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ABSTRACT

Teaching Standards have been an integral part of appraisal in New Zealand for nearly 20 years, however, there is a paucity of literature on teachers’ perspectives on professional standards and the nature of their use in the appraisal process. There are six Standards for the Teaching Profession, the first of which is called the Treaty of Waitangi partnership. Anecdotal evidence indicates that teachers and leaders at secondary schools lack confidence to engage with this Standard. Therefore, although the Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of New Zealand, teachers’ and leaders’ understanding of what a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership looks like in practice may need development.

Using an interpretive approach, this study investigated how commitment to biculturalism was appraised in two New Zealand secondary schools. The three research questions guiding this study were: What is the relationship between appraisal and the professional standards related to biculturalism? In what ways is commitment to biculturalism appraised? What challenges do teachers and appraisers encounter in the appraisal of their commitment to biculturalism? Two senior leaders, two middle leaders and two classroom teachers participated in semi structured interviews.

Findings from this research exposed that teachers and leaders lack a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. Whilst an effective performance appraisal system is based on mutual agreement between appraiser and appraisee about performance expectations, the scope of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard may require this ‘mutual agreement’ to be led by the Education Council, and the Board of Trustees and senior leaders of schools.

This research highlights the need for a partnership between the Ministry of Education, the Education Council, and Boards of Trustees and leaders of schools to develop and implement a national programme of leadership development for those with appraisal responsibilities which is contextualised, supportive and underpinned by the Treaty of Waitangi partnership.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Aotearoa the Māori name for New Zealand

Iwi describes a large group of people from a designated area, often translated to mean ‘tribe’

Manaaki to support, take care of, give hospitality to, protect, look out for – show respect, generosity and care for others.

Manaakitanga hospitality, kindness, generosity, support - the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others

Māori indigenous person of Aotearoa-New Zealand

Marae the courtyard of a Maori meeting house, especially as a social or ceremonial forum

Pākehā a term used to refer to non-Māori New Zealanders, usually of European descent

Tangata whenua meaning ‘people of the land’, tangata whenua refers to the status of Māori as the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa-New Zealand

Tangata whenuatanga affirming Māori learners as Māori, providing contexts for learning where the language, identity, and culture of Māori learners and their whānau is affirmed.

Tauiwi foreigner, non-Māori, colonist

Te reo literally meaning ‘the language’, te reo Māori describes ‘the Māori language’

Te Tiriti o Waitangi Treaty of Waitangi

Tikanga correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, - the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context, tikanga defines the cultural practices specific to Māori people

Tino rangatiratanga self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, self-government

Tipuna ancestors, grandparents

Whānau family, in a Māori context, encompassing many generations and layers of one’s family

Whanaungatanga relationship, kinship, sense of family connection - a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging

Whakawhanaungatanga process of establishing relationships, relating well to others
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoT</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO</td>
<td>Education Review Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGs</td>
<td>National Education Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZEI</td>
<td>New Zealand Educational Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTC</td>
<td>New Zealand Teachers’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPTA</td>
<td>Post Primary Teachers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Standards for the Teaching Profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Research Outline

My research topic is centred on how teachers meet the Standard for bicultural commitment within the appraisal process in two Auckland secondary schools. Teachers are under considerable pressure to provide evidence of a commitment to biculturalism through the auditing systems of appraisal, registration and re-certification (Lourie, 2015a). As a member of the professional learning team in my current setting, a large Auckland secondary school, I am responsible for reviewing teacher appraisal reports. It is evident that many teachers find it challenging to produce evidence of commitment to biculturalism. Many teachers and their appraisers are unclear on how to assess levels of commitment or even what bicultural commitment looks like.

Rationale for this Study

In my opinion, the bicultural Professional Standard is the most important for all New Zealand teachers, however, it is the least attended to. Given that teachers in New Zealand accept employment on the understanding that they will meet these standards to fulfil the requirements of registration, and hence be able to practice, teachers and appraisers cannot ignore it. I believe that this research will benefit me as I address my own gaps in knowledge. In part, this research is about my own personal and professional development and my active seeking to decolonise heart and mind.

My personal development will benefit the leaders in my school setting as they look to me for guidance in this area of appraisal. This responsibility is in part because of my own dual heritage, that of Cook Island-Māori and Pākehā descent. My mother, born in Rarotonga, is Ngati Makea and Ngati Uriarau of Avarua, and came to New Zealand as an immigrant child. The experiences of being able to physically depart Aotearoa-New Zealand and a Eurocentric view of life to arrive in Rarotonga throughout my life, experiencing a different way of being, has given me a dual view of the world. Barnes (2013), who describes the engagement of four Pākehā researchers in Kaupapa Māori educational relationships, discusses a departure from a “Eurocentric understanding of the world through personal, professional, and community experiences” (p. 25), and a move by researchers toward an appreciation of Māori realities and educational issues. However, I am not a New Zealand Māori and I am not blind to the privileges of my fair skin and hence white privilege,
and the ability to go to my Cook Island homeland welcomed by family and the government, with citizenship and land rights.

With a predominantly Pākeha leadership and teaching staff in my current school, many avoid discussing the bicultural aspect of appraisal. Tolich (2002) terms this ‘Pākeha paralysis’, and states that this is a Pākehā problem that needs to be resolved. These are complex issues that interest me because they are unique to Aotearoa-New Zealand. There is a need to foster greater levels of understanding and respect across all peoples of Aotearoa-New Zealand for the culture of the tangata whenua, a culture that plays a part in the identity of all New Zealanders.

The New Zealand Setting

Twenty years ago the New Zealand Ministry of Education (MoE) issued a document called Performance Management in Schools (Ministry of Education, 1997). The mandated guidelines require schools to institute a Performance Management System. Educational leaders are required to “design performance appraisal systems appropriate to their school and community within a minimum quality assurance and accountability framework” (p. 1) and perform annual appraisals of principals and teachers. In 1999 ‘Professional Standards’ were incorporated into schools’ Performance Management Systems, against which teachers were to be evaluated for salary progression (Nusche, Laveault, MacBeath, & Santiago, 2012). The Performance Management System also incorporates statutory requirements for registration. A further set of criteria to ensure ‘quality teaching’ were issued in 2010 by the New Zealand Teachers Council. Subsequently, the professional body responsible for registering teachers as competent for practice has recently been ‘rebranded’ to become the Education Council, and they have issued a new set of six standards to replace the Practising Teacher Criteria (Education Council, 2017). Quality of teaching is now assessed against two different sets of mandatory national teaching standards, these being the Standards for the Teaching Profession, developed by the Education Council, and the professional standards associated with collective employment contracts (Nusche et al., 2012).

Teachers are required to demonstrate that they are meeting the Standards for the Teaching Profession set out by the Education Council in Our Code Our Standards (Education Council, 2017). The Standards are described as the expectations and aspirations of the teaching profession and apply to every certificated teacher. Teachers must provide satisfactory evidence that they are meeting all standards in order to gain or renew a practising certificate. For teachers in their first seven years in the profession, the ‘signing off’ their annual appraisal means a move up the pay
scale, however for the majority of teachers, this contributes towards a collection of evidence needed for the three-yearly renewal of their practising certificate.

One of the six Standards in specifically refers to the bicultural nature of education in New Zealand and asks teachers to demonstrate a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership (Education Council, 2017). The elaborations for this standard ask teachers to “understand and recognise the unique status of tangata whenua in Aotearoa-New Zealand; Understand and acknowledge the histories, heritages, languages and cultures of partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and; Practise and develop the use of te reo and tikanga Māori” (Education Council, 2017, p. 18). While the use of te reo (the Māori language) appears to be easy to measure, this elaboration can be viewed as narrow and tokenistic. The question of how teachers demonstrate understanding and recognition of the unique status given to Māori in New Zealand has left many in the teaching profession confused and frustrated.

Education policy has established biculturalism as an “ideological basis for teaching practice in schools, and some evidence of teachers’ commitment to bicultural partnership is required” (Lourie, 2015a, p. 54). Considering the lack of a shared understanding of the meaning of biculturalism (Durie, 1998; Lourie, 2015a, 2015b; Walker, 1986), many schools and teachers struggle to engage with the bicultural aspects inherent in current education policy. Consequently, there is a lack of agreement about what biculturalism looks like in practice.

While the appraisal process is mandated by the Ministry of Education, it is managed within schools and the principal is responsible for ‘signing off’ all teaching staff. In practice, middle and senior leaders are responsible for the task of assessing teachers against the standards. In my experience many lack the knowledge or skills to engage with the issues associated with biculturalism and much of the evidence and reflections I have been privy to in appraisal documents could be described as tokenism. As a teacher, appraiser and a leader of the appraisal process at my workplace, the gaps in knowledge and practice of the concept of biculturalism have resulted in either complete avoidance or reduction of the process to an administrative tick box exercise.

**Research Aims and Questions**

The purpose of this study is to examine the challenges teachers and appraisers encounter in New Zealand secondary schools as they attempt to provide and assess measureable evidence of commitment to biculturalism. References to the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism are an
accepted part of educational policy in New Zealand and this is seen in the bicultural emphasis in *Our Code Our Standards* (Education Council, 2017). The recently renamed Standards for the Teaching Profession were developed in 2017 and one of the Standards requires teachers to recognize, honour, and demonstrate a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership (Education Council, 2017). This requires teachers and their appraisers to have knowledge and understanding of the concept of biculturalism and the skills to demonstrate this commitment.

There is considerable pressure on teachers to provide evidence in respect to biculturalism and the purpose of my research is to contribute to the knowledge needed to inform meaningful appraisal practice of biculturalism in secondary schools. This research aims to engage with the literature on the meaning of biculturalism and investigate what this might look like in practice. Lourie (2016) states that “the requirements for schools and teachers to provide evidence of bicultural practice, without the space to engage with more fundamental issues associated with biculturalism can result in tokenism” (p. 645). My intention is to consider how the concept of biculturalism can inform teaching practice, examine how biculturalism is currently appraised in secondary schools, and build the capabilities of teachers and appraisers in implementing the policies and practices that relate to biculturalism.

**Research Aims**

With my study, I have sought to contribute to the knowledge base in relation to the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism guided by the following three aims.

1. To explore the relationship between appraisal and the professional standards for teaching related to biculturalism;
2. To investigate how commitment of biculturalism is appraised; and,
3. To examine how the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism challenges teachers and appraisers.

**Research Questions**

The following questions were formulated to seek insight into principle knowledge, understanding and practices of the appraisal of bicultural commitment in two secondary schools in New Zealand.

1. What is the relationship between appraisal and the professional standards related to biculturalism?
2. In what ways is commitment to biculturalism appraised?
3. What challenges do teachers and appraisers encounter in the appraisal of their commitment to biculturalism?

**Thesis Organisation**

*Chapter One*
This chapter introduces the research topic, the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism in New Zealand secondary schools. A rationale is provided for this research study and the research aims and questions are outlined.

*Chapter Two*
This chapter provides a critical review of the literature. The concept of biculturalism in education is examined as is the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard for the Teaching Profession. Understandings concerning the management of teacher performance are also investigated.

*Chapter Three*
Chapter Three provides an overview of research methodology and a rationale for the adoption of an interpretive approach to this study. Participant selection is outlined along with a discussion of the method of data collection. Data analysis, validity and reliability are discussed and ethical issues considered.

*Chapter Four*
Findings from this research are presented in this chapter. Data is presented from the perspectives of senior leaders, middle leaders, and classroom teachers from two secondary schools. This data is presented under the headings: the purpose of appraisal; the purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession; understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard; and accountability to biculturalism.

*Chapter Five*
This chapter discusses the key findings from chapter four in the context of the literature from Chapter Two. Five key conclusions are presented and recommendations are made at both the national and school level. Strengths and limitations of this study are discussed and areas of further research are provided.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is to critically review and examine the literature pertaining to how teachers demonstrate and assess commitment to biculturalism within the appraisal process. Due to the nature of my research, I have largely drawn on education and policy literature from New Zealand.

As I reviewed the literature, the following three major themes were evident in the literature.

1. Biculturalism in Teaching;
2. Locating the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard; and

Reference to the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles began to be included in parliamentary acts in the 1980’s, thus recognising New Zealand’s bicultural nature in legislation (Orange, 2013). The Education Act of 1989, replacing the 1877 Act, established a legal framework for New Zealand’s education system that makes specific references to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Investigating how commitment of biculturalism is demonstrated and appraised in secondary schools required an examination of the political and historical events on which biculturalism is founded and incorporated into education. For this reason, the theme of Biculturalism in Teaching is discussed and critiqued.

The Standards for the Teaching Profession set the threshold expected for teachers to enter and maintain ongoing membership of the teaching profession in New Zealand (Education Council, 2017). Teacher appraisal is a mandatory process internal to the school and is part of the registration and certification process. For mainstream secondary teachers, this means being assessed against the Standards in an annual appraisal cycle. In the first two years of teaching, a portfolio of evidence demonstrating practice of the six Standards is required in order to receive full registration into the teaching profession. Furthermore, teachers need to present evidence every three years demonstrating practice of the six Standards in order to maintain a practicing certificate. The first of the six Standards, labelled Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership, requires teachers to demonstrate commitment to tangata whenua and Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand (Education Council, 2017). The interpretation of this Standard and what it looks like in
practice are essential components of my research questions. Consequently, the critical review of
the theme Locating the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard is presented.

An effective performance appraisal system depends on the mutual agreement between appraiser
and appraisee about performance expectations and the identification of areas for improvement
(Cardno, 2012). Tensions can arise between the accountability and developmental purposes of a
performance appraisal system and this tension can create a high degree of defensiveness (Cardno,
2012). In conjunction with the topic of biculturalism, acknowledged as a sensitive topic given the
history of race relations in New Zealand, demonstrating and appraising commitment to the Treaty
of Waitangi partnership has its challenges. For this reason, the theme of Managing Teacher Performance
is considered and evaluated.

The defining feature of biculturalism in this nation is Te Tiriti o Waitangi-Treaty of Waitangi, an
agreement signed in 1840 by the indigenous Māori and British representative of the Crown
(Orange, 2013). The definition of biculturalism, the meaning of the Treaty of Waitangi and an
understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi principle of partnership are all subject to diverse
interpretations, however, they are interconnected. For this reason, the two terms Treaty of
Waitangi partnership and biculturalism are used interchangeably throughout my dissertation.

Biculturalism in Teaching

The Concept of Biculturalism

In New Zealand, the concept of biculturalism refers to two ethnically and culturally different
The indigenous Māori people or tangata whenua of this land represent one side of this relationship.
The other people are the British settlers, who would in later generations become known as Pākehā.
This partnership dates back to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, generally understood
as an exchange of promises between Māori and the British Crown (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Hohepa
& Robinson, 2008). According to Bishop and Glynn (1999), New Zealand has not seen a
partnership of two peoples developing a nation, but the marginalisation of the indigenous Māori
people through biased legislation of the Pākehā majority. The philosophy of biculturalism is
considered to have only emerged in the 1970s, in response to a partial Māori decolonisation,
bringing with it cultural self-assertion (Walker, 2004). According to the historian Belich (2001), the
concept of biculturalism also developed because of a growing number of Pākehā becoming more open to recognising the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of New Zealand.

The concept of biculturalism is disputed (see for example, Lourie, 2015a, 2015b; Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Walker, 1986, 2004). Lourie (2015a) highlights some concerns when considering the concept of biculturalism with reference to a partnership relationship between Māori and the Crown. She asks who the partners are in the relationship, questioning whether homogeneity exists in reality for Māori people. Lourie and Rata (2014) question the identification of Māori as an ethnic group considering all Māori have European or other ancestry. The question of who is Māori and therefore who should benefit from public policy measures, has been the subject of considerable debate. Kukutai (2004) claims that the lack of definitive criteria to define an ethnic group is at the heart of the problem, but maintains that having a Māori ancestor is a mandate for inclusion.

Durie (1998) proposed a continuum of biculturalism to describe its different interpretations. Durie (1998) linked each form of biculturalism with the goals and structural arrangements which emerged through the discourse of the socio-political context of the time. For example, through the removal of discriminatory barriers and prejudices, a contextualised discourse emerged that aimed to celebrate Māori culture, traditions and way of life. This type of biculturalism was labelled as ‘soft’ by Fleras and Spoonley (1999), who developed Durie’s continuum of biculturalism further by labelling each form of biculturalism from soft to hard, and connected the policy outcomes to each form. The ‘soft’ form of biculturalism centres around mainstreaming and the ‘moderate’ form around ‘taha Māori’, a phrase that translates to taking a Māori perspective or side as opposed to taking a Pākehā or European perspective (Fleras & Spoonely, 1999). According to Lourie (2015b), the continuum could be used as a timeline representing stages of ongoing change in the socio-political arena and could be a useful framework for understanding the changing nature of biculturalism. However, she warns that while some forms have dominated at different periods, many forms of biculturalism have overlapped one another to co-exist.

**The Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi Incorporated into Law**

There were many reasons Māori signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, most notably because they expected the Treaty to be the start of a new relationship with Britain, in which they would play an equal role (Orange, 2013). However, the Treaty would not be recognised in New Zealand law until 1975 when the incumbent Labour government passed the Waitangi Tribunal Act. Under the Act,
a Tribunal was established to investigate possible breaches of the Treaty and make recommendations to the government (Hill, 2010; Orange, 2013).

The concept of the Treaty principles first appeared in the 1975 Waitangi Tribunal Act, however they were not well defined. One of the Tribunal’s earliest tasks was to determine the meaning of the Treaty of Waitangi. To achieve this, careful consideration of the differences in meaning between the Māori and English versions of the Treaty was required (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). The differences in the translations combined with a need to apply the Treaty in contemporary times, led the Tribunal and the courts to consider the underlying spirit and intent of the Treaty (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). This led Parliament to refer to the principles of the Treaty in legislation (Hill, 2010; Orange, 2013; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). In 1989 the government released Principles for Crown Action on the Treaty of Waitangi, a publication of five principles. They were:

- The government’s right to govern
- The right of iwi to self-management of their resources
- Redress for past grievances
- Equality, all New Zealanders are equal before the law
- Reasonable cooperation by both parties (Orange, 2013; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001).

The principles are constantly evolving and it is for this reason that the Waitangi Tribunal does not have a single set of Treaty principles to apply in assessing each claim (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). Some core principles have emerged, such as partnership, reciprocity, autonomy, active protection, mutual benefit and redress, however, there is much discussion and debate as to what these principles mean (Orange, 2013; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). According to Orange (2013), the principles differ depending on the institution discussing them but remain “a touchstone for government and the community in developing Treaty relationships” (p. 124).

**The Treaty of Waitangi and Education Policy**

Reference to the Treaty and its principles began to be included in parliamentary acts beginning with the Environment Act 1986 and the Conservation Act 1987, thus recognising New Zealand’s bicultural nature in legislation (Orange, 2013). Labour’s recognition of Treaty rights would finally impact on the reforms of mainstream education with the Education Act of 1989 replacing the 1877 Act. The Education Act (1989) establishes the legal framework for New Zealand’s education system and makes specific reference to the principles of the Treaty. For example, the Act requires the Board of Trustees of schools to take all reasonable steps to act in a manner that is consistent
with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Education Act, 1989, Section six). Lourie (2015a) highlights the challenges school boards face in writing school-based policies that reflect the principles of the Treaty due to difficulties in determining what principles to apply and what they mean in practice.

