Rawlins P (2013), *The Assessment of Teacher Quality – An investigation into current issues in evaluating and rewarding teachers*, Education Policy Response Group, Institute of Education, Massey University.
- Syed, M. (2010). Disciplinarity and methodology in intersectionality theory and research. *American Psychologist*, 65(1), 61–62.
- Taonga, N. Z. M. for C. and H. T. M. (n.d.). Mazengarb report [Web page]. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/photograph/28261/mazengarb-report>
- Thompson, G., & Cook, I. (2013). The Logics of Good Teaching in an Audit Culture: A Deleuzian analysis. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 45(3), 243–258.
- Towl, P., & New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association. (2007). *Best practice behaviour management: a view from the literature*. [Wellington, N.Z.]: PPTA.
- WERO web page. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.whs.school.nz/about-us/wero/>
- Wylie, C. (2012). *Vital connections: why we need more than self-managing schools*. Wellington, N.Z: NZCER Press.
- Wylie, C., & New Zealand Council for Educational Research. (2007). *School governance in New Zealand-- how is it working?* Wellington [N.Z.]: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.