The Education Act 1989 also gives effect to the four components that make up the National Education Guidelines. The Guidelines contain: (1) National Education Goals; (2) Foundation curriculum policy statements; (3) National curriculum statements; and (4) National Administration Guidelines (Education Act, 1989, section 40). Two of the four guidelines make specific reference to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi: The National Education Goals (NEGs) and the National Curriculum statements.

The ten NEGs are statements of government policy objectives that schools use to guide and develop their own policies (Ministry of Education, 2004). The NEGs that reference the Treaty of Waitangi principles are:

NEG 9 - Increased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in Te Reo Māori, consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi; and

NEG 10 - Respect for the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand people, with acknowledgment of the unique place of Māori, and New Zealand’s role in the Pacific and as a member of the international community of nations.

Although the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism are implied rather than stated in NEG 10, via the acknowledgement of “the unique place of Māori”, this distinction situates biculturalism as separate from multiculturalism, which is addressed in the first part of the statement as “respect for the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand people”.

Biculturalism as an ideal differs from multiculturalism (Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Smith, 2010; Sullivan, 1994). According to Maaka and Fleras (2005), multiculturalism is concerned with the accommodation of diversity whereas biculturalism emphasises a degree of cultural co-existence between distinct communities. While British colonies were introducing multiculturalism as national policy in the 1970’s, the particular context of New Zealand demanded a bicultural framework (Sullivan, 1994; Smith, 2010). Smith (2010) brings our attention to the fact that Māori are not
another one of a number of ethnic groups living in New Zealand because other ethnic groups cannot claim the rights given to Maori under the Treaty of Waitangi.

Sullivan (1994) draws attention to members of minority groups such as Samoans or Cook Islanders, questioning where they fit in the Maori-Pākehā relationship. According to Smith (2010), multiculturalism can be ‘fitted into’ a bicultural framework but this would require a “shift in policy and practice to accommodate the demographic reality of New Zealand’s increasingly multicultural society” (Smith, 2010, p. 3). Sullivan (1994) advocates for a Maori-Tauiwi relationship to replace the Māori-Pākehā relationship to more accurately represent New Zealand’s contemporary ethnic makeup and political system. Tauiwi includes descendants of European settlers, Samoans, Cook Islanders, Chinese, Indian or other descent. According to Sullivan (1994), this interpretation of biculturalism “acknowledges the rights of the tangata whenua and includes all non-Māori in this important partnership” (p. 200).

**Authentic or Tokenistic Education Policy**

The *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007), official policy relating to teaching and learning in English-medium New Zealand schools, acknowledges the “principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 9). The curriculum also articulates a strong statement of support for the idea of partnership in one of its five vision statements, expressed as “our vision is for young people…who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners” (p. 8). Greater attention was being paid to the inclusion of a Māori perspective in mainstream school settings and a power-sharing model of partnership began to emerge from discourse (Walker, 1986). With the emphasis on partnership, Lourie (2015b) associates these policy statements as move away from a ‘moderate’ form of biculturalism to ‘inclusive’ biculturalism.

Inclusive biculturalism emerged in the late 1980s and 1990s and was strongly influenced by the Waitangi Tribunal (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Lourie, 2015b). The idea of partnership was established and legitimatised by the Tribunal and Fleras and Spoonley (1999) termed this type of biculturalism as ‘inclusive’, characterised by active Māori involvement. Māori academic Ranginui Walker advocated for a power-sharing model of partnership, stating that “biculturalism means more than Pākehās learning a few phrases of Māori language and how to behave on the marae. It means they will have to share what they have monopolised for so long, power, privilege and
occupational security. (1986, p. 5). Lourie (2015b) highlights that inclusive biculturalism, with its emphasis on partnership, did not appear in mainstream education policy until the 2000s.

According to Lourie (2015a), education policy statements relating to biculturalism are symbolic because they “typically carry little to no commitment to implementation and usually do not have any substantial funding attached to them” (p. 52). In addition, the often vague and ambiguous statements provide little guidance for teacher practice. The lack of discussion and critique associated with bicultural education policy and the lack of agreement about what biculturalism looks like in practice means that schools are often forced to enact “what might be described as fairly tokenistic practices” (Lourie, 2015a, p. 59).

Tokenism was described by Kanter (1977) in terms of the numerical representation of a minority group within an organisation. If the numerical representation of a particular group is less than 15% the situation is described as tokenism and the minority group as tokens. Tokenism is now more directly tied to the concept of ‘boundary permeability’, a term used to describe an intergroup context where very few members of a disadvantaged group are accepted into positions usually reserved for members of the advantaged group (Wright and Taylor 1998). According to Richardson and Wright (2010), tokenism exists when “individual opportunity to move into a more advantaged group is not completely closed, while at the same time many qualified members of lower status groups are prevented from gaining access to the opportunity afforded by members of higher status groups” (p. 560). This focus on boundary permeability led to research on how disadvantaged group members, and more recently advantaged group members, respond to tokenism.

Tokenism falls between a clearly illegitimate closed system and an open legitimate system and this creates uncertainty (Richardson & Wright 2010; Wright & Taylor;1998). The research of Richardson and Wright (2010) contrasted tokenism with contexts where group boundaries were completely open, and with contexts where group boundaries were completely closed. The open context was strongly endorsed and the closed context strongly opposed by both group members, however, tokenism created uncertainty for both groups. The disadvantaged group members were less likely to take collective action and the advantaged group members were easily manipulated by the focus of attention. When advantaged group members were encouraged to think about the effects on their own group members, their disapproval of the tokenism context was significantly less than that of the closed context. However, advantaged group members encouraged to think
about the negative effects on the disadvantaged group members disapproved equally of the
tokenism and the closed system contexts.

Acknowledgement of New Zealand’s bicultural heritage in education policy, without tangible
directives or accountability, could be viewed as symbolic and tokenistic. Teachers faced with
tokenism experience uncertainty. In their discussion, Richardson and Wright (2010) state that
“those faced with tokenism should be especially susceptible to messages that can help resolve the
ambiguity and reduce the aversive state of subjective uncertainty” (p. 565). Resolving ambiguity in
education policy and auditing documents, starting with clarity around what form of biculturalism
is being referred to, is a necessary step towards a deeper understanding of bicultural education
policy and more meaningful teacher practice.

Lourie (2015a) says that symbolic policy legitimises a particular political view and what gives them
‘teeth’ is not the policy statements themselves, but the auditing systems that accompany them” (p.
53). These systems serve to institutionalise a particular worldview by influencing practice to shape
values and behaviour. The lack of agreement on the concept of biculturalism and what this looks
like in practice, and the number of strong auditing systems, such as teacher appraisal and external
reviews conducted by the Education Review Office, places immense pressure on schools and
teachers in New Zealand. Lourie (2016) states that “the requirements for schools and teachers to
provide evidence of bicultural practice, without the space to engage with more fundamental issues
associated with biculturalism can result in tokenism” (p. 645).

Locating the Treaty of Waitangi Partnership Standard

Professional Standards in Education

In New Zealand, the Ministry of Education issued a document called Performance Management in
Schools (Ministry of Education, 1997) 20 years ago. The mandated guidelines require schools to
institute a Performance Management System and educational leaders are required to perform
annual appraisals of teachers “within a minimum quality assurance and accountability framework”
(p. 1). Teacher appraisal as part of performance management occurs in two specific instances; to
gain registration and practicing certificates to teach in New Zealand; and, as part of performance
management processes. According to Nusche et al. (2012), teacher appraisal has two major
purposes: (i) Attestation for salary progression; and (ii) professional learning.
In 1999, ‘Professional Standards’ were incorporated into schools’ Performance Management Systems against which teachers were to be evaluated for the purpose of annual attestation for salary progression (Nusche et al., 2012). These Professional Standards are part of collective agreements between the Ministry of Education and the two teaching unions, the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) and the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI). They are used for attestation and also set the minimum standard for teacher competency; these standards must be brought into play in any employment competency issues between the professional leader and a teacher (PPTA Executive, 2016). The process of annual attestation for salary progression introduces an element of accountability. However, Nusche et al., (2012) noted that practically all teachers progress up the salary scale each year and a good proportion of teachers are already at the top of the incremental salary scale. They believe that the attestation process serves a limited purpose and identifying underperformance could be more adequately played out by the registration and certification process, now guided by the Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Until 2009, the set of standards called the ‘Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions’ were used to determine what constituted a satisfactory teacher for the statutory requirements for registration and certification. The New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), the professional body for teachers responsible for registering and certificating teachers as competent for practice, issued a further set of criteria in 2010, the ‘Registered Teacher Criteria’ replacing the Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions. In 2015, the Education Council of Aotearoa-New Zealand was established and replaced the NZTC. The Registered Teacher Criteria were renamed as the Practising Teacher Criteria, but the criteria themselves, and the rules around meeting them did not change. In consultation with the sector, the Education Council developed a new set of teacher expectations to replace the Practising Teacher Criteria. In July 2017, the new ‘Standards for the Teaching Profession’ were published in Our Code Our Standards (Education Council, 2017).

The ‘quality of teaching’ is assessed against a two different sets of mandatory national teaching standards, the Standards for the Teaching Profession, developed by the Education Council, and the Professional Standards associated with the collective employment contracts. The research of Nusche et al., (2012) found the co-existence of two different sets of teaching standards in New Zealand as problematic. Their review teams found that many schools had integrated the two sets of standards within the processes of attestation and appraisal and most teachers could not identify which standards were used to guide their professional growth (Nusche et al., 2012). According to Nusche et al., (2012), having two different sets of professional standards risks “weakening the
alignment between teacher appraisal, teacher registration, professional development, and career structure that common reference standards seek to achieve” (p. 77).

Nusche et al. (2012) believe that national teaching standards are a key element in an effective performance appraisal system. However, Bolam (2002) highlights the lack of research evidence about the impact of these standards on student learning. Furthermore, the question of what kind of standards are best for the teaching profession is much disputed. A paper by Martin Thrupp was commissioned by the two teacher unions, PPTA and NZEI, to inform the debate around professional standards for teacher education in New Zealand. Thrupp’s (2006) work distinguishes two types of professional standards he labels ‘generic’ and ‘specified’. According to Thrupp (2006), “Generic standards are broad descriptors of teachers’ skills and knowledge. Specified standards attempt to define more precisely what is to be taught, what would count as evidence of the quality of that teaching and what would count as meeting the standard” (p.3).

In the lead-up to the writing of the Registered Teacher Criteria, the NZTC commissioned a review by two Australian researchers. Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2007) argued for highly specified criteria for the teaching profession because they “capture what good teachers know and do. Generic standards don’t do this” (p. 49). These authors believe that professional standards should inform teachers and leaders about what will be measured, how it will be measured and, how good is good enough. In contrast, Thrupp (2006) argues for generic standards on the grounds that while they “require a higher trust approach … [they] are a sensible response to the paradox that the more managerial and performative pressure is placed on teachers, the less authentic their teaching will become” (p. 4).

Teachers have long resisted any attempts by those who define teaching too narrowly (Sachs, 2003; Thrupp, 2006; Upsall, 2001). Specified standards, according to Thrupp (2006), are a managerial intervention that tries to sum up high quality teaching and fails. Upsall (2001) believes that a managerial approach to performance appraisal encourages a tick box mentality, reducing teachers to technicians. High quality teaching is an uncertain activity that requires a cultural response rather than a technical response. Sachs (2003) asks those who are interested in improving the quality of teaching and student learning outcomes to “acknowledge that conceptions of good teaching are changing, and that the knowledge and research base of teaching and learning are expanding” (p. 185). Defining and judging competent teaching is multifaceted, and requires a collaborative,
supportive and positive model that values professional growth. Most importantly, Sach (2003) and Upsall (2001) believe that this model must be developed and owned by the teaching profession.

New Zealand has historically favoured generic standards and both sets of standards used in the teaching profession are considered to be generic (Thrupp, 2006). However, Grudnoff, Hawe and Tuck (2005) note that generic and specified standards are often confused in New Zealand. These authors state that any standard for teaching must make a clear distinction between generic and specified standards, “and the latter must be aligned validly with the former” (p. 104). According to Grudnoff et al. (2005), reaching a consensus on what a generic standard looks like in practice in a particular context is a difficult task, and is more often than not, poorly executed. The contextual nature of teaching practice calls for the involvement of practitioners in this process, but as Grudnoff et al. (2005) say, “it is unreasonable to assume that consensus actually exists or can be established in all instances” (p. 100). These authors are also critical of the assumption that representation of various stakeholders ensures all voices are heard. They say that “the process of consensus can mask “dissensus”, and privilege the voice of a confident majority” (p. 100).

**The Standards for the Teaching Profession**

The Standards for the Teaching Profession are expressed in the Education Council’s policy entitled *Our Code Our Standards* and they “apply to every certificated teacher, regardless of role or teaching environment” (Education Council, 2017, p. 1). The Education Council describe the Standards as a “holistic descriptions of what high-quality practice looks like” and state that they are “purposely designed at a high level so every practitioner can apply them to suit the context they are working in” (p.14). These statements provide broad guidance, characteristic of generic standards. Making no claim to reflect particular contexts, an open expectation is that generic standards will need “local interpretation by teachers, school leaders and teacher educators” (Thrupp, 2006, p. 10).

The purposes of the Standards are described by six statements, two of which directly acknowledge the professionalisation of teaching. They state that the Standards are to “promote the status of the teaching profession through making explicit the complex nature of teachers’ work” and “strengthen public confidence in the teaching profession” (Education Council, 2017, p.16). This assumes that by providing a framework of standards by which teachers can exhibit ‘professionalism’ the status of the teaching profession will improve.
Sachs, an Australian academic, argues for the critical review of professional standards for teachers and the claims that are made by their advocates. Sachs (2003) states that professionalism under the guise of standards becomes a tool for employers to demand more of teachers and puts teachers in a double bind. She says that if teachers “do not have a set of publicly documented standards like other ‘professions’, then they are seen not to have the same professional status as those professionals who do have these codified frameworks” (p. 184). The catch, according to Sachs (2003), is that undertaking the professional learning activities implicit in professional standards without the time allocation, contributes to the intensification of teachers’ work. Thrupp (2006) also questions the discourse of professional standards improving the social status of teachers. He warns that the public and professional appeal of teaching standards may be politically exploited and may serve as a way of controlling “teachers by asserting the perspective of standard-setter over the practitioner” (Thrupp, 2006, p. 3).

Two more purposes of the Standards for the Teaching Profession are described as to “set the standard expected for teachers to be issued with a practising certificate” and “provide a framework to guide career-long professional learning and development as a teacher” (Education Council, 2017, p. 16). It is mandatory for practising teachers in New Zealand to be registered and to hold a practising certificate. Entry to and maintaining ongoing membership of the teaching profession means being assessed against the Standards for the Teaching Profession in an annual appraisal cycle. Additionally, every three years, in order to maintain a practising certificate, teachers are required to provide evidence of their practice that reflect each Standard. According to the Education Council (2017), this evidence will be generated ‘naturally’ from high quality practice.

Many researchers have argued that professional standards can provide a useful framework for teachers’ learning, however, Mayer, Mitchell, Macdonald and Bell (2005) highlight the paucity of literature on teacher’s perspectives on professional standards and the nature of the professional learning associated with the standards. Mayer at al. (2005) draw on a pilot project conducted by Education Queensland in 2002 which sought to provide teachers with opportunities to engage with a set of professional standards as a framework for professional learning. They found that most participants strongly endorsed the standards and their use as a tool to support professional learning. Participants noted their learning as it pertained to their sense of themselves and their efficacy as professionals. Most participants saw the standards as an aid to personal reflection leading to actions to improve teaching and learning. This was characteristically an individual activity as teachers were “typically focused on using the standards for personal reflection of their
own classroom practice” (p. 173). Lack of time was found to be the major factor that limited engagement with the standards and networking with the wider professional community. This research also highlighted the lack of documentation, and, as a result, specific ways of recording teachers’ learning was difficult to ascertain. Mayer et al. (2005) believe that the problematic task of documenting professional learning will need to be addressed “if standards are to remain a central part of professional development policy” (p. 177).

**The Treaty of Waitangi Partnership Standard**

There are six Standards for the Teaching Profession, the first of which directly acknowledges the Treaty of Waitangi and the principle of partnership. This Standard requires teachers to “demonstrate commitment to tangata whenuataanga and Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand” (Education Council, 2017, p. 18). ‘Tangata whenuataanga’ is one of five cultural competencies described in a document titled *Tātaiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori Learners* (Ministry of Education, 2011). *Tātaiako* underpinned *Ka Hikitia*, the Maori Education Strategy (2008), and the aim of *Tātaiako* was to support teachers of Māori learners. *Tātaiako* was also used to inform the writing of the Standards for the Teaching Profession, and the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard appears to be aligned to tangata whenuataanga.

As a cultural competency, tangata whenuataanga is described as “affirming Māori learners as Māori - providing contexts for learning where the identity, language and culture (cultural locatedness) of Māori learners and their whanau is affirmed” (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 12). Providing more explicit directives than the Standard itself, *Tātaiako* provides exemplars of what success looks like, from both student and whānau perspectives, under the headings learner voice and whānau voice. However, as the document is aimed at Māori learners and has a focus on redressing the educational underachievement of Māori, there is the danger of viewing the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard as applicable only to Māori, rather than to all in New Zealand.

Behaviour indicators describe teacher practices that reflect each cultural competency in *Tātaiako* (Ministry of Education, 2011). In the case of tangata whenuataanga, an example of high quality education provided by teachers and the school provider is described as harnessing “the rich cultural capital which Māori learners bring to the classroom by providing culturally responsive and engaging contexts for learning” (p. 12). However, exactly what culturally responsive learning practices look like in practice has not been identified. Lourie (2015a) says that these types of policy
Statements are symbolic, in that they acknowledge biculturalism but lack clear goal statements to guide teacher practice. She highlights that this is made more difficult by a lack of a shared understanding of the meaning of biculturalism and “consequently schools put into practice what they can” (Lourie, 2015a, p. 55).

Statements on the Education Council’s website (www.educationcouncil.org.nz) under the heading of the ‘Narrative of Standards for the Teaching Profession’, describe the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard as the foundation on which subsequent standards build on to form a framework for quality teaching. According to this website, Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership describes how “all teachers need to frame how we consider ourselves as professionals and citizens with Aotearoa New Zealand. Further detail of this ‘deep context’ is provided in Our Code Our Standards under the heading of ‘elaboration of the standard’. These elaborations are said to support teachers to identify and develop high-quality practices in their settings and three are offered for the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard (Education Council, 2017). They state that teachers will “understand and recognise the unique status of tangata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand”, “understand and acknowledge the histories, heritages, languages and culture of partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi”, and “practice and develop the use of te reo and tikanga Māori” (p. 18). The practice and use of te reo, the Māori language, is a clear directive that would appear to be relatively easy to demonstrate and document for the purpose of appraisal, registration and certification. However, how teachers show and document their understanding and acknowledgment of the unique status given Māori as indigenous to New Zealand, remains elusive.

The Education Council (2017) also describes the high standards for ethical behaviour expected of every teacher in Our Code Our Standards. While the Code of Professional Responsibility is not appraised formally, it sets out high standards for ethical behaviour that are expected of members of the teaching profession and four commitments are made to: (1) the teaching profession; (2) to learners; (3) to families and whanau; and, (4) to society (Education Council, 2017). Three of the four commitments make direct reference to biculturalism, one specifically asking teachers to demonstrate an undertaking to the “Treaty of Waitangi partnership in the learning environment” (p. 10) and another, asking teachers, as a responsibility to society to “demonstrate a commitment to a Tiriti o Waitangi based Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 12). However, directives of what a Treaty of Waitangi partnership in the learning environment looks like or what a Treaty of Waitangi based Aotearoa New Zealand means for its citizens are missing.
The Image of Partnership

The Treaty of Waitangi is primarily about partnership (Durie, 1998, 2001, 2002; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). Durie (1998) suggests that the strength of the principle of partnership lies in the image of the two partners to the Treaty working together to realise mutually acceptable goals, in other words, a mutually beneficial relationship. The Waitangi Tribunal emphasised the obligation on both partners to “act reasonably, honourably, and in good faith, but derives these duties from the principle of reciprocity and the principle of mutual benefit” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001, p 77). Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development, believes that all other Treaty principles can be derived from the principle of partnership.

The image of partnership, according to Bishop and Glynn (1999), is a metaphor for “power-sharing in decision-making and goal-setting so that those who govern can do so in the knowledge that they are realising these mutually acceptable goals” (p. 196). This requires governing bodies to have consultation processes in place in order to negotiate ‘mutually acceptable goals’. These authors believe that this system of consultation needs to address issues of power and control. Bishop and Glynn (1999) present a model for evaluating power relationships devised from five issues: initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability. That is, “the voices (representation) need to be authoritative (legitimation) and the partnership will be accountable (accountability) to both partners, who in turn should be there at the start (initiation) to identify the benefits (benefits) both partners want from the enterprise” (p. 197). According to these authors, relationships that address these issues of power and control at the governance level can be generalised to teachers and classrooms where teachers and students ‘govern’ goals mutually established.

Bishop and Glynn (1999) state that the current pedagogy in New Zealand’s mainstream schools is underpinned by traditional metaphors of ‘knowledge transmission’ which are ‘successful’ for the dominant culture. They note that Pākehā curriculum developers tend to begin the process pondering what sort of knowledge needs to be included, whereas Māori curriculum developers start with listing principles and metaphors that guide people’s lives. Bishop and Glynn ask educational institutions and the teachers that work in them to critically reflect on the metaphors they use to conceptualise the teaching process. They offer other forms of relational metaphors, such as tino rangatiratanga and whakawhanaungatanga, with which they believe Treaty guarantees of power-sharing and partnership might be achieved in the classroom.
Defining tino rangatiratanga is a conceptual exercise (Bishop 2008; Glynn, 2015; Maaka & Fleras 2005). Even the Waitangi Tribunal (1987) say “the meaning of ‘tino rangatiratanga’ has caused us much trouble” (p. 185). Literal English translations range from ‘full chieftainship’, ‘full authority’, and ‘leadership’; however, it is important to note that authority is not seen to be imposed from a hierarchical structure in Māori society, but belongs to the people, “with chiefs as leaders, not rulers” (Waitangi Tribunal, 1987, p. 186). While the English equivalent is contentious, there is considerable agreement that tino rangatiratanga has taken on a figurative meaning of self-determination (Bishop 2008; Glynn, 2015; Maaka & Fleras 2005).

Central to the meaning of tino rangatiratanga is the right to determine and define one’s own destiny, and to define and pursue a method of realising that destiny (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Bishop 2008; Glynn, 2015; Maaka & Fleras 2005). Glynn (2015) believes that this concept has been given strength through the United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous people and highlights that Māori have two sets of rights, as citizens of, and indigenous to, Aotearoa New Zealand. Maaka and Fleras (2005) emphasis that indigenous rights are not a consequence of the Treaty of Waitangi but emerge from the principle of original occupancy. These authors take the view that tino rangatiratanga is about “forging a new social contract for living together differently” (p. 103) and advocate for bi-nationalism over biculturalism. They believe that the concept of biculturalism is limited because it only modifies existing systems that still require Māori to fit into a hierarchy, whereas their concept of bi-nationalism is based on power sharing and partnership, and constitutional change built on new foundational principles.

Statements in the first Standard for the Teaching Profession suggest that teachers are required to engage with and recognise indigenous rights. Demonstrating “commitment to tangata whenua” and understanding and recognising “the uniques status of tangata whenua” (Education Council, 2017, p. 18) are both statements that put forward the principle of indigeneity. Previously, indigeneity has been referred to as a ‘strong’ form of biculturalism underpinned by the principle of self-determination (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999). However, O’Sullivan (2007) argues that the principle of indigeneity and self-determination is an alternative framework for thinking about Māori relationships with the Crown, separate to biculturalism. Indigeneity discourse challenges the philosophical grounds of post-colonial notions of sovereignty and government (O’Sullivan, 2006) and many Māori researchers ask New Zealand society to engage with the principle of indigeneity (see, for example, Durie, 2001).
The Education Council offers a matrix that aligns the Standards for the Teaching Profession with the previous standards, the Practising Teacher Criteria. This matrix aligns the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard to two of the previous twelve Practising Teacher Criteria, criteria three and ten (Education Council, 2015). These criteria required teachers to “demonstrate commitment to the bicultural partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 11) and “work effectively within the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 14). On the document itself, Tātaiako aligns these two Criteria to the cultural competency tangata whenuatanga (Ministry of Education, 2011). The association between the Treaty of Waitangi, the concept of biculturalism, and the metaphor tangata whenuatanga, have been part of the appraisal system in New Zealand schools since 2011. However, the discourse of the Standards for the Teaching Profession in Our Code Our Standards appears to have shifted away from using the term biculturalism towards the terms ‘Treaty of Waitangi partnership’ and ‘tangata whenuatanga’, placing equal value on the concept of biculturalism and indigeneity.

The argument of indigeneity has raised a concern that “Māori might get a better deal than other citizens and that would offend the principle of equality and equal democratic rights” (Durie, 2002, p. 598). Durie (2002) believes that a shared understanding of citizenship could help to reconcile the three obligations of indigeneity, the Treaty of Waitangi relationship, and citizenship. According to Durie (2002), associating citizenship with ones’ democratic rights without placing equal value on citizenship as an enabler of active participation in society could be limiting peoples’ engagement with the concept of indigeneity and the Treaty of Waitangi relationship. Valuing indigeneity and tangata whenuatanga enables Māori to participate in Māori society (Bishop, 2008; Durie, 2001; 2002). However, as Durie (2002) says, “Far from conferring special rights on Māori individuals, the task is to ensure that the right to participate in whatever society is appropriate applies to both Māori and to other New Zealanders” (p. 600).

Managing Teacher Performance

External Accountability

In New Zealand, performance appraisal is a mandatory process internal to the school under the Performance Management in Schools Act (Ministry of Education, 1997). Boards of Trustees and school leaders design their own performance management systems and this creates the “potential for wide variation in the quality of practice” (Nusche et al., 2012, p. 77). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report produced by Nusche et al. (2012) found
considerable variance in the application of performance appraisal across schools in New Zealand. Their research showed that the quality of the appraisal process depended largely on the pedagogical leadership of the principal and the senior leadership team. In order to make teacher appraisal more effective in New Zealand, Nusche et al. (2012) recommended a process of external validation of school appraisal processes to ensure consistency and minimum standards are met. The OECD report noted that the Education Review Office had a role in guaranteeing systematic and coherent teacher appraisal was conducted in all schools.

The Education Review Office is a government department, set up under the State Sector Act 1988, to evaluate the quality of education provided in New Zealand schools. In 2015, the Education Council was set up as an independent statutory body to replace the New Zealand Teachers Council. On the first day of its operation the Council signed an agreement with the Education Review Office (ERO) to undertake the requirement to audit and moderate the appraisals of at least 10% of the practising certificates issued or renewed each year, an obligation under section 328 of the Education Act (1989). This audit process takes place in the context of regular ERO external evaluations of schools across New Zealand and focusses on teachers who were endorsed for full registration or a practising certificate in the twelve months prior to the review.

The report issued by ERO (2016b), entitled Appraisal as a Catalyst for Improved Learner Outcomes: One Year On, outlined the audit results after the first year. This report showed that nearly two thirds of the appraisals supporting renewal of certificates were judged satisfactory and this increased to three quarters for those being issued with full registration. Confusion over which standards and criteria teachers and leaders were to use was the most common reason for an appraisal not being considered satisfactory. Best examples of practice included appraisal processes that integrated cycles of reflection and feedback on practice from a range of perspectives. Taking personal responsibility to curate evidence from everyday practice was also cited as a commonality of best practice. However, ERO (2016b) noted that teachers and leaders in immersion settings found the documentation of the appraisal process challenging due to the “oral nature of their interactions and communication” (p. 8). The variance of effective appraisal process within schools was also highlighted. ERO recommended the provision of professional learning opportunities in appraisal workshops provided by the Education Council be extended.

The second report issued by ERO (2017) outlined the audit results of the second year of their three-year contract with the Education Council. Similar to the first year audit, there was a higher
rate of satisfactory issues of full registrations than renewals of certificates. Overall there was a small improving trend in the quality of appraisals, however, inconsistency of implementation within schools was highlighted again. Professional leaders who were aware of in-school variation said that more guidance for appraisers and teachers was needed “about what constitutes evidence and how to use the Criteria as the basis for curation of evidence practice” (ERO, 2017, p. 5). Providing professional development for appraisers on how to provide critical feedback and encourage deeper reflections on practice was also identified as an organisational issue that needed addressing. However, recommendations made by ERO and the Education Council in this 2017 report suggest that the onus is on schools to “make time to discuss and reflect on the new Code and Standards and the ways in which they might be to further develop aspects of teachers’ knowledge and practice” (p. 10). Two of the six recommendations suggest professional leaders and teachers use the Education Council website for professional learning.

ERO reviews schools, on average once every three years; however, evaluations are more frequent where performance is judged as poor, or less frequent where a school demonstrates good appraisal processes. While ERO does not publicly report on the performance of individual teachers, it does report on the overall performance of schools. These reports on individual schools are freely available to the public. According to Lourie (2016), this makes ERO evaluations a powerful auditing system.

ERO’s handbook, entitled School Evaluation Indicators (ERO, 2016a) is a guide for use by ERO evaluators when doing external evaluations. This publication makes a clear statement about biculturalism, asserting that “ERO is committed to honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand and the agreement that underpins relationships between Māori and the Crown” (p. 15). Derived from the valued outcomes in the New Zealand Curriculum, the handbook identifies four learner-focused outcomes together with indicators for ERO evaluators to focus on when reviewing schools. Indicators ask evaluators to look for students who use cultural knowledge and understandings to contribute to the creation of an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners. This suggests that evaluators can observe students using ‘cultural knowledge’ but does not specify what this looks like.

According to ERO (2016a), the learner-focused outcomes “support the three goals identified by Durie (2001) as critical for the educational advancement of Māori” (p. 16). Durie (2001) believes
it is unreasonable for the education sector to ignore the meaning of being Māori. He says that being Māori is a Māori reality and that “education should be as much about that reality as it is about literacy and numeracy” (Durie, 2001, p. 2). The three goals Durie (2001) proposes to use as a framework for Māori education are: enabling Māori to live as Māori, facilitating participation as citizens of the world, and contributing towards health and a high standard of living. In this same framework for Māori education Durie suggests the principle of indigeneity. Providing the resources for teachers to cultivate an understanding of the concept of biculturalism and its different forms, along with the principle indigeneity, is needed if teachers are to develop practices that reflect these concepts.

The *School Evaluation Indicators* also identify six key domains found to influence school effectiveness and student outcomes (ERO, 2016a). Under the domain of responsive curriculum, effective teaching and opportunity to learn, effective practice is identified as observing teacher practice that reflects the five cultural competencies outlined in the *Tātaiako* (2011). *Tātaiako* assures teachers that the competencies are not formal standards or criteria, but are associated to the Standards for the Teaching Profession developed by the Education Council. It appears that the cultural competencies described in *Tātaiako* are explicitly linked to ERO’s guidelines for the evaluation of school providers, and therefore could be considered formal criteria to measure the quality of education.

**Collective Responsibility**

The suitability of performance management in education is much debated (Forrester, 2011; Oldroyd, 2005; O’Neill & Scrivens, 2005). Policy-makers view performance management as a motivating mechanism that will drive teachers to perform to higher standards and improve student learning. However, Forrester (2011) takes the view that performance management and appraisal are forms of control that give school management the power to define what is appropriate employee behaviour. Forrester (2011) is concerned that the business orientated origins of performance management has driven the education sector towards a competitive culture “which has brought about a tick-box mentality” (p. 8). According to Oldroyd (2005), the higher level of professional autonomy in the teaching profession, combined with the complexity in measuring ‘learning’, highlight the difficulty of adopting a Performance Management System directly from the business sector. O’Neil and Scrivens (2005) raise the question of whether teachers should be measured by how they “exercise their moral judgement or the academic results they achieve?” (p.184). This emphasises the complexity that underpins teacher accountability and reveals the view
of performance management and appraisal as a regime of managerial control (Forrester, 2011; O’Neill & Scrivens, 2005).

In an educational setting, the ultimate purpose of appraisal should be to improve teaching and learning so that student learning outcomes can be improved. However, tensions arise when appraisal is practised. Cardno (2012) highlights the failure of many organisations attempts to introduce effective appraisal systems, blaming a lack of clarity on the values that underpin the dual purposes of performance appraisal, that is accountability and development, which inherently makes them ‘undiscussable’. Viewing accountability too narrowly in terms of prescription and surveillance enhances the tension between the two concepts of professional learning and professional accountability (Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo, & Hargreaves, 2015; Mayer et al., 2005; Upsall, 2001). Upsall (2001) states that New Zealand Government policy has focussed too heavily on external and individual forms of accountability and that this creates a culture of distrust in schools. She says that “changing the focus to foster internal accountability would encourage teachers to be reflective professionals seeking to improve their own practice” (p. 167).

Benade (2015) defines reflective practice as “on-going, regular and persistent use of reflective tools to engage, individually and collectively, in critical thinking about various aspects of practice (teachers’ work)” (p. 110). Benade believes that a willingness to question personal assumptions and beliefs is a necessary disposition of a reflective practitioner. According to Johns (2013), assumptions are deeply embedded beliefs and values that are central to our identity. Becoming consciously aware of ones’ assumptions is like getting to know oneself more clearly.

The work of Argyris and Schön (1978) influenced Benade’s position on critical reflective practice with their notions of single loop and double loop learning. Double loop learning involves teaching people to think more deeply about their own assumptions to solve complex problems (Argyris, 1977; Argyris & Schön, 1978). This lies in contrast to single loop learning which only permits a range of alternative actions to solve a simple problem, whereas double loop learning develops alternative thinking. According to Argyris (1977), if individuals are to move to double loop learning, they need to become aware of how their present assumptions about what is effective practice are counterproductive for the very kind of learning they need to be effective. Double loop learning means we must challenge and restructure deeply held assumptions and act in new and unfamiliar ways in order to solve complex problems (Argyris, 1977; Argyris & Schön, 1978;
Cardno, 2012). Cardno (2012) warns that while the idea of double loop learning is highly appealing, enacting it presents considerable challenges.

Internal accountability is defined by Fullan et al. (2015) as “taking responsibility for one’s actions” (p. 4). Educational internal accountability occurs when “individuals and groups willingly take on personal, professional, and collective responsibility for continuous improvement and success for all students” (Fullan et al., 2015, p. 4). A model of internal professional accountability, proposed by Hargreaves and Fullan (2012), is based on what they coin ‘professional capital’ which consists of three kinds of capital: human, social and decisional. Human capital is a measure of individual ‘talent’ or ‘quality’; social capital a measure of the quality of the group; and, decisional capital is the ability of individuals and groups to make effective judgements (Fullan et al., 2015; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). At the core of this model is the idea that teachers will become more internally accountable and responsible if policymakers take a professional growth approach and focus on creating the conditions for maximising social capital.

Research conducted by Leana (2011) shows that collaborative social capital is far more powerful in terms of making large sustained improvement in student learning than individual human capital. In the context of schools, Leana (2011) defines human capital as a “teacher’s cumulative abilities, knowledge, and skills developed through formal education and on-the-job experience” (p. 32). In sharp contrast, social capital is described as a teachers’ ability to gain knowledge from others. Social capital refers to the quality of the relationships among teachers and Leana’s research demonstrated that when there was a “feeling of trust or closeness among teachers” (p. 33) student achievement gains were above those seen in higher ability classes, with higher ability teachers, in a school with lower social capital. Developing how teachers as a team can best identify and respond to the needs of individual students may be the best investment for policymakers, school leadership teams, and appraisers.

According to Fullan et al. (2015), creating the conditions for team learning is critical to internal professional accountability. Team learning builds on the discipline of developing a shared vision and can be linked to the concept of synergy (Bush & Middlewood, 2005; Senge, 1990). According to Senge (1990), synergy develops when a shared understanding of the team’s purpose emerges and team learning is “the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (p. 236). Bush and Middlewood (2005) appear to consider the potential of team learning as a critical step in building organisational learning, but highlight...
challenges, such as the hierarchical framework of educational organisations and the low emphasis on team training and development.

A requirement of the *Performance Management in Schools Act* (Ministry of Education, 1997) is for Boards of Trustees to ensure each teacher is assigned one appraiser. The current appraisal system in most mainstream schools in New Zealand is of the hierarchical nature, where a ‘line manager’ appraises the teachers ‘below’ them. Heads of subjects appraise the teachers in their department, senior leaders appraise a number of Heads of departments, and the Principal appraises the senior leaders. Using team learning as a form of internal accountability would appear to be challenging in this single line accountability model. Additionally, how teams ‘capture’ and document team learning for the purposes of appraisal, registration, and certification renewal would need to be addressed.

**Professional Growth**

New Zealand has one of the highest within-school variances of student success in the world and the learners that experience the least success in New Zealand English-medium schools are also the fastest growing group in our population, Maori and Pasifika (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd., 2009). Castagno and Brayboy (2008) state that “the growing diversity of students in schools paired with the continued homogeneity of teachers makes the call for culturally responsive schooling more important than ever” (p. 942). The purpose of culturally responsive schooling is to improve students opportunities for academic success by placing students existing strengths and interests at the core of new learning (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). This requires the professional development of teachers and leaders who are culturally competent (Bishop, O'Sullivan & Berryman, 2010; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). The meaning of culturally competent teachers, what it looks like in practice, and how it can be appraised is the core question of my study.

Three years after the *New Zealand Curriculum* was released, ERO conducted an evaluation of its principles, with a focus on effective implementation of schools’ curricula and enactment in classroom curricula (ERO, 2011). In its findings, The Treaty of Waitangi ranked as the least evident principle in both the school and classroom curricula, signifying a correlation between school wide systems driven by management and classroom practice. Reading and discussing *Ka Hikitia*, the New Zealand government’s strategy for Māori education, was recommended by ERO (2011) as “a first step in developing knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi curriculum principle” (p. 4).
*Ka Hikitia - Acceleration Success 2013-2017* provides guidelines for leaders and teachers working with Māori students centred on outcome focused strategies in its goal to enable educational success as Māori (Ministry of Education 2013). ‘Māori achieving as Māori’ is a central concept of the *Ka Hikitia* strategy, however, this is not easy to measure, and as noted in the Auditor General’s report on Education for Māori, many schools struggle to apply the strategy (Auditor General, 2016). There is no clear and consistent guidance on how to translate the strategy into action and the information about educational success ‘as Māori’ is varied and not collected throughout the education sector (Auditor General, 2016). This report indicates a significant gap in information that the education sector needs to address. Furthermore, *Ka Hikitia* is a document underpinned by an attempt to redress the educational underachievement of Māori, endangering the view that the Treaty and the concept of biculturalism is for all citizens of New Zealand, not just Māori.

Bishop and Glynn (1999) claim that the ideology of cultural superiority that is fundamental to colonisation is perpetuated through control over curriculum and pedagogy. They maintain that if Māori people are to be guaranteed a share in the power of decision-making, then teachers and leaders must question issues of power and control. Exploring the issues of the power and control could be challenging for many teachers and leaders in mainstream secondary schools. The Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard appears to be asking us about our knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi and how we use this knowledge to frame ourselves as citizens of Aotearoa New Zealand. Making this personal knowledge public through the appraisal process may create unpleasantness for many teachers and leaders.

Cardno (2012) takes the view that “the most effective professional development that leaders and teachers can engage in involves the understanding and skill learning related to uncovering a defensive theory of action and adopting a productive theory of action” (p. 59). This position is influenced by the work of Argyris and Schön (1978) with their notions of theories of practice and mindsets. They distinguished between espoused theory and theory-in-use. The words we use to say how we would act in a given situation is called our espoused theory; however, the theory that is implicit in what we actual do is the theory-in-use. The research of Argyris and Schön discovered significant discrepancies between espoused theories and theories-in-use, and revealed that people were unaware of these inconsistencies. Most people espouse a productive theory of action governed by values to seek and give valid information and be open to challenge. However, research shows that a defensive theory of action, from which actions serve to block unpleasant information
that can lesson our control of a situation, is more than likely their theory-in-use (Argyris & Schön, 1978)

The Standards for the Teaching Profession are central to appraisal processes. The first of six purposes of the Standards for the Teaching Profession is to “describe the essential professional knowledge in practice and professional relationships and values required for effective teaching” (Education Council, 2017, p. 16). The interpretation of the first Standard, what it looks like in practice and how one appraises it, appears to require knowledge of the concepts of citizenship, indigeneity, and the Treaty of Waitangi principle of partnership. In-depth knowledge of Māori concepts and metaphors, such as tino rangatiratanga and the five cultural concepts outlined in Tātaiako, also appear to underpin this Standard.

**The Appraisal Role**

Cardno (2012) says that an effective performance appraisal system is based on the mutual agreement between appraiser and appraisee about performance expectations and the identification of areas for improvements. Generally, no formal training is required or given to those in appraisal roles in New Zealand mainstream schools. Nusche et al. (2012) state that developing competencies for appraisal is essential. They suggested that appraisers be trained on how to assess teachers against the teaching standards and how to give constructive feedback for further practice improvement. The audit of appraisals conducted by ERO (2017) shows that there is a demand for more professional development for appraisers on how to use the teaching standards, provide critical feedback, and, encourage reflections on practice. According to Nusche et al. (2012), in order to benefit from the outcomes of appraisal, appraisers need to be provided with support to understand the appraisal procedures, including coming to a shared understanding of teaching standards.

Cardno (2012) says that “when appraisal occurs in a system that integrates accountability and development in a framework of improving teaching and learning, the key activity that must occur is dialogue at all points of enacting the system” (p. 95). Performance appraisal can be a time of anxiety for many, especially if they view professional concerns as weaknesses (Cardno, 1995). This defensiveness can be further heightened if there is a lack of understanding of the Standards for the Teaching Profession. Nushe et al. (2012) state that appraisers need to develop the skillsof
Productive rather than defensive dialogue in order to nurture spaces conducive to developing shared understandings and professional growth.

Productive appraiser-appraisee relationships are underpinned by productive dialogue focussed on improving student learning outcomes. However, open dialogue carries risks (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cardno, 2012; Senge, 1990). According to Bolman and Deal (2008), courage and a high level of trust is required to openly express what one thinks and feels, and to actively seek understanding of others' thoughts and feelings. Senge (1990) describes this process as ‘suspending assumptions’, which is neither the suppression nor elimination of ones’ opinions but instead the process of becoming aware of ones’ assumptions through collective examination. Senge (1990) maintains that open dialogue cannot be achieved if we are “defending our opinions… or unaware that our views are based on assumptions, rather than incontrovertible fact” (p. 243).

Senge (1990) alerts us to two types of discourse: dialogue and discussion. He claims that appreciating the difference between dialogue and discussion can unlock the energy trapped in defensive routines. The purpose of discussion, as defined by Senge (1990), is to present ones’ view and to win, in contrast to the exploratory nature of dialogue, where one captures the situation from differing points of view to get a better understanding of the situation. Moving between dialogue and discussion, with an awareness of the differing rules and goals of each type of discourse, could achieve insightful dialogue and productive discussion. Bolman and Deal (2008) define this as ‘reframing’ and claim that “the ability to think about situations in more than one way” (p. 6) increases ones chances of solving complex problems successfully.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided a substantial review and critique of the relevant literature around the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism, with a focus on the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard for the Teaching Profession. Three key themes around the knowledge and requirements of demonstrating commitment to biculturalism within the appraisal process have been critiqued, and these themes reinforce this study. The next chapter will present the research methodology along with the process for data analysis and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the rationale for the adoption of a qualitative research methodology for my research study. An outline of the interpretive epistemology selected and the historical context within which it is located is described. The semi-structured interview method used for data collection is examined along with the central principles for determining participant selection. Data analysis, validity, and reliability are discussed and the ethical implications of my research are addressed.

Research Methodology

Paradigms

The word paradigm comes from the Greek word *paradeigma* which translates as ‘pattern’. It relates to a particular set of philosophical assumptions about what the world is made of and how it works (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) define a paradigm as a view of what counts as accepted knowledge and a way of pursuing knowledge.

Common contrasts are made between two paradigms called positivism and interpretivism (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Wellington, 2015). Positivism claims that there is a single reality that is observable and measurable, independent of the observer, and knowledge gained through the study of this reality is often labelled scientific (Bryman, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Wellington, 2015). Both Bryman (2012) and Wellington (2015) believe that it is a mistake to treat positivism as synonymous with the scientific because, as Wellington (2015) describes, Modern Science shows that physical science is not capable of absolute certainty with an observer potentially influencing that being observed. Since the 1960s there has been a move away from viewing scientific practice in positivist terms, however, as Bryman (2012) says, “the influence of this worldview on social science is hard to overstate...this is, if you like, the ‘standard’ way to ‘scientifically’ understand the world” (p. 27).

Cohen et al. (2011) believe that positivism is limited in its application of the study of human behaviour because “the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world” (p. 7). While many policy makers and politicians still view ‘hard’ scientific data as the best possible
evidence to aspire to in education (Wellington, 2015), Cohen et al. (2011) argue that positivism silences an important debate about values and beliefs, and fails to “take account of our unique ability to interpret our experiences and represent them to ourselves” (p. 15). In contrast, the interpretive paradigm is characterised by a concern for individuals and their interpretations of the world around them (Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al., 2011; Wellington, 2015). Bryman states, contextual understanding of values, beliefs and behaviour plays a significant role in the collection of data, as the interpretive researcher aspires to grasp the subjective meaning of social action.

**Epistemology and Ontology**

According to Merriam (2009), interpretive researchers do not find knowledge but they construct it. Constructionism is a term often used interchangeably with interpretivism (Bryman, 2012; Merriam, 2009). Constructionism is an ontological position that assumes reality as being socially constructed, a position that challenges the ontological position of objectivism that quantifies and applies measures to social life (Bryman, 2012). Ontology deals with questions about what things exist in the ‘real’ world whereas epistemology is concerned with deciding what counts as legitimate knowledge (Bryman, 2012; Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Davidson and Tolich assert that epistemological and ontological considerations are intertwined and are central to all social research (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). According to Cohen et al. (2011), ontological assumptions give rise to epistemological assumptions and these give rise to methodological considerations.

To research the appraisal of bicultural commitment in two New Zealand secondary schools, I have adopted an epistemological position of interpretivism. I believe an interpretive approach is appropriate because it enables the issue of the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism to be viewed through the eyes of teachers and appraisers and interpreted accordingly. Given the history of race relations in New Zealand and the emotions this subject can evoke the topic of biculturalism is acknowledged as being sensitive. This research explores an issue that could be deeply personal and I am fully aware that this subject will arouse a variety of subjective and potentially emotional viewpoints. This led me to adopt an epistemological position of interpretervism, thus the process of interpretation and reinterpretation of the beliefs and behaviour of teachers and appraisers is at the core of this study.

For this study, the research aims and questions were developed to explore, investigate and examine the values, beliefs, and behaviours of teachers and appraisers in two secondary schools to action and assess a commitment to biculturalism. Bryman (2012) states that interpretivism requires
researchers to grasp the subjective meaning of social action by gaining “access to people’s ‘common sense thinking’ and hence to interpret their actions and their social world from their point of view” (p. 30). The concept of biculturalism and the process of appraisal could be polarising and extremely private. In order to navigate these issues, thoughtful consideration was given to the epistemological position of interpretivism, and the selection of a qualitative research methodology.

The Qualitative Approach

Broadly speaking, researchers who have philosophical roots in positivism tend toward quantitative methodology whereas researchers who have interpretive roots tend towards qualitative methodology (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Merriam, 2009). According to Davidson and Tolich (2003), quantitative research and qualitative research have different starting points because “they assume different things about the world” (p. 19). However, many authors (see, for example, Cohen et al., 2011), argue against the polarisation of research into either quantitative or qualitative approaches, and their associated objectivity and subjectivity respectively. Bryman (2011) reiterates this warning and prefers to view the distinction between quantitative and qualitative research as tendencies and not absolutes.

The methodology most closely associated with interpretivism is qualitative research (Bryman, 2012; Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Qualitative research involves researchers collecting data from people in their own context and attempting to make sense of their experiences from their point of view (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Lichtman, 2013). Lichtman (2013) states that the key concern for qualitative research is “understanding the phenomenon of interest from the participants’ perspectives, not the researchers” (p. 14). The challenges teachers and appraiser face as they attempt to demonstrate a commitment to biculturalism reside in the hearts and minds of these practitioners. Consequently, the data collection for this research problem requires a methodology that emphasises words rather than quantification. For this reason, I selected a qualitative research methodology to explore the issues around the appraisal of bicultural commitment in two secondary schools in Auckland, New Zealand.

Sample Selection of Schools

The decision to gain participation from two secondary schools in the Auckland region was in some part due to convenience. Living and working in the Auckland region, and attending meetings to present the focus of my research in order to gain participation, along with conducting the
interviews, required the locality to be in the Auckland region. Bryman (2012) labels this convenience sampling, a type of non-probability sampling “that is simply available to the researcher by virtue of its accessibility” (p. 201). Therefore, it is impossible to generalise the findings of this research to other locations, however, qualitative research does not seek to generalise to the whole population but to “provide a precise (valid) description of what people said or did in a particular research location” (Davidson and Tolich, 2003, p. 34).

Coleman and Briggs (2007) believe that when convenience sampling is used by researchers as much information as possible needs to be reported about the sample and how it was selected. According to Coleman and Briggs this reporting is essential so that “readers can form their own judgement as to how such factors may affect any conclusions that are drawn from the research, and the potential for generalising from sample data to a wider population” (p. 135).

A total of seven schools were approached, first by post and then email (see Appendix A). The shared commonalities of the seven schools approached were that they were all co-educational English medium state schools with a Māori student population of less than 30%. Many Māori students attend schools where they form a small proportion of the total roll, which can make giving attention to Māori students and their whānau more of a challenge (Auditor General, 2016). This lack of attention could contribute to the challenges teachers and appraisers experience in demonstrating and appraising a commitment to biculturalism, key components of the research aims and questions of this study. This type of sampling is labelled as purposive sampling, that is, sampling in a strategic way, “with some purpose or focus in mind” (Punch, 2005, p. 187).

Bryman (2012) makes a clear distinction between convenience and purposive sampling, specifying that purposive sampling is guided by the research questions. While the schools approached were conveniently close to my place of work and home, their selection was intentional and rational and could be classed as a type of purposive sampling labelled ‘typical’. Wellington (2015) defines typical sampling as “sampling persons or organisations believed to be normal or ‘typical’” (p. 120). Schools were selected because the majority of secondary schools in New Zealand are English medium state schools, where Māori form a small proportion of the total roll (Auditor General, 2016). This does not mean that it is possible to make generalisations from the findings as the sample may not be representative of the possible sample population. However, according to Bryman (2012), qualitative research generalises to theory rather than populations.
There were a total of five positive responses and two schools were randomly selected and designated a label: School A and School B. Each school nominated a liaison person which helped with effective communication and potential interview participants. Both liaisons were deputy principals at their respective schools and chose to take part in the research themselves. Organisational consent was obtained (see Appendix B) and the liaisons were sent the appropriate information sheet (see Appendix C).

While both schools are large co-educational mainstream schools there are some important differences which may need further discussion. That is, School A has a Māori student population of 27% with an attached Māori medium unit. School B has a Māori student population of 8%. Moreover, School A has established co governance, that is representatives from both the Māori medium unit and the mainstream school sit on the Board of Trustees.

**Research Method: Semi Structured Interviews**

*The Interview Method*

Qualitative methodology investigates people in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). According to Davidson and Tolich (2003), qualitative research concerns interpretations and contextualisation and so qualitative methods are based on some variation of asking questions. My research centred around the thoughts and feeling of teachers and appraisers on biculturalism within the appraisal process. Consequently, for this research, interviewing was selected as the most appropriate research method for data collection.

Lichtman (2013) says that individual interviewing can be considered a “conversation with a purpose” (p. 189) and highlights that there are several types of interviews ranging from highly structured to little or no structure. Davidson and Tolich (2003) describe a semi-structured format as a “powerful research technique when not much is already known about the topic being researched, or where that topic is particularly complex” (p. 240). Using criteria to set the standard expected for teachers to be issued with a practising certificate is relatively new in New Zealand. Demonstrating a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership adds another complex dimension to the appraisal and registration process for teachers. In order to obtain an in-depth personal account from teachers and appraisers as they demonstrate and appraise commitment to biculturalism, interviewing using a semi-structured format was selected as the most appropriate research method for data collection.
Preparing the Interview Guide

Wellington (2015) suggests that the literature review around the research problem will identify themes and categories which will shape the interview schedule and consequently provide the basis for analysing data. However, Davidson and Tolich (2003) warn that themes should be treated as guides and not structures in qualitative research, implying the need for flexibility. Flexibility is valued in qualitative research and the ability to adapt to a changing emergent research problem is seen as a key strength of a qualitative researcher (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Lofland, Snow, Anderson & Lofland, 2006).

Bryman (2012) says interviews are a reconstruction of events. My research required teachers and appraisers to reflect on biculturalism within the appraisal process and explain how they have evolved in relation to the current situation. The semi-structured interview format was well suited to my research methodology because it provided a structure to focus on the aims and questions of my research and yet was flexible enough to explore and clarify issues through the use of follow-up questions.

According to Lichtman (2013), strategies such as ‘elaboration’ and ‘probing’ are key techniques researchers require to get participants to reveal what he or she thinks or believes about something. Elaboration provides an opportunity for the participants to say more and probing provides the interviewer a chance to get to the underlying meaning of what is said (Lichtman, 2013). The importance here is not the predetermined set of questions; rather the techniques needed to encourage participants to open up their worlds as the researcher prompts for more information and detail (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Lichtman, 2013). This, as Davidson and Tolich (2003) say, allows the researcher and the participant together to “construct the layers and layers of rich texture that is human experience” (p. 151).

The aims and questions of the research along with the three themes identified in my literature review were all used to guide the interview schedule (see Appendix D). As suggested by Bryman (2012), I conducted pilot interviews, not just to receive feedback on the interview questions but in order to gain some experience. I conducted four pilot interviews with a senior leader, two middle leaders and a classroom teacher all at my current place of work. I was able to get constructive feedback on both the wording and order of the questions that allowed the interviews to flow more naturally. These pilot interviews were essential as they allowed me to refine the interview schedule and grow in confidence in respect to the process of interviewing. Running four pilot interviews
also afforded me opportunity to get to know the interview schedule at a deep level, and according to Bryman (2012), this is an essential aspect to successful interviewing.

**Selection of Participants**

Interviews were conducted with a senior leader, a middle leader and a classroom teacher in each of the participating schools, a total of six interviews. In large secondary schools, the expectation is for principals to appraise senior leaders (deputy and assistant principals), senior leaders are allocated a number of middle leaders to appraise, and middle leaders appraise the teachers in their area of leadership. This research is focused on exploring how a commitment to biculturalism is demonstrated and appraised and the challenges experienced. Interviewing three practitioners at different management levels within each school allowed me to obtain data to gain multiple perspectives on the meaning of biculturalism within the same appraisal system.

All research involves sampling because no research can include “everyone everywhere doing everything” (Punch, 2005, p.187). Purposive sampling allows researchers to select participants who are “relevant to the research questions being posed” (Bryman, 2008, p. 415). A prominent type of purposive sampling approach is labelled as ‘criterion’, which Wellington (2015) defines as samples chosen according to predetermined criteria. Participants in this study were required to have engaged with the bicultural Standard for the Teaching Profession and have taught in New Zealand for at least five years. Senior and middle leaders were also required to have been in an appraiser role for at least three years. This was to ensure both teachers and leaders had taken part in at least three annual appraisals leading to their own re-certification, and that leaders had appraised others for at least three years leading to the re-certification of those they had appraised. In summary, for this research, the sampling approaches used were: convenience, typical and criterion (Bryman, 2012; Wellington, 2015). As Wellington says, “there are a range of sampling strategies with different labels, many of which overlap” (p. 120).

My intention was to email all staff to introduce myself and the research and follow this up by attending a morning meeting. I had planned to remain at the school after this meeting so that any potential participants had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the research focus, the criterion for participation, and obligations. I would have adopted a first-in approach to selection and take the first three participants to respond at each school that met the criteria stated above. However, the liaisons, both deputy principals at their respective school, chose to take part in the research and preferred to organise participants through ‘word of mouth’. I subsequently emailed
each interviewee the information sheet and the interview schedule before the interview. This allowed me to make contact personally and allow interviewees time to ask any questions they may have had before the interview.

**Conducting the Interviews**

All interviews took no longer than one hour and were conducted at the participants’ place of work. This provided the interviewees with a comfortable environment and eliminated the need for participants to travel unnecessarily. Two audio recorders were used to record each interview producing a digital audio file that was uploaded onto a computer for ease of transcription. I personally transcribed all interviews and this was emailed confidentially to each participant within a week of the interview. They were given two weeks from receipt of the email to make amendments and verify the content of the interview for use in the dissertation. Participants were also reminded that they could withdraw any information or from the research entirely at this stage. No interviewee made any changes to the transcripts.

Bryman says that “one of the main ingredients of the interview is listening (p. 478). According to Lichtman (2013), qualitative interviewing addresses ways to listen to participants speak their own words. It is more than just a set of questions; it is a process that requires a balance between being an active interviewer without being too intrusive. Carefully written open ended ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions, supported by the questioning strategies of elaboration, probing, and wait time suggested by Lichtman (2013), allowed the participants to reveal what he or she thought or believed about biculturalism within the appraisal process. Being ethically sensitive towards participants was essential (Bryman, 2012) and this meant cutting short a line of questioning when an interviewee became visible uneasy. The complex nature of demonstrating and assessing commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard meant that some participants became uncomfortable when asked about the types of evidence and documentation used for the purpose of appraisal. This response required that I employ ethical practice and move to a different question on the interview schedule.

All participants were asked the same set of questions, with the only variance being an additional question asked of the senior and middle leaders regarding their experiences of appraising other practitioners on their commitment to biculturalism. On closing the interview, I provided the opportunity for participants to add any additional comments they felt they didn’t have the opportunity to address through the questions I asked. This closing question was vital and revealed
some meaningful and useful data. This may have been due to the positive rapport developed throughout the interview process.

Lichtman (2013) says interviewers need to be relaxed, accepting, and approachable so that participants feel comfortable. This was achieved by allowing time at the beginning of the interview to chat about the day and discuss any questions they may have about the research. All participants were reminded that any information provided or in fact their participation, could be withdrawn at any time after receipt of the transcript. This also provided an opportunity for interviewer and interviewee to read over the information and sign the participant consent form (Appendix E) before the interview began.

Validity

Understanding

Validity, according to Cohen et al. (2011), has different meanings in quantitative and qualitative research. These authors state that it is important for the researcher to demonstrate “fidelity to the research approach” (p. 180) and to discuss validity within the research paradigm being used. The focus of my research is on exploring how teachers and appraisers interpret their experiences of providing and assessing measurable evidence of commitment to biculturalism, and this is matched with an epistemological position of interpretivism. Interpretivism requires researchers to grasp the subjective meaning of social action and this epistemological position falls under the umbrella of qualitative research (Bryman, 2012; Merriam, 2009). Merriam (2009) says that qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret and make meaning of their experiences, and for this reason, a qualitative methodology is judged as the best approach for my research problem.

Cohen et al. (2011) state that in qualitative research, ‘understanding’ may be a more suitable term than ‘validity’, alluding to the highly subjective nature of interpreting meaning to what people say and write. In the case of the method used in my research to collect data (semi-structured interviews), I had the opportunity to increase validity by probing for deeper understanding and asking for clarification, a prospect not available with other methods such as questionnaires (Lichtman, 2013). According to Wellington (2015), developing a deep sense of a person’s understanding of a situation is a principle of validity in qualitative research. Individual interviewing helped me develop a deep sense of participants’ understanding of demonstrating commitment to biculturalism within the appraisal process.
The quality of the conversation depends on the quality of the questions asked and Davidson and Tolich (2003) suggest researchers start the process of writing good questions by deciding what they really want to know, and to ensure questions are pretested on a small group of people. Bell (2010) states that pre-testing is an integral part of the research process that reduces time and energy wastage, and improves the validity of the data collected. As mentioned earlier, I piloted my interview four times and invited my colleagues to offer feedback regarding my elaborating and probing skills during the interview. These strategies are recommended by Lichtman (2013) as they encourage participants to reveal their values and beliefs. Improving these techniques helped me contextualise the views of the people interviewed improving the validity of the interview method employed.

**Trustworthiness**

The results of the small sample of schools selected for my research may not be generalisable to other locations, however, the strength of qualitative research lies in its validity (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Validity tells us whether a method or research tool measures what it is supposed to measure (Bell, 2010; Cohen et al., 2011; Wellington, 2015). Bell (2010) highlights that the structure or design of the research determines the conclusions that can be drawn from it, and thus, focussing on the quality of the design is a measure of validity. No measurement can be 100 percent valid, as Cohen et al. (2011) remind us that all measurements have a level of uncertainty or error associated with them. According to Wellington (2015), researchers can only lay claim to the validity of the tool or method used to make measurements. The depth and richness of the information I collected using semi-structured interviews will allow readers to make judgements about the applicability of my outcomes to other school contexts.

A qualitative researcher’s role is to construct and interpret the reality of the person being interviewed, which assumes that reality is socially constructed (Merriam, 2009). Information gathered, interpreted, and organised is filtered through the researcher’s point of view (Bryman, 2012). Lichtman (2013) reiterates this message, encouraging researchers to accept that they are not trying to be objective but instead to acknowledge subjectivity. Recognising that this research problem has evolved out of my own frustrations with needing to identify effective measurable evidence of bicultural commitment, my own experience may influence my findings. By placing a greater emphasis on reflection and taking a critical attitude towards the interpretation of data, along with forewarning my readers of my possible bias, the quality of the data is likely to increase.
Personal involvement and partiality could be viewed as a disadvantage to using the interviewing process as an instrument of data collection. However, interpretive research involves people in social settings requiring interpretations of subjective meaning (Bryman, 2012; Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Merriam, 2009). In fact, Davidson and Tolich (2003) say that subjectivity is a valued part of qualitative research because this type of research approach does not seek to “generalise to the whole population but to provide a precise (or valid) description of what people said or did in a particular research location” (p. 34).

**Triangulation**

The term triangulation is used by qualitative researchers to describe the use of multiple methods or perspectives of data collection to study human behaviour (Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al., 2011). According to Cohen et al. (2011), “triangulation is a powerful way of demonstrating concurrent validity, particularly in qualitative research” (p. 195) and these authors offer numerous types of triangulation within which different data sources can be used. Triangulation is described by Bryman (2012) as “the use of more than one method or source of data in the study of a social phenomenon so that findings may be cross-checked” (p. 717). Interviewing three practitioners at different management levels within each school allowed me to gain multiple perspectives on biculturalism within the appraisal process and enabled me to obtain a comprehensive picture of the challenges teachers and appraisers encounter in the appraisal of commitment to biculturalism. I was able to compare the data collected from individual interviews with a senior leader, middle leader and teacher within two schools and find similarities and differences, identifying categories and themes. Data collected from each of the two schools participating was also compared and contrasted, which again strengthened the robustness of my findings.

**Analysis of the Data**

**An Inductive Approach**

One of the advantages of the interview method is the ability to investigate a great many areas, which Davidson and Tolich (2003) call the ‘texture’ of the data, however, the collection and then subsequent analysis of the data is extremely time consuming. Data analysis, according to Lofland et al., (2006) is “a kind of transformative process in which the raw data are turned into findings or results.” (p. 195). Lofland et al., (2006) say that data analysis is about searching for themes and patterns in order to draw conclusions and is “skewed in the direction of induction” (p. 195).
The process of induction allows theoretical observations to emerge out of the data, that is, theory is the outcome of the research (Bryman, 2012; Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Bryman (2012) claims that the commonest view of the relationship between theory and research is the process of deduction, usually associated with a quantitative approach, where the theory determines what the researcher tests. Deductive and inductive processes, according to Bryman (2012), are better thought of as tendencies rather than opposites and highlights that an inductive analysis is likely to involve an amount of deduction. Davidson and Tolich (2003) reiterate this idea maintaining that very little research is purely inductive or deductive in the real world.

Qualitative research produces large amounts of data and because of the inductive nature of qualitative analysis, it follows that the highly interactive process between the researcher and the data is a labour-intensive and time-consuming process (Lofland et al., 2006; Wellington, 2015). Wellington (2015) proposes three stages to guide the activity of analysing qualitative data: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Data reduction requires the researcher to become engrossed in the data, then stepping back and reflecting on the data, and finally beginning the process of coding or categorising sections of the interview transcripts in order to identify themes (Lofland et al., 2006; Wellington, 2015). Data display is referred to by Lofland et al. (2006) as ‘diagramming’ and these authors believe a diagram is both a product and activity of analysis. Designing a display, whether it is a matrix or chart, requires the researcher to select data and choose the form it should be entered into the display. The last step, conclusion drawing, highlights that the searching for themes and patterns is about the transformative process in which data is turned into findings related to the aims and questions of the research problem (Lofland et al., 2006; Wellington, 2015).

**Data Coding**

Coding is described as the process of creating categories, patterns, or recurring themes, used to organise the data via the application of different frameworks (Lofland et al., 2006; Wellington, 2015). Lofland et al. (2006) differentiate between initial coding and focussed coding by emphasising that the former requires the inspection of interview transcripts line by line and reflecting on open-ended questions such as: What is this an example of? What does it represent? What do these actions and events take for granted? On the other hand, focussed coding is more conceptual, asking more analytical questions, such as: What topic is this an example of? What question about a topic does this item of data suggest? What intention is being suggested? Lofland
et al. (2006) suggest that focussed coding leads to identifying research themes and the second stage of displaying the data.

Initial coding was the process I employed to create categories and emerging themes. Reading through each transcript in detail and allocating codes to responses provided me with an impression of the data in relation to my research aims and questions. This produced numerous and varied labels of codes, as predicted by Lofland et al. (2006). These initial codes were revisited using the more conceptual questions suggested by Lofland et al. (2006) in order to move towards categorising my data more thoroughly for further analytical elaboration.

Bryman (2012) states that the research questions and literature review can help to identify the key categories and themes, and these were incorporated into the framework which helped me work methodically through the transcripts to code the data. However, Bryman warns against becoming “too locked in or committed to a particular theoretical perspective” (p. 217) and encourages researchers to think flexibly. It was important to keep an open mind when viewing and reviewing my collected data to ensure that the findings were based on the participants’ voices and experiences. Bryman (2012) also highlights the possibility of losing the context of what is said with thematic coding. I was conscious of analysing the context of the response prior to coding it in order to ensure the trustworthiness of my findings.

To assist me through this process I made use of memo writing, that is writing notes to myself to serve as reminders of my thinking and to record my reflections. Lofland et al. (2006) claim that writing memos is fundamental to making sense of your data and serves as an intermediate step between coding and the first draft of a completed analysis. Memo-taking encouraged me to reflect on my initial thoughts and impressions while immersed in the data. As Allen (2017) says, researchers can ensure “the trustworthiness and credibility of their claims by constantly comparing their findings and emergent themes with their data sets to ensure their interpretation is in fact grounded within the voice of their participants” (p. 81).

**Ethical Issues**

**Description**

According to Wellington (2015), the main criterion for educational research is that it should be ethical. Terms such as morals, values, and principles underpin ethics (Bryman, 2012; Wellington, 2015). Wellington (2015) defines an ‘ethic’ as “a moral principle or a code of conduct which
actually governs what people do” (p. 113). For Bryman (2012), the ethics of social research centres around how we should treat the people on whom we conduct research. Ethical issues can arise throughout the research project, from the initial planning to the findings of the research (Wellington, 2015). A researcher needs to recognise the demands of ethical conduct throughout a project and focus on protecting the people in a study from any possible harm. As my research involved interviewing people, it was essential that ethical practices were employed throughout the study.

Concerns arise in the four areas of: harm to participants, informed consent, invasion of privacy and deception. Bryman (2012) suggests that harm can manifest itself in many ways such as loss of self-esteem and stress. In terms of using interviews as my method of data collection, these were kept to a minimum amount of time and conducted at an appropriate hour and place to avoid invading participants’ privacy (Wellington, 2015). It was essential that ethical practices were employed and I made sure to monitor participants’ physical behaviours during interviews to ensure that they were not becoming uncomfortable with any of the questions asked.

**Informed Consent**

It was important to gain permission by way of informed, voluntary consent. This meant, before willing participants received a written agreement and consent form to complete, I needed to seek organisation consent from the participating school principals (Appendices A and B). Participants were ensured of confidentiality before the interview through emails and the information sheet (Appendix C). Before the interview and the signing of the consent form (Appendix E) participants were given the opportunity to ask questions about the research and they were reminded of their ability to withdraw any information from the transcripts or their participation within two weeks of receiving the transcript. The interview schedule was also sent through to participants before the interview as a means of developing a deeper understanding of the research focus before the interview.

**Anonymity and Confidentiality**

In order to maintain confidentiality, the records and identities of participants were maintained as confidential and stored securely, taking care to designate labels to schools and pseudonyms to teachers in the presentation of the research. In the case of my research on the appraisal of bicultural commitment in two Auckland secondary schools, I have not been able to use some data in order to maintain school confidentiality as readers may be able to identify the school and hence specific
participants. The anonymity of the participant is partial because participants will be able to identify the other two interviewees from their own school. However, they understood this issue and this was not a concern. It was more important to be mindful of certain findings that could lead to individual schools being identified.

**Ethics Proposal**

An ethics proposal was developed and presented to the Unitec Research Ethics Committee. This was approved, providing a safeguard that the research project complied with ethical standards and had the appropriate protocols in place. This ensured some protection from any potential issues for the participants, myself, and the academic institution.

(Unitec, 2018-1018)

**Summary**

In this chapter, I have provided an examination of my research methodology and an explanation of the rationale underpinning the interpretive epistemological position I have taken for this research project. The semi-structured interview method used for data collection was described, and the way in which the data was analysed, along with considerations for validity, were discussed. Finally, the ethical implication of my research was presented. In the following chapter, I present the significant findings from the six semi structured interviews conducted in two secondary schools in New Zealand.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings gathered from two secondary schools in Auckland, New Zealand. Two senior leaders, two middle leaders and two classroom teachers were interviewed using a semi-structured format. This research is focussed on developing a deeper understanding of how teachers meet the Professional Standard for bicultural commitment in secondary schools, within the appraisal process. Gathering data from two different schools enabled me to compare the perspectives of each. Analysis of the data meant I was able to identify similarities, differences, and aspects that were unexpected. Within this analysis, I was also able to compare the perspectives of a senior leader, a middle leader, and classroom teacher within the same appraisal system.

The findings are organised by the four categories that emerged from the data itself: The Purpose of Appraisal; The Purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession; Understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi Partnership Standard, and; Accountability for Biculturalism. These categories are then broken down into a range of sub categories, developed from the data during the analysis. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, the categories and sub categories did not necessarily appear during a direct line of questioning. Rather, participants shared their thoughts and experiences, categories emerged from the connections participants made. The perspectives of the different schools and different management levels of each school are presented within these four categories.

Profiles of Participating Schools and Interviewees

For the purpose of the study I have used a letter to identify each school, school A and school B, and each practitioner was assigned a code shown in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Codes to identify interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leader</td>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>SLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Leader</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While school A and B were randomly selected from five responses, it is interesting to note the differences which need further discussion. School A has a Māori student population of 27% with an attached Māori medium unit. Moreover, School A has established co-governance, that is representatives from both the Māori medium unit and the mainstream school sit on the Board of Trustees. Interestingly, while school B has a comparatively small Māori student population of 8%, Pākehā student population is not the majority, at only 20%. Four of the six interviewees discussed their understanding of commitment to biculturalism with respect to their own ethnic group, and for this reason the ethnicities of the interviewees are also shown in the table below.

Table 4.2: Profile of Participating Schools and ethnicities of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori medium unit</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-governance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of Senior Leader</td>
<td>English/British</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of Middle Leader</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Māori and Pākehā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Appraisal**

The participants provide their understanding of the purpose of teacher appraisal, along with examples of how the appraisal process is conducted at their schools.

**Emphasis on Professional Development**

When asked to explain their understanding of the purpose of appraisal, the common thread between all six participants was their emphasis on appraisal being a supportive process for teachers to reflect on their practice. This theme is encapsulated in the following statements made by the senior leader and the classroom teacher from school A.

*My understanding is that the purpose of appraisal is, rather than being a check-up, it’s a right which is guaranteed for staff to get the feedback they need to develop themselves. (SLA)*

*To have a second opinion on your practice and to reflect on that and to improve practice and improve outcomes for students. (TA)*
This concept of professional development based on reflective practice as the key component of appraisal was evident in many of the statements made by all six participants.

In school A, when discussing the appraisal system, the term ‘accountability’ was only used by the middle leader in terms of being accountable to the community to support the professionalisation of teaching. The middle leader from school B also discussed this idea of appraisal being a mechanism for dialogue with the community and the professionalism of teaching.

*To value teachers as a profession so that kind of accountability is important and so the dialogue that you have with outsiders as well as what you do in, has to translate outside as well.* (MA)

*To ensure the professionalism of Teaching, but that’s kind of from an outside looking in. But inside the purpose of Appraisal is to examine, self-examine and examine each other’s practice.* (MB)

Only two interviewees made this point, interestingly the middle leaders from each school.

The senior leader from school B was clear about the dual aims of appraisal: making teachers accountable for their performance; and using appraisal information for staff development. Referring to the Education Council registration process, SLB used terms such as *obligation* and *mandatory* to describe making teachers accountable for their performance. However, her opinion was that viewing appraisal this way made it appear onerous and that it was important to change this perception. This idea was a key component in School B’s decision to move to an appraisal system focussed on inquiry.

*So most schools see appraisal as cumbersome and another chore. I don’t think you can change that, and I think that’s why we have shifted appraisal to not being appraisal but appraisal as inquiry and what falls out of that should be appraisal.* (SLB)

The middle leader and classroom teacher from school B concurred with this concept and used ‘soft’ accountability terms when describing the purpose of appraisal, such as *checks and balances to some degree* and *a checkpoint process* respectively. Both participants emphasised the shift towards an appraisal process that had become centred around inquiry, data and priority learners (such as Māori and Pacific students). It was believed by all three practitioners at school B that an inquiry focussed appraisal system would make the process more authentic and valued by teachers.
In contrast, the senior leader from school A was cautious about an inquiry approach to appraisal. He was wary that the purpose of inquiry could become to meet the Standards for appraisal, making it a sterile thing.

> The point of inquiry should be about on really improving student outcomes and improving teaching, and of course that is what the purpose of appraisal should be about. So the two should nice and neatly dovetail but I think that sometimes the desire to generate the robustness of the appraisal has constrained the nature of the inquiry. (SLA)

The middle leader from school A briefly mentioned inquiry as a mechanism for professional growth that could feed into the appraisal process, however, TA did not discuss inquiry at all during the interview.

**Forms of Accountability**

School A separated the dual purposes of appraisal, accountability and development, by associating attestation as a minimum accountability framework and appraisal as a framework for professional growth. While there was a lack of clarity around the connections between attestation, appraisal and the renewal of Practising Certificates, it was clear that school A viewed attestation as a means to reach minimum standards.

> I think trying to pin down, really clearly appraisal and attestation and the relationship between the two is really vague nationally and really quite confused. I think, historically, the view of the college has been that attestation is essentially about meeting minimum standards, and is for the purpose of 'sign off', and then appraisal is actually about target setting and development and, more as progressional. And I quite like that distinction. (SLA)

Both the middle leader and classroom teacher from School A also made a distinction between attestation and appraisal, however, there was some confusion as to how these linked to the three yearly renewal of practising certificates. What was evident though, was a clear aim to avoid an appraisal process becoming a procedural tick-box exercise.

> Well, I think it sometimes feels a bit adhoc, in the sense that we link our appraisal goals always to professional development … and in terms of school wide, we have tried to link the Code and the
Standards to our appraisal, so that actually it isn’t something that we just tick the box and when registration comes it’s not a matter of thinking oh my gosh, I’ve got to do this that and the other. (MA)

Purposefully avoiding this ‘tick-box’ mentality was also evident in school B. All three practitioners saw the Standards for the Teaching Profession as a way to guide appraisal process away from viewing accountability as ‘templates that needed filling in’. Accountability was viewed as: a mechanism to identify teachers who needed support and coaching; reflective practice whether individual or collective; and an opportunity to celebrate good practice.

I see appraisal as a supportive thing, I see it as an opportunity for people to share good practice and it’s also an opportunity to discover when practices may be not as good as they could be but it’s not a pejorative thing. It’s not a finger wagging process. (MB)

Key Findings
All six participants viewed professional growth centred on improving learner outcomes as the main purpose of appraisal. When asked what the purpose of appraisal was, obtaining and reflecting on feedback to improve learning and teaching was discussed by five participants. However, from whom and in what form this feedback was given was not specified. Both schools desired a move away from a tick-box mentality of appraisal towards viewing accountability in terms of reflective practice and the celebration of high quality practice. Accountability was also seen as a means to determine who needed support and coaching. One school had moved to an inquiry based appraisal system while the other was explicitly wary of integrating the inquiry process into an appraisal process. There was general confusion amongst all six interviewees about the connection between the processes of appraisal, attestation and the renewal of Practicing Certificates.

Purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession

The interviewees described their understandings of the purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession and offered examples of how they were being used in their contexts.

Guidelines for Growth

When asked what the purpose of the Standards for Teaching Profession were, all six participants talked about them as broad guidelines to becoming an effective teacher. Discussing the Standards as ‘a way of being’ was proposed by three participants. The middle leader from school A believed that the Standards were a guide to teacher reflection and that this “should be ingrained and embedded
in our profession”. This idea of the Standards for the Teaching Profession being used to aid the ‘continual process of becoming’ was also expressed by the classroom teacher from school B.

The purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession is effective teaching, that basically keeps teachers on the balls of their toes and are constantly upskilling and challenging their way of thinking, and those Standards keep teachers current but also give balance and breadth to the complexity of teaching. (TB)

One participant, the senior leader from School A, talked about the aspirational or generic nature of the six Standards explicitly, stating that this allowed teachers to reach the Standards at different levels. His opinion was that the different levels within the Standards were an important aspect that enabled professional growth. Although no— one else made this point about reaching the Standards, I am adding it because it was surprising.

Essentially I would say they are aspirational targets which provide scope for how you might grow. I would like to think there is minimum you can do to reach the standard but then there’ll be different layers, where you could meet the standard at an exceptional level or a strong level. So there’s a growth projection. So a vehicle for growth. (SLA)

Naturally Occurring Evidence

When asked about the purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession, five of the six interviewees compared the new six Standards for the Teaching Profession to the 12 Registered Teacher Criteria. They believed that the nature of the new Standards made it feel less ‘tick-boxy’ and offered a more holistic approach to professional growth within the appraisal process.

It’s a lot clearer, there is a lot more value put on to it, like it’s values based…We had the Practising Teacher Criteria, the PTCs and before that was the RTCs, that was tick box, anyone could tick boxes, anyone could say that they were doing the Māori component, anyone. But were they really? Whereas the STPs and the Code of Professional Practice actually makes you identify those requirements. (SLB)

The senior leader from school A stated that the new six Standards were all focussed on learning and improving student outcomes which could not be said about the previous Registered Teacher Criteria. He was optimistic about using the Standards in a more natural way, and this was
mentioned by all three participants from school B. There was a common perception across both schools that the Standards described a ‘naturally occurring set of guidelines’ and that this was an opportunity to simplify the appraisal process.

So the Standards within the school are fed in through the inquiry process and supposedly or the concept of naturally occurring evidence and that is supposed to feed into all the Standards. So it’s not like a siloed approach, which it has been in the past, where you do stuff relevant to each STP or the RTCs what they used to be called. Now we are kind of placing the learners at the centre within an inquiry based approach or model and the STPs [Standards for the Teaching Profession] naturally feed into the inquiry. (TB)

While School B took the view that their inquiry centred appraisal system would naturally feed into the six Standards, School A took a completely different approach. They had begun the process of writing standard role descriptions of what someone in a position does to meet those Standards in their daily work. The Heads of Departments along with the senior leaders collaboratively developed an understanding of middle leader quality practice across the breadth of their everyday role against the six Standards. The school planned to complete this process for classroom teachers and other positions, such as senior leaders in the near future. Referring to a professional development workshops run by the Education Council, the senior leader from School A stated that the argument was:

If you make that kind of list or template then you have that as the default, and this is what you say people are doing and if it hasn’t come up in the appraisal meetings, that someone is not doing these things, then you can take it as read that they are. So rather than them going from having to find evidence of every little micro bit of what they’re doing, you flip the onus and the onus is on that to be raised if there is a concern. (SL-A)

This is not to say that School A did not have an inquiry focussed professional development programme, on the contrary, both the senior leader and middle leader mentioned the collaborative inquiries teachers and leaders were involved in. However, this was seen as just one of the mechanism for professional growth and one method or ‘vehicle’ that could be used to demonstrate many of the six Standards.
**Key Findings**

To summarise, the Standards for the Teaching Profession were seen as guiding principles for professional growth. Five out of the six participants viewed the new six Standards as a positive step towards a more holistic approach to improving teacher practice within the appraisal process. There was a common perception amongst all interviewees that teachers generated naturally occurring evidence against the six Standards in their everyday practice. However, the approaches taken by the two schools in generating evidence against the six Standards differed greatly. School B used an inquiry focussed approach to appraisal which they believed the Standards for the Teaching Profession *naturally fed into*. While this structure was in its infancy, all three participants from School B were optimistic that this approach would move the appraisal process away from a compliance exercise towards more meaningful professional growth and improved learner outcomes. School A had moved to writing standard role descriptions against the six Standards for the Teaching Profession. These agreed quality practice descriptions could be assumed by default if not raised as a concern, in other words, the practice and hence evidence could be assumed unless raised as a concern by the appraiser or appraisee.

**Understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi Partnership Standard**

The interviewees described their understanding of the Standard for the Teaching Profession labelled ‘Treaty of Waitangi partnership’ and discussed the challenges of coming to a shared understanding.

**Interpretation**

When asked what their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was, all six participants suggested it was a *way of being or a mindset* that allowed you to view the world from different perspectives. The senior leader from School A said that this Standard was about setting and developing a mindset and a way of thinking that should flow into and inform the other five Standards. This idea was also supported by the senior leader from School B who emphasised the deliberate act of having this Standard as the very first Standard from which a framework for quality teaching could be built. This senior leader also believed that placing the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard first was a way to avoid tokenism and align ourselves with other professions like that of the legal and medical professions.

*You know, it was done on purpose, to have that as the very first STP, and one of the reasons why is because, it’s very easy for teachers to tick off oh I say kia ora all the time … and being surface in that*
sense. But we have an obligation, it’s in all the legal documents so, it’s about time that we are aligned ourselves with the rest of our professional cousins. (SLB)

All three participants from School A referred to the presence of the Māori immersion unit and the co-governance of the school when discussing their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership. MA talked about being immersed in a bicultural setting that allowed new teachers to come to an understanding of genuine and meaningful partnership.

I think it’s looking at two ways of operating and it’s like the duality of how we operate here, something that we are really proud of. The way we operate is bicultural in the sense that we have got the [Principal of the Māori medium school], and there is a visible presence at our meetings, in terms of governance, the decision-making, and I think it’s a perspective that we have adopted of how we govern and make decisions at that level, but it is also in the day to day running of how we operate. (MA)

This idea of power sharing in decision-making from the highest level, that is at the governance level, flowed into statements made about professional development, classroom activities and the relationships between students and teachers. TA believed that a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi was about considering a Māori perspective, and that teaching and learning were all opportunities to demonstrate respect for the Treaty of Waitangi. This teacher believed that working at a school that had an attached Māori medium school and co-governance was a privilege because the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard had a real presence in the day to day running of the school.

Four of the six participants interviewed believed that at the heart of this Standard were the students and the relationships you formed with them. The middle leader from school B suggested that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership was about context, and that the students were the context. According to MB, this standard was about teachers forming strong relationships with all students so that the content and context used for learning were connected to their lives. Providing Māori content when appropriate was important to both MB and TB, however, this was not enough to engage Māori learners, and both practitioners said this could be viewed as tokenism. Speaking specifically about Māori learners, TB suggested that a Treaty of Waitangi partnership in the classroom was about teacher pedagogy being informed by the knowledge Māori learners bring with them.
So in terms of the teaching practice, it’s how do we engage them as learners in the classroom, what knowledge do they bring to the classroom, how can we as teachers in terms of our pedagogy use what they know as a way of being within the learning. (TB)

**Challenges in Interpretation**

The Treaty of Waitangi document was discussed by the classroom teacher from School B who highlighted who the partnership was between, the principle of collaboration, and the need to address injustices suffered by Māori.

It's a partnership between the indigenous people who arrived in New Zealand, Maori, and the subsequent arrivals. And so that is working in collaboration with each other. It's also addressing injustices with the Maori people as a result of the colonisation process. (TB)

According to TB, the tokenistic practices and evidence gathered for the purpose of appraisal by some teachers were a reflection of the work that needed to be done in addressing ignorance towards the injustices that Māori experienced as a result of colonisation. Interestingly, no one else connected the lack of high quality practice associated to this Standard as evidence of a need to engage with a decolonisation process.

The classroom teacher from School A also spoke specifically about the Treaty of Waitangi document in terms of the partnership between Māori and Pākehā. TA raised a concern that people who weren’t born in New Zealand or later migrants may not have an understanding of the Treaty or biculturalism. Their interpretation of the Treaty may leave them wondering where they fit into this partnership, and therefore not think it relevant.

One student teacher I had recently, had come from Europe to New Zealand, and was training at the University, and they couldn’t understand why they had to show evidence to meet that criteria, because to them, in their perspective or their interpretation of the Treaty, it was between Pākehā or the Crown and Māori. They couldn’t see where they fitted into that partnership. Therefore, they didn’t believe it was really relevant for them. Not something they had to demonstrate in class. (TA)

Five of the six participants believed that coming to a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was a process that needed to be led by management. Building a shared understanding of this Standard was a process School A was embarking on, described by
MA as *our journey together*. Breaking down barriers, and accepting and respecting the guiding principles of the Treaty of Waitangi document were important aspects of this process that required all staff members to be a part of. According to MA this needed to be driven by management.

*The challenge is, I think has been that top management need to drive it, and they do it through professional development, we do it through our staff meetings, we do it through our procedures. … we need to demand and expect of ourselves and our colleagues that is how we are moving forward, and we need to take everybody. Management has to drive it.* (MA)

Creating a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and what this could look like in practice were also key concerns for the middle leader and classroom teacher from School B. A large variance on how this Standard was practiced and evidenced was highlighted by these participants. Their view was that while individual teachers needed to take responsibility for their own learning, coming to a shared understanding of the Standards needed to be led by management.

*We can still be more accountable ourselves in terms of what that evidence might look like, and I think one of the issues is, well yes it’s the individuals’ responsibility to get evidence or to have an understanding of what those Standards are like, but at the same time there is a systemic issue in terms of, you know, the school system needs to ensure that they have done their job to upskill or let people know what those Standards might look like in practice.* (TB)

The senior leader from school B took this issue to a higher level and stated that the Education Council had an obligation to disseminate the new Code of Professional Practice and the Standards for the Teaching Profession in a more robust manner. She highlighted the lack of resourcing attached to building knowledge around the Standards and what they looked like in practice.

*I guess the challenge Nationally is that School’s haven’t been given the time or money or resources to give it a really good go… It’s only now the Council is rolling out how the Standards for the Teaching Profession should look for schools delivering appraisal, but again those workshops are done on a first in first serve, and not everyone is aware of those workshops and schools can’t afford to send every single teacher on those workshops.* (SLB)
According to SLB, relying on strategic people who may have attended one of the workshops offered by the Education Council or using the on-line resources leaves some schools without the support or resources necessary to deliver a high quality appraisal process guided by the Standards.

The senior leader from School A was wary about leaders and teachers interpreting the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard to *all things Māori*. He believed that forming positive learning environments for Māori learners and improving Māori student achievement existed in all the Standards and that the challenge was for teachers and leaders to consider this standard carefully. SLA also believed that this was the Standard that teachers and leaders feared the most. Fear of pronunciation could be paralysing some teachers and leaders from engaging with this Standard and he proposed three different ways for teachers and leaders to access the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. They were correct pronunciation of te reo Māori, tikanga or including Māori culture in daily life and interactions, and coming to a deeper understanding of Māori concepts and values.

*There are different routes for people to start to access this Standard because I think you can start to make progress and development on that Standard through a language route, in terms of using words and pronunciation, I think you can start to access that through tikanga and how you interact with colleagues and run meetings but also how you are in the classroom with students, protocols there. And the other mode of access is really thinking about Maori concepts and being quite reflective of those.*

(SLA)

This idea was also reiterated by the middle leader from School B, however, MB appeared to place these forms of evidence on a continuum, where attempting correct pronunciation was at a basic level moving towards a Maori value or conceptual understanding of the world at the highest or deepest level.

*It's from a basic level of attempting correct pronunciation, so there's that basic level and you might get people saying that in their appraisal as some sort of evidence you know, or they might go further and talk about, in a particular unit they included Māori music. But it has to be deeper than that, it has to be about the values, it has to be about the world view.*

(MB)
**Key Findings**

All six participants interviewed suggested that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was a mindset that set the scene or context for high quality teaching. The attached Māori medium unit and the establishment of co-governance was a huge influence on the three participants from school A. Power sharing in decision-making from the highest level was felt in the day to day running of the school and the teaching and learning in the classroom. Four of six interviewees believed that at the heart of this Standard were the relationships formed with students. For them, the students were the context that shaped the teaching and learning in their classrooms.

Having a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and what this looked like in practice were key concerns for five of the six participants. Four interviewees believed that this process needed to be led by management and one senior leader questioned the lack of resources and support provided nationally with the launch of the new Standards for the Teaching Profession. This lack of a shared understanding made accessing and evidencing this Standard, in a meaningful and genuine way, problematic.

**Accountability for Biculturalism**

The participants discussed their personal commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and four interviewees described their role as appraisers.

**Personal Responsibility**

Having a solid sense of self was illustrated in the way all six participants described their personal and professional identities when talking about their commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. All spoke of being intrinsically motivated. Two of the six participants identified as Māori and both linked their intrinsic motivation to the value they placed on their own culture and identity, and as tangata whenua, the responsibility they felt to lead by example.

*Of course being Māori, I’m always going to be waving that tino rangatiratanga flag, always. (SLB)*

*I am constantly thinking about my learners, both Māori and others, as a teacher and how I am engage them in the class. More so, I do have an affinity to Māori students purely because I come from a background where I have Māori and European ancestry, but my father who was Māori went through a system where he wasn’t allowed to speak it and he was punished in school so he made a choice not to teach us the language even though he could speak it. So I guess I am a by-product of some of those injustices, so I just have more of an affinity with those students. (TB)*
The other four participants, who identified as Pākehā, Samoan or British, also acknowledged intrinsic reasons for being committed to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership. These participants expressed a deep respect for Māori as tangata whenua and to the Treaty of Waitangi and three connected these beliefs to their understandings of Māori values and concepts. The middle leader from school A referred to the language and values of her own Samoan culture when describing her understanding of Māori values and her commitment to biculturalism.

*My language has been really important; I speak it fluently. So I understand in terms of the strong cultural understanding of who you are through your language. Not that it’s easier if you are Samoan, but many of those cultural values, like whanaungatanga, is really exactly how we function in Samoan culture. (MA)*

According to MA, the bicultural procedures at school A needed to be *internalised* so that they carried *a potent meaning* and the challenge was for all teachers to *see it the way we see it*. MA said that all teachers were culturally located and that this was to be respected. However, in her opinion, recognition and respect of the unique status of tangata whenua and the Treaty of Waitangi were essential for *everybody* on the staff at school A.

The middle leader from school B, who identified as Pākehā, also acknowledged strong feelings of being connected to Māori values like whanaungatanga. According to MB, childhood experiences and her own reflections on Māori concepts and values allowed her to grow personally and professionally. She felt that getting *everybody on board* was a difficult task and accepted that not all teachers would achieve a mindset that allowed them to view the world from a Māori perspective. However, similar to the middle leader from school A, MB was unwavering in her opinion that all teachers and leaders needed to at least recognise and respect Māori culture.

*I have always identified more with, as far as my understanding is, of Māori values, and I have had experiences, personal experiences...when it comes to people talking about tipuna, ancestors, where you go, when you die, I don't have a problem with any of that. And I guess the connection has also been through literature over the years, just reading, reading literature, viewing exhibitions, listening to music, it connects, and it doesn't connect everybody, and you can't make people connect, but I think valuing the connection of the heritage of the tangata whenua is absolutely essential in terms of partnership and...*
MB believed that an in depth understanding of Māori concepts meant that providing evidence of commitment to biculturalism for the purposes of appraisal was easy. According to MB, the inclusion of Māori values in national and school policies was a positive step towards including a *spiritual aspect* to appraisal. However, she questioned whether many teachers and leaders fully understood what Māori values like whanaungatanga and manaakitanga meant. Like SLA, this middle leader called for a deeper reflection of Māori concepts and metaphors as a means of accessing the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and developing a framework for high quality practice.

All three practitioners from school A expressed a belief that commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi was just the right thing to do. The senior leader and classroom teacher expressed different reason as to what informed their beliefs. Influenced by his experience from overseas travel, TA expressed his knowledge on the effects of colonisation. This experience reinforced his respect for and the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi, a feeling he had had from a very early age, due largely to the influence of his father.

> My father was also a teacher and a school principal, so he, I think demonstrated respect and an understanding of the Treaty and also referred to it as a relevant document. I suppose, throughout my education, people I have been exposed to, or, people I have been involved with, have mostly demonstrated some respect for it. So I always thought it was the right thing to do and when, when I see it not being respected, or referred to as relevant, I would always point that out to the person. It’s just what I believe I suppose. Yeah I think it’s the right decision, I think it’s the right thing to do. Especially in schools.

*(TA)*

Five of the six participants recognised that teaching was political and that the curriculum and curriculum policy were not value neutral. This knowledge provided the motivation to navigate the systemic boundaries for the benefit of their Māori learners. Formal postgraduate education informed SLA’s understanding of differing worldviews within a dominant culture. According to SLA, the structures of a predominantly European model of education needed to be acknowledged by teachers and leaders in order to move to a fairer system that respects both Treaty partners.
Cause actually if you’ve got Māori who are coming into an education system which is set up on a European model, whatever accommodations are made, whatever structures and supports are put in place and things to try and mitigate that, the structure of the thing itself, if it’s a predominantly European model and if the language being used is predominantly English as well, in most cases for most Māori that is the case, then there’s not an equal playing field there. So you have to, I think, with what’s to do with the Treaty, you have to actually really actively support Māori being able to live as Māori. That is the underlying part of it. (SLA)

The Role of the Appraiser

From the interviews, it became apparent that teachers and leaders were unsure of the role an appraiser played in the appraisal process. This became more complicated when discussing the role in terms of supporting teachers’ development with their understanding Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard.

The Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was considered by all participants to be about how we consider ourselves as professionals and citizens of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Developing this mindset provided the framework for thinking about the subsequent Standards. How an appraiser could assess someone’s mindset for the purposes of appraisal was seen as a difficult task by most participants.

I don’t know to what extent you can, apart from how people act. Cause I think you’re clearly looking for a change in behaviour, perhaps the change of development in behaviour, development is probably a better word actually. Probably the development of behaviour is reflected more in the other Standards, that’s why I keep on saying I think they’re integrated. (SLA)

This holistic approach to the six Standards for the Teaching Profession and the appraisal process was seen as a positive step towards authentic professional growth by all four interviewees who were in appraiser roles. However, moving from appraisees presenting a portfolio of evidence that demonstrated practice of each Standard to a process that captured the interconnectedness of the six Standards was still in its embryonic stage. Participants were largely silent on the documentation of the appraisal process, with three participants referring back to their experiences of portfolios for gaining registration.
School A was moving to standard job or role descriptions, written collaboratively. These role descriptions were seen as living documents that would be adapted as new understandings were formed about quality practices related to each Standard. At the time of the interviews, heads of faculties and senior leaders had developed an understanding of the head of faculty role and quality practice against the six Standards. These practices could be assumed unless raised as a concern by either the appraisee or appraiser. Creating a shared understanding of high quality practice was seen as both the role of the appraisee and the appraiser in this process.

School B had moved to collaborative inquiries that were focussed on priority learners, such as Māori and Pacific students. Demonstrating the six Standards were seen as a consequence of the inquiry, in other words, the inquiries drove the actions that created naturally occurring evidence against the six Standards. Management had put the onus on the appraisee to reflect on their practice and their inquiries against the six Standards and decide on how their practice reflected a particular Standard. How teachers were supported by their appraisers depended on them taking the initiative to have conversations with their appraisers about any concerns they might have about their inquiries.

*It’s not up to the appraiser to go searching for the evidence or go searching for the information, it’s up to the appraisee to say this is what I have been doing, as a consequence of my actions in doing this research and theory and inquiry, this is what I have come up with. This is my espoused theory, this is what I have found out to be sure, these are the facts and actually while I was doing that I’ve noticed that these Standards for the Teaching Profession slot into here… So the Standards for the Teaching Professions are a consequence of those actions but they don’t drive the actions.* (SLB)

Speaking specifically about supporting teachers to develop a commitment to biculturalism, dialogue between the appraiser and appraisee was identified as the key component of the appraisal process by all four appraisers interviewed. The middle leaders from both schools spoke about working collaboratively to break down barriers in order to see the world from different perspectives. Dialogue was seen as essential to removing barriers and developing commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. This process was seen as a lifelong learning process that was both challenging and exciting.

*It’s about getting to the hearts and minds of people, and seeing it in a way that’s different from ours, and then learning to adopt and adapt what we learned through all of that. Through our collaborative*
work, working together and sharing, so that there isn’t that divide there, and if there is then it is of our own making. (MA)

I think breaking down the barriers towards, ‘ah I don’t know about culturally responsive pedagogy’, which is the kind of things you hear. (MB)

Being unable to verbalise what the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard looked like in practice made it difficult to appraise. The breadth and complexity of how teachers demonstrated commitment to this Standard was recognised by three of the four appraisers as challenging to assess for the purposes of appraisal.

What’s really difficult and challenging, I think, is that when you go into a classroom, I think teachers do it differently. (MA)

We all practice it in our own ways. (MB)

Three of the four appraisers interviewed saw barriers or resistance demonstrated by some teachers to engage with the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard as a challenging aspect of their role. Confronting teachers about their lack of meaningful engagement was generally avoided by most appraisers. Having difficult conversations was seen as unpleasant and could prove to create more defensiveness and resistance.

The challenges are, it’s just, everyone is so nice, you know, we’re also careful to be respectful, it’s really hard to have the difficult conversations, it really is. (MB)

I just can’t be bothered fighting, so you just love them harder, you know, and it’s hard, sometimes you go in there fighting to love them, you know, cause they’re pushing you away. (SLB)

Leading by example was seen as a more productive method of supporting and coaching teachers by all four participants in appraiser roles. Having made progress with incorporating tikanga into his daily routines and developing a deep understanding of Māori values and concepts, SLA was uncomfortably aware of his avoidance of using te reo Māori. Recently, SLA decided he needed to demonstrate to his staff that he was willing to take the risk and has begun to incorporate te reo Māori into his daily work.
So I thought, actually I need to, I need to take the plunge and be willing to take a risk and, you know, you are asking other people to do it…(SL-A)

**Key Findings**

Participants’ reflections illustrated a sense of personal responsibility to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. What informed their understandings were quite individual to them and demonstrated a wide range of experiences. Two of the six interviewees identified as Māori and both linked their sense of responsibility to the value they placed on their own culture and identity. Another three participants connected their knowledge of Māori values and concepts to their personal commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. Acknowledging the predominantly European model of education was motivation for five of the interviewees to actively develop their commitment to this Standard.

The findings of the semi-structured interviews showed that appraisers have a number of challenges that range from not having a full understanding of their own role, to dealing with the complex nature of assessing other teachers against the Standards for the Teaching Profession. An extra layer of complexity is added when supporting others in their development of commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. All appraisers interviewed saw this Standard as a way of thinking that provided a framework for thinking about the other five Standards. Assessing someone’s way of thinking and moving to a process that captured the interconnectedness of the six Standards was a difficult task. The lack of a shared understanding of what this Standard looked like in practice and the varied ways that it was practiced was challenging for the middle leaders from both schools. Dialogue between the appraiser and appraisee was seen as essential by all four appraisers, however, who initiated this dialogue, and what the focus was on depended largely on the structure of the appraisal process.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the findings from the analysis of data collected from a series of semi structured interviews with a senior leader, a middle leader and a classroom teacher from two different secondary schools, a total of six interviews. The findings revealed that teachers and leaders viewed appraisal and the new Standards for the Teaching Profession as vehicles for professional growth, and that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was central to this
process. Accountability took many forms and was seen as a means to determine who needed support and coaching. The approaches taken by the two schools in generating evidence against the six Standards differed greatly and depended on the vision of the senior leader in charge of appraisal and professional development. Dialogue between the appraiser and appraisee was seen as essential by all four appraisers, however, who initiated this dialogue and what the focus was on depended largely on the structure of the appraisal process. Having a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and what this looked like in practice were key concerns. This lack of understanding added to the complex role of the appraiser, many of which appeared to not have a clear understanding of their role. The next chapter will discuss these findings as well as present conclusions and provide some recommendations.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This research stems from concerns related to my experience as both an appraiser and a leader of performance appraisal in my current setting, a large secondary school in New Zealand. As a member of the Professional Learning Team, I am responsible for leading an inquiry based approach to appraisal and the development of a shared understanding of the Standards for the Teaching Profession. On reviewing teacher inquiry and appraisal reports, it became evident to me that many teachers and their appraisers found it challenging to produce evidence towards professional standards related to biculturalism. Consequently, this research examined the appraisal of bicultural commitment in two Auckland secondary schools to gain an understanding of: the relationship between appraisal and the professional standards for teaching related to biculturalism; current appraisal of commitment to biculturalism practice; and the challenges teachers and appraisers face in the appraisal of their commitment to biculturalism.

This chapter analyses the findings reported in Chapter Four and discusses them in the context of the literature presented in Chapter Two. This discussion leads to the five conclusions of this research. Here, I also offer recommendations, discuss the strengths and limitations of my study, and suggest areas for further research. The five conclusions are presented to reflect the research questions that guided this study:

1. What is the relationship between appraisal and the professional standards related to biculturalism?
2. In what ways is commitment to biculturalism appraised?
3. What challenges do teachers and appraisers encounter in the appraisal of their commitment to biculturalism?

Discussion and Conclusions

Appraisal: Critical reflection for improvement

A key finding of this research is that all participants viewed professional development as the main purpose of performance appraisal. Teachers and leaders used words such as supportive and reflective when discussing the appraisal process and shied away from discussing any hierarchical forms of
accountability. Participants were adamant that the process was not a check-up or a pejorative thing but an opportunity to get feedback or a second opinion to improve practice and student learning. This is different to research by Cardno (2012), which says that appraisal can be a time of stress and anxiety for many. This finding suggests a shift away from viewing professional concerns as weaknesses towards opportunities to foster personal and social responsibility.

All the teachers and leaders in this study believed that taking on personal responsibility for continuous improvement was central to the appraisal process. This echoes research conducted in New Zealand by Nusche et al. (2012) and Upsall (2001) who advocate for a move away from individual forms of accountability towards internal accountability. Internal accountability is about taking on individual and collective responsibility for continuous improvement and success for all students and this can only occur if policy makers take a professional growth approach (Fullan et al., 2015; Upsall, 2001). Acknowledging the risk in combining both accountability and professional development objectives in the one appraisal system, Nusche et al. (2012) recommend performance appraisal in New Zealand be conceived as predominantly for improvement. Both senior leaders in my study reflect this research, believing that shifting the perception of performance appraisal from a mandatory annual exercise in compliance towards ongoing professional growth was seen as a key aspect of their leadership role.

Critical reflective practice was seen as an essential component of professional growth within the appraisal process by all participants in this study. This finding reflects research by Upsall (2001) who says that fostering internal accountability encourages teachers to seek continual improvement through reflective practice. A report issued by ERO (2016b) endorses this approach as best practice, stating that effective appraisal processes integrate cycles of reflection and feedback on practice from a range of perspectives. However, exactly who provides feedback and how this feedback is delivered and received was unclear in my research. Furthermore, exactly what reflective practice is, and how it occurs within the appraisal process, was not discussed in depth by any of the participants in this study. Despite all participants’ emphasis on appraisal being a supportive process for teachers to reflect on their practice for professional growth, these findings suggest that there may be a lack of understanding of how this process is enacted and captured in order to meet the mandatory requirements for attestation, registration and re-certification.

All four interviewees in appraisal roles spoke of their feelings of a recent move toward a more holistic approach to appraisal based on collective responsibility for professional growth. Viewing
accountability in terms of a top down hierarchical approach was rejected by all participants in this study. It was clear that these practitioners attributed this narrow view of accountability to the ‘tick-box’ mentality of appraisal they had had experience of. This confirms earlier research by Forrester (2011) who believes that the business orientated origins of performance appraisal, and its heavy focus on prescription and surveillance, has driven schools towards a compliance exercise. In contrast, a much wider view of accountability was taken by the participants in this study, one based on internal accountability.

Collective responsibility is an essential component of internal accountability (Fullan et al., 2015; Upsall, 2001). This assumes being responsible to more than one person, however, the current appraisal system in most mainstream schools in New Zealand is of the hierarchical nature, where a ‘line manager’ appraises the teachers ‘below’ them. This was the case in both schools my research was conducted in. While both schools had a collaborative inquiry approach to appraisal, individual teachers were expected to write individual inquiry reports assessed by their line manager and there was little discussion around a collective approach to the mandatory requirements of appraisal. Furthermore, School B required individual teachers to initiate discussions around concerns they might have about their inquiry or practice with their appraiser. This assumes that teachers and leaders have the capabilities and attitudes to conduct inquiries and engage in critical reflection.

Alignment of an inquiry model with appraisal was embraced by school B. The senior leader at this school believed that this helped shift understanding of performance appraisal from an annual exercise in compliance forced upon them at the end of the year to an ongoing activity intended to provoke critical reflection. In contrast, the senior leader from school A thought that this alignment would constrain the nature of inquiry and he was adamant that the two processes should remain separate. This particular view reflects research by Benade (2015) who primarily sees inquiry as critical reflective practice. Critical reflection requires teachers to explore their own assumptions and beliefs collaboratively and Benade (2015) highlights that “the trust implied in collaborative and public reflective activity may be compromised by appraisal, essentially and accountability process” (p. 115). While all six teachers and leaders in this study explored their own assumptions and beliefs on an individual basis, there was little evidence to suggest that this practice was done collaboratively.
Fullan et al. (2015) state that a broader view of accountability lessens the tension between the two concepts of professional learning and professional accountability. It was evident that both schools had moved away from viewing the accountability aspect of performance appraisal from a punitive exercise in compliance, to ongoing professional learning based on reflective practice. The two middle leaders believed that a culture of trust was essential to this process. Speaking specifically about the teachers they appraise, these leaders used phrases such as *getting to the hearts and minds of people* and *breaking down barriers* in order to promote critical reflection leading to professional learning. Upsall (2001) strongly advocates for this shift in focus, stating that a professional growth focus encourages teachers to become reflective professionals. This research concludes that there has been a shift away from viewing appraisal in terms of hierarchical accountability and professional growth towards critical reflection for improvement.

**Standards for the Teaching Profession: A vehicle for growth**

A key finding of this research is that the new Standards for the Teaching Profession are seen as guiding principles for professional growth. They were embraced by all teacher and leaders in this research and were described as broad guidelines or principles to aid the continual improvement of teaching and learning. The senior leaders from both schools recognised the generic nature of the Standards, with one specifically talking about the Standards being *values based* and the other using the phrase *aspirational targets*. These findings reflect research by Thrupp (2006) who describes New Zealand’s teaching standards as broad guidance to teachers’ practices and aspirations. Thrupp (2006) commends this approach, rejecting specified standards on the grounds that quality teaching cannot be summed up into a series of statements about what is to be taught and what would count as evidence towards meeting a standard. He believes that while generic standards require a higher trust approach, they provide a more holistic approach to improving the quality of teaching as they recognise the importance of local context and pedagogical autonomy.

Interestingly, when asked about the Standards for the Teaching Profession, five of the six participants referred negatively to the previous 12 Registered Teacher Criteria. They felt the large number and the specified nature of the key indicators contributed to the appraisal process being viewed as a compliance exercise. Teacher resistance to narrowly defining teaching was evident in many of the statements made by the teachers and leaders I interviewed. The complex nature of teaching was acknowledged by all participants in my research and they believed that the Standards for the Teaching Profession recognised this complexity. This echoes research by Sachs (2003) and
Upsall (2001) who believe that defining quality teaching is multifaceted and requires a supportive model that values professional growth.

The structure of the appraisal process in the two schools my research data is based on reveals a difference in perception. While there was a common opinion amongst all interviewees that teachers generated naturally occurring evidence against the Standards in their everyday practice, the senior leaders led very different appraisal processes. This mirrors research by Nusche et al. (2012) who reveal the variation of performance management systems in New Zealand and correlate the quality of the appraisal process to the pedagogical leadership of the principal and the senior leadership of individual schools.

School A had begun the process of writing role descriptions against the six Standards. For example, a role description of what a Head of Department does to meet the six Standards was written collaboratively by the Heads of Department and their appraisers, the senior leaders of the school. This process reflects recommendations made by Grudnoff et al. (2005), Upsall (2001) and Sach (2003) who all call for the involvement of practitioners in the process of contextualising generic teaching standards. Research by Cardno (2012) also appears to support this process as she believes that an effective performance appraisal system is based on the mutual agreement between appraiser and appraisee about performance expectations.

At School A, the agreed quality practice descriptions against the six Standards could be assumed by default unless raised as a concern by the appraiser or appraisee. However, this system assumes that both the appraiser and appraisee can assess practice against the Standards, provide critical feedback, and encourage reflections on practice, capabilities Nushe et al. (2012) state as essential for effective appraisal. Grudnoff et al. (2005) also warn that reaching consensus on what a generic standard looks like in practice in a particular context is a difficult task and usually poorly executed. These researchers are also critical of the assumption all voices are heard, stating that the voice of the confident majority are privileged. Furthermore, in order to identify everyday practice that reflects each Standard, this process assumes that high quality practice or knowledge of it already exists in schools.

School B took a different approach. The senior leader at this school recognised that high quality practice did not exist for priority learners and a collaborative inquiry model, focused on priority learners, drove the appraisal process. The Standards for the Teaching Profession were expected to
feed into and fall out of these inquiries and the responsibility to recognise any concerns appeared to be with the appraisee. Consequently, appraisees were expected to initiate engagement with their appraisers for feedback and guidance on the Standards for the Teaching Profession when they felt it necessary. Similar to the process at School A, this assumes appraisees have the capabilities to critically reflect on their practice against the Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Only one participant talked about reaching a minimum standard, the senior leader from school A, however, he was adamant that the Standards main purpose was to provide a growth projection for teachers and leaders. All participants were optimistic that the new six Standards provided a more holistic approach to improving teacher practice within the appraisal process. Therefore, this research concludes that leaders and teachers view the new six Standards for the Teaching Profession as guidelines towards a more holistic approach to professional growth.

*Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard: A way of being*

Another key finding of this research is that teachers and leaders viewed the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard as a way of being that flowed into all the Standards for the Teaching Profession. This Standard was described as a mindset that allowed you to view the world from different perspectives. The presence of the Māori immersion unit and the structure of co-governance were acknowledged as strong influences on all three participants’ understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and the principle of partnership from School A. The idea of power sharing in decision-making from the governance level to classroom practice was demonstrated in statements made by all three participants. They believed that commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi was much more than just considering a Māori perspective, it was a way of being revealed in statements such as it’s the duality of how we operate. This co-governance structure reflects the work of Bishop and Glynn (1999) who suggest using the image of partnership as a metaphor for power sharing in decision-making at the governance level. These authors state that the ideology of cultural superiority is perpetuated through control over curriculum and pedagogy. They believe that governing boards need to address issues of power and control in order to guarantee Māori people a share in the power of decision-making.

The participants from School B also believed that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was a mindset, exemplified in statements such as it’s a way of being and a way of knowing and it’s everything that we do. All three practitioners from this school spoke of their understanding of the Standard with respect to their own identity, with two of the three identifying as Māori. Furthermore, the
middle leader and classroom teacher strongly believed that at the heart of this Standard were the students and the relationships you formed with them. Both spoke of how this Standard was about teachers recognising and valuing the knowledge students bring to the classroom and allowing that knowledge to inform their pedagogy. Interestingly, this was also echoed by the middle leader and classroom teacher from School A, indicating the contextualisation of this Standard at the classroom level. These ideas reflect the views of Bishop and Glynn (1999) who believe that relationships that address issues of power and control at the governance level can be generalised to classroom practice, where teachers and students manage goals mutually established.

Leaders and teachers in this study viewed professional growth as the main purpose of appraisal guided by the Standards for the Teaching Profession. Central to this is the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard, identified as a way of thinking about the world from different perspectives. Bolman and Deal (2008) define this as reframing and claim that “the ability to think about situations in more than one way” (p. 6) increases ones chances of solving complex problems successfully. This way of thinking informs the other five Standards and because of this, all other decision-making and action as a teacher and leader can be traced back to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. This research concludes that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard for the Teaching Profession is central to the appraisal process.

**The Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard: Coming to a shared understanding**

The Treaty of Waitangi is a defining feature of the concept of biculturalism (Orange, 2013); however, the concept of biculturalism and the meaning of the Treaty of Waitangi are much disputed (Lourie, 2015a, 2015b; Walker, 1986,2004). The principles underlying the spirit and intent of the Treaty are constantly evolving and differ depending on the institution discussing them (Orange, 2013; Te Puna Kōkiri, 2001). Durie (1998, 2001, 2002) believes that the Treaty of Waitangi is primarily about partnership and the Education Council appears to agree. The new Standards for the Teaching Profession in *Our Code Our Standards* (2017) ask teachers to demonstrate commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership in Aotearoa New Zealand, however, directives of what a Treaty of Waitangi partnership in the learning environment looks like remains elusive to many teachers and leaders.

A key finding of this research is that teachers and leaders want a top down approach to developing an understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. The middle leader from School A, who had been at the school for 25 years, spoke of this as a past challenge that had been met at
her school. Statements such as *they do it through professional development, we do it through our staff meetings, we do it through our procedures* all demonstrated her belief that co-governance and the senior leadership team had driven change that had led to practice that genuinely reflects the Treaty of Waitangi principles. The classroom teacher from School A also spoke of his understanding of this Standard being strongly influenced by *just being a teacher at this school*. He said that his school *actively demonstrates what the Treaty means and how it is relevant in this context...it’s just how we operate here.*

In contrast, the classroom teacher from School B spoke of a need for management to guide the development of a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. Speaking in general about all the Standards, this teacher said that the *school system needed to let people know what those Standards might look like in practice.* The senior leader from this school appeared to shift this responsibility to the national level and highlighted the lack of resourcing attached to building knowledge around the new six Standards. This lack of resourcing provides support for Lourie’s (2015a) view on education policy related to biculturalism as being tokenistic. She says that policy statements relating to biculturalism usually do not have any substantial funding attached to them and therefore carry little to no commitment to implementation. According to Lourie (2016), the lack of funding and the ambiguous policy statements that offer little guidance for teacher practice force some schools into tokenistic practices.

All three practitioners from School B spoke of their experiences of tokenistic practice and evidence collected towards the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard provided by some teachers for the purpose of appraisal. These practitioners viewed tokenistic behaviour as the use of some te reo or tikanga in a non-meaningful manner. This was associated to a siloed individual activity to provide evidence for appraisal which did not change teacher behaviour. The classroom teacher believed that tokenistic practice was clear evidence that the injustices caused by colonisation were not being addressed, a requirement stated in *Our Code Our Standards* (Education Council, 2017). According to Richardson and Wright (2010), those faced with tokenism are susceptible to messages that can “help resolve ambiguity and reduce the aversive state of subjective uncertainty” (p. 565). For that reason, management will need to have a clear vision on what the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard means and looks like in their context in order to develop a shared understanding.

While all the participants from School B believed that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was relevant for all students, two also spoke specifically about Māori learners and providing Māori contexts for learning when discussing this Standard. In contrast, the senior leader from School A
was acutely aware of what he believed to be a misconception with the interpretation of this Standard to mean all things Māori. Interestingly, none of the participants from School A mentioned Māori learners as they unpacked their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. This research concludes that there is no shared understanding of what the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard looks like in practice.

**Appraising commitment to biculturalism: A difficult and complex process**

My research found that demonstrating commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership is wide-ranging. The breadth and complexity of how teachers demonstrate commitment to this Standard were acknowledged by the appraisers in my research. They believed that correct pronunciation of te reo Māori, tikanga or including Māori culture in daily life and interactions and, coming to a deeper understanding of Māori concepts and values were three ways that teachers and leaders could engage with this Standard. According to the senior leader from School A, this Standard was the professional standard that teachers and leaders feared the most, and anxiety around correct pronunciation could be paralysing some from engaging meaningfully with this Standard. He suggests that bringing tikanga into daily actions, alongside critical reflection on Māori concepts and values, may be a better starting point for some teachers and leaders.

Both middle leaders said that an understanding of and a connection to Māori values were necessary in the development of a Māori world view. They specifically spoke about their deep connection to the principle of whanaungatanga and, in their opinion, this made it easy to demonstrate and evidence the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. This reflects research by Bishop and Glynn (1999) who ask teachers to critical reflect on the metaphors that underpin our New Zealand’s mainstream schools. They believe that traditional metaphors of ‘knowledge transmission’ need to be replaced by relational metaphors such as whanaungatanga, with which they believe Treaty guarantees of power-sharing and partnership can be achieved in our schools.

One of the five cultural competencies outlined in Tātaiako (Ministry of Education, 2011), whanaungatanga, is described as establishing relationships in a Māori context, that is forming relationships that reflect a sense of family connection. The five Māori concepts are about “knowing, respecting, and working with Māori learners and their whanau and iwi so their worldview, aspirations, and knowledge are an integral part of teaching and learning, and of the culture of the school” (p. 4). The Education Council states that Tātaiako informs the Standards for the Teaching Profession, however, this document is aimed at Māori learners. This places
biculturalism and the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard in danger of being viewed as applicable to Māori only, rather than relevant to all in Aotearoa-New Zealand. This may be contributing to the misconception that the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard is relevant and applicable to Māori only.

Critical reflection requires self-awareness of one’s own beliefs and values (Benade, 2015). All four appraisers had a strong sense of self and a willingness to question their personal assumptions and beliefs. These leaders all recognised that the curriculum and curriculum policy were not value-neutral and this reflects the work of Benade (2015). He says that the willingness to locate reflection in a socio-political context is an important disposition for critical reflection as it provides the motivation for change.

My research revealed that the capabilities required for the appraisal role are not clearly defined. Open dialogue was seen as a challenging aspect of the appraiser role and was generally avoided with teachers who demonstrated resistance to engage with the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard. Bolman and Deal (2008) say that courage and a high level of trust is required to openly express opinions and the belief system their opinions are based on. According to Senge (1990), open dialogue cannot be achieved if participants are unaware that their views are based on assumptions. This idea was highlighted by three of the four appraisers in my research who believed that having difficult conversations with teachers who demonstrated a lack of meaningful engagement with the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard only proved to create more defensiveness and resistance. How appraisers develop self-awareness within the teachers they appraise is seen as a challenging task and there is a lack of clarity on what this looks like. Nusche et al. (2012) strongly recommend that appraisers be trained on how to give constructive feedback and encourage reflections against the teaching standards.

A further finding of this research is that appraising commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard is challenging. Participants in my research were largely silent on the documentation of the appraisal process and this reflects research by Mayer et al. (2005). These researchers found that while professional standards provide a useful framework for professional learning, this learning was characteristically an individual activity and specific ways of recording teachers’ learning was difficult to ascertain. The Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was considered by all participants in my research to be about how we consider ourselves as professionals and citizens of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Interestingly, the senior leader from School
A recognised the difficult task of assessing someone’s mindset for the purpose of appraisal and suggested that this Standard is more reflected in a change of behaviour associated with the other Standards. Therefore, this research concludes that demonstrating and appraising commitment to biculturalism is a difficult and complex process.

Summary of Conclusions

This study has illustrated that schools view appraisal as professional learning guided by the new six Standards for the Teaching Profession. Teacher accountability is seen as critical reflection against the Standards, however, this assumes teachers have the necessary dispositions of a reflective practitioner and knowledge of the Standards for the Teaching Profession. This study identified a gap in leadership competence development for those with appraisal responsibilities. Appraisers did not always feel confident in leading collaborative critical reflection against the new Standards and desired a top down approach to developing an understanding of their role and the Standards for the Teaching Profession.

My study showed that, despite the lack of a shared understanding, the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard was viewed as central to the appraisal process. This Standard was described as a mindset or framework for thinking about the subsequent Standards. However, appraisers acknowledged the breadth and complexity of how teachers demonstrate commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership. Furthermore, those with appraisal responsibilities were uncertain about how to develop and assess someone’s mindset. The findings of this research suggest that both teachers and leaders need professional development to deepen their understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and to engage in discourse on ways of documenting teachers’ learning.

The major conclusion drawn from this study are:

1. There has been a shift away from viewing appraisal in terms of hierarchical accountability and professional growth towards critical reflection for improvement.
2. Leaders and teachers view the new six Standards for the Teaching Profession as guidelines towards a more holistic approach to professional growth.
3. The Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard for the Teaching Profession is central to the appraisal process.
4. There is no shared understanding of what the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard looks like in practice.
5. Demonstrating and appraising commitment to biculturalism is a difficult and complex process.

Recommendations

Drawing on the conclusions of this research, several recommendations are proposed at both the national and at school levels.

National Level

It is a recommendation of this research that the Ministry of Education implement a national programme of leadership development for those in appraiser roles. The complexity of the role demands a set of skills and relevant theoretical and practical knowledge which requires specialised training (Nusche et al., 2012). The Education Review Office (2017) shows that there is a demand for more professional development for appraisers on how to use the teaching standards, provide critical feedback, and encourage reflections on practice. In addition, there is currently no national provision for equipping appraisers with the skills they require to meet the demands of their leadership role.

This research highlights the complex knowledge and dispositions needed to engage with the first Standard for the Teaching Profession, the Treaty of Waitangi partnership. The interpretation of this Standard, what it looks like in practice, and how one appraises it appears to require knowledge of the concepts of citizenship, indigeneity, and the Treaty of Waitangi principle of partnership. In-depth knowledge of Māori concepts and metaphors such as the five cultural competencies outlined in Tātaiako (Ministry of Education, 2011) also appear to underpin this Standard. It is essential that members of Boards of Trustees and senior leaders have a clear understanding of the appraiser role, the Standards for the Teaching Profession and the cultural competencies outlined in Tātaiako. This research recommends that the development of a national leadership development programme for appraisers should be developed in conjunction with senior leaders and middle leaders with a strong Māori representation.

School Level

A further recommendation of this research is that school leaders increase their understanding of leadership development for those in appraisal roles. Deepening their knowledge of the Standards for the Teaching Profession, with a particular focus on the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard, is a central part of professional development and the appraisal process. This research reveals that teachers and leaders want management to lead the development of their understanding
of the new Standards for the Teaching Profession. Therefore, it is essential members of Boards or Trustees, senior leaders, and those in appraisal roles have a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard.

The research findings suggest that Boards of Trustees and senior leaders review their appraisal policy so that it better reflects the interconnectedness of the new six Standards for the Teaching Profession. This research reveals that all participants viewed appraisal as a holistic approach to improving teacher practice guided by the new Standards. The Treaty of Waitangi Standard provides a framework for thinking about the other five Standards and is therefore central to the appraisal process and professional growth. The problematic task of documenting professional learning focussed on the Treaty of Waitangi partnership will need to be addressed, as will the hierarchal nature of the current appraisal system. Documenting collective responsibility and collaborative critical reflection would appear to be challenging in this single line accountability model.

**Strengths and Limitations of this Study**

A strength of this research is that it gained the perspectives of a senior leader, a middle leader and a classroom teacher from two different schools. Rich qualitative interview findings from six practitioners has contributed new insights to the paucity of literature on teachers’ perspectives on professional standards, appraisal, and the concept of biculturalism in education policy. Obtaining multiple points of view provided a wide variety of perspectives, allowed data to be triangulated and therefore provided findings, conclusions, and recommendations which are trustworthy and context specific.

One limitation of the study is the element of bias associated with the selection of participants for this research. The initial email inviting research participants was sent to school principals, enabling principals to respond in three ways: no access; controlled access, and; free choice. The two schools my research was conducted in offered me controlled access, where the senior leader in charge of professional learning and performance appraisal took part in the research and organised the middle leader and classroom teacher to be interviewed. However, the strength of the semi-structured interviewing model allowed probing and further clarification in order to elicit deep rich findings. Although this investigation focused on how commitment to biculturalism is demonstrated and appraised, another limitation of this study was that the perspectives of principals, who have the task of appraising senior leaders, was not explored.
Areas for Further Research

This research has focussed on the appraisal of the first Standard for the Teaching Profession, the Treaty of Waitangi partnership, from the perspectives of senior leaders, middle leaders, and classroom teachers. This research highlighted a lack of a shared understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard and the need for leadership development for those in appraisal roles. Further research investigating principals and Board of Trustees understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership Standard may add to a more informed debate regarding leadership development of appraisers. In addition, further research could be carried out to investigate the impact of the Standards for the Teaching Profession on student learning.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter to Principal for Initial Consent

12th April 2018

Dear,

My name is Caroline Andrew and I am a teacher at Green Bay High School. I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management in the department of Education at Unitec Institute of Technology. The focus of my research is to develop a deeper understanding of how teachers meet the Professional Standard for bicultural commitment in secondary schools within the appraisal process. I am specifically interested in finding out what barriers teachers and appraisers like myself may identify in this context, and what advantages successful teachers and appraisers may have.

In my time as a secondary school teacher and a middle leader it has come to my attention that teachers struggle to provide evidence of commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi bicultural partnership, as stated in the Practising Teacher Criteria, now called the Standards for the Teaching Profession. As an appraiser and a member of the Professional Learning Team (PLT) at my school, this is made more difficult as I assess other teachers against these same standards for the purpose of appraisal and re-registration.

I am therefore writing to ask your permission for consent so that any teachers on your staff who would like to be involved in this research would be able to take part in an interview that would only take 30 to 40 minutes of their time. Ideally, I would like to interview a teacher, a middle leader, and a senior leader at your school. All contributions will be confidential.

At the completion of the study, I would be happy to write a summary of the main findings for your school and offer my time to work with your school around the focus of my research.

If you have any questions about the research, you may contact me at andrec33@myunitec.ac.nz, phone 021933021, or my supervisor, Martin Bassett at mbassett@unitec.ac.nz, phone (09) 815 4321.

I understand teachers and leaders are very busy people, but any participation would be greatly appreciated. Please find enclosed a consent template to go on your school’s letterhead and self-addressed envelope.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Andrew
Appendix B: Organisational Consent

Organisations’ Letterhead

12th April 2018

To: Caroline Andrew
    12 Cliff View Drive
    Green Bay
    Auckland 0604

To whom it may concern

Re: Organisational Consent

I (name and position in organisation) of (organisation) give consent for Caroline Andrew to undertake research in this organisation as discussed with the researcher.

This consent is granted subject to the approval of research ethics application by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee and a copy of the application approval letter being forwarded to the organisation as soon as possible.

Signature:

Date:
Appendix C: Information Sheet

Interview Information Sheet for Participant

Title of Thesis: The Appraisal of Commitment to Biculturalism

My name is Caroline Andrew. Your principal has given permission for me to invite you to participate in a research project I am conducting as part of the requirements for my Master of Educational Leadership and Management degree at Unitec Institute of Technology.

The focus of my research is to develop a deeper understanding of how teachers meet the Professional Standard for bicultural commitment in secondary schools within the appraisal process. I am specifically interested in finding out what barriers teachers and appraisers like myself may identify in this context, and what advantages successful teachers and appraisers may have.

I request your participation in the following way.

I will be collecting data using an interview schedule and would appreciate being able to interview you at a time that is mutually suitable. The interview venue will be at a place that best suits you and the duration of the interview will be no longer than 40 minutes.

Neither you nor your school will be identified in the thesis and all information will be kept secure and confidential. I will be recording your contribution and will provide you the interview transcript to check for accuracy. You may withdraw yourself or any information that has been provided for this project up to 14 days after accepting the interview transcript for verification. I will also be asking you to sign a consent form regarding this event.

I do hope that you will agree to take part and that you will find this participation of interest. If you have any queries about the project, you may contact my supervisor at Unitec Institute of Technology.

My supervisor is Martin Bassett and may be contacted by email or phone.

Phone: (09) 815 4321 ext 8501   Email: mbassett@unitec.ac.nz

Yours sincerely

Caroline Andrew

andrec33@myunitec.ac.nz

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2018-1018

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 8 June 2018 to 8 June 2019. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 8551). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix D: Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule for Participants

1. In your opinion, what is the purpose of appraisal?

2. In your opinion, what is the purpose of the Standards for the Teaching Profession?

3. In what ways are the Standards for the Teaching Profession used to guide the appraisal process?

4. What is your understanding of biculturalism/Treaty of Waitangi partnership as expressed in education policy?

5. What is your understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi partnership as expressed in this Standard?

6. What factors contribute to your understanding and practice of commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership as expressed in the first Standard for the Teaching Profession?

7. What barriers inhibit your understanding and practice of commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership as expressed in the first Standard for the Teaching Profession?

8. How do you feel your practice meets the first Standard for the Teaching Profession?

9. What are some of the challenges you experience in providing evidence towards the first Standard for the Teaching Profession within the appraisal process?

For Appraisers Only

10. What are some of the challenges you experience as an appraiser in measuring and assessing other teachers against the first Standard for the Teaching Profession within the appraisal process?

Closing Question

Are there any matters regarding the appraisal of biculturalism/ commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership that we have not covered that you wish to discuss?
Appendix E: Participant Consent

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
For the Teacher/Appraiser

RE: Master of Educational Leadership and Management

THESIS TITLE: The Appraisal of Commitment to Biculturalism

RESEARCHER: Caroline Andrew

Participant’s consent
I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my school will be used in any public reports. I also understand that the information I provide in my interview will only be used for the purpose of the project and will not be shared with any other participants including my principal. I will be provided with a transcript of my interview for checking before data analysis is started. I am aware that I may withdraw myself or any information that has been provided for this project up to 14 days after accepting the interview transcript for verification.

I agree to take part in this project.

Signed: _______________________________

Name: _______________________________

Date: _______________________________
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