ABSTRACT
Children’s challenging behaviour in classrooms can have negative effects on students and teachers. The New Zealand government is funding Incredible Years Teacher (IYT) professional learning and development (PLD) to provide teachers with classroom management skills to manage young children’s challenging behaviour. This research explored how teachers incorporated IYT into their practice, and the factors supporting or hindering sustained implementation. The qualitative approach of interpretive description was used to guide in-depth interviews with 12 teachers and other education professionals. The thematic analysis illuminated the variation in how teachers implemented IYT. Overall, teachers with more support deeply embedded IYT and sustained its incorporation in their practice.

INTRODUCTION
Children’s challenging behaviour in classrooms is a significant issue in New Zealand schools (Office of the Auditor-General, 2009; Wylie & Hodgen, 2007) with at least one student in every New Zealand primary school teacher’s class likely to display challenging behaviour (Wylie & Bonne, 2014; Wylie & Hodgen, 2007). This paper uses the term challenging behaviours as it is typically referred to in New Zealand educational contexts to represent the broad “spectrum of antisocial, aggressive, delinquent, defiant and disruptive behaviours” (Blisset et al., 2009, p. 13).

Children who exhibit persisting challenging behaviours have a high risk for low academic achievement throughout their school years and poor social and emotional outcomes (Church, 2003). In the long-term, such children are at increased risk of substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, violent relationships, crime, mental health issues, poor educational achievement, and unemployment (Fergusson, Horwood & Ridder, 2005). Further, the more severe the challenging behaviours are in childhood, the greater the chance of poor outcomes in young adulthood (Fergusson et al., 2005).

Although challenging behaviours in the classroom can cause stress for teachers and disruption to classmates (Johansen, Little & Akin-Little, 2011; Wylie & Hodgen, 2007), effective classroom management has been associated with a decrease in challenging behaviours, and increase in student engagement, academic achievement, and social competence (Oliver, Wehby & Reschly, 2011; Whear et al., 2013). Similarly, positive teacher-student relationships have been found to promote children’s pro-social behaviour and achievement (Baker, Grant & Morlock, 2008; Hamre & Pianta, 2001; O’Connor, Dearing & Collins, 2011).

One way to support teachers and learners in behaviour management is through professional learning and development (PLD). Classroom management is often taught as part of PLD (Guskey, 2000), in programmes such as Webster-Stratton’s (2012) Incredible Years Teacher (IYT). Effective PLD programmes provide multiple opportunities and time for teachers to engage at a deep level with content (Mitchell & Cubey, 2003; Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung, 2007). Growing evidence indicates coaching is an effective and essential PLD activity (Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010; Stormont, Reinke, Newcomer, Marchese & Lewis, 2015). Contextual factors such as teacher and school acceptance of the PLD programme, and supportive and proactive leadership are also essential factors for effective PLD (Cherrington et al., 2013; Han & Weiss, 2005; Timperley et al., 2007).

INCREDIBLE YEARS TEACHER
IYT is one of the Ministry of Education’s Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) suite of programmes (Ministry of Education, 2011). It aims to provide teachers with positive classroom management skills.
to promote students' social, emotional and academic learning. The programme is premised on building positive relationships between teachers, parents and students, and encouraging positive behaviour rather than focusing on negative behaviours (Reinke, Stormont, Webster-Stratton, Newcomer & Herman, 2012). IYT is part of the Incredible Years (IY) series of training programmes for parents, children and teachers of children aged 3–8 years, which can be delivered independently or in combination with parent and child components (Webster-Stratton, 2014).

IYT is delivered in groups of 15–18 people, meeting a day each month over six months (Webster-Stratton, 2011). Group leaders in New Zealand deliver IYT as per the programme’s manual and Ministry of Education (2015a) guidelines. Group leaders are typically Ministry of Education staff, early childhood educators, and Resource Teachers: Learning Behaviour (RTLB; Ministry of Education, 2015a, 2015b). RTLB work with teachers and schools to support students who have learning and/or behaviour difficulties (Ministry of Education, n.d.).

Group leaders deliver IYT training through video-modelling, role-plays, group discussion, and coaching to facilitate teachers’ learning (Webster-Stratton, 2011). The video-modelling consists of over 250 vignettes showing teachers and children in a range of situations (Webster-Stratton, 2001). Webster-Stratton (2011) advocates providing one-to-one coaching visits between the monthly workshops to support teachers and model teaching skills. Although more coaching visits are considered ideal, the Ministry of Education expects group leaders to provide a minimum of two coaching sessions during the IYT course, and a follow-up workshop three months after the final IYT workshop (Ministry of Education, 2015a).

IYT is widely espoused to be an evidence-based programme (Herman, Borden, Reinke & Webster-Stratton, 2011; Hutchings & Williams, 2017). However, while there is general acceptance of IYT’s effectiveness, many of the overseas studies contributing to this understanding make it difficult to infer the sole effects of IYT due to adapting IYT (e.g., Baker-Henningham, 2011; Baker-Henningham, Scott, Jones & Walker, 2012; Carlson, Tret, Bender & Benson, 2011; Raver et al., 2008; Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007; Snyder et al., 2011; Williford & Shelton, 2008), or studying it in combination with the IY parent and child programmes (e.g. Herman et al., 2011; Webster-Stratton, Reid & Hammond, 2001, 2004; Webster-Stratton, Reid & Stoelmiller, 2008). There are promising indicative results about the effectiveness of IYT (Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development, n.d.) but few studies have considered long-term outcomes or utilised large-scale, randomised controlled trials with IYT as a stand-alone programme (Ford et al., 2012).

IYT was first evaluated in New Zealand during the first stage of its national rollout in 2010/11 with 239 teachers (Fergusson, Horwood & Stanley, 2013). Teachers reported significant increases in their frequency and use of positive behaviour management strategies and high levels of satisfaction with the programme. In 2014, Wylie and Felgate (2016c) evaluated IYT delivery in New Zealand, collecting data from 97 group leaders and 1,103 teachers who participated in IYT. Primary school teachers reported they used around half of the IYT strategies at the same levels 8–9 months after completing IYT. Praising positive behaviour was the most commonly-used strategy, with 100 percent of primary school teachers reporting they used it often or very often at the end of IYT, only dropping to 98 percent frequency usage 8–9 months later. Teachers reported large decreases in using seven IYT strategies, particularly the use of a discipline plan and social and emotional coaching. Nearly half (46%) of teachers reported positive differences in their target student’s behaviour when they continued using behaviour plans, compared to teachers who had stopped using behaviour plans after IYT (36%). One fifth (20%) of primary school teachers reported challenges in implementing IYT, particularly around getting consistency with other staff and having sufficient time. Further, the video vignettes garnered mixed support. Some teachers valued the vignettes as spurring discussion, while others found they raised scepticism about the appropriateness of IYT in New Zealand (Wylie & Felgate, 2016b). Approximately one third of primary school teachers, particularly those who noted challenges to implementing IYT, desired follow-up after IYT.

While there is much research about teachers’ frequency of implementing IYT strategies, there is a paucity of research about how teachers incorporate IYT into practice, and the factors supporting or hindering sustained implementation. Further, there are few studies of IYT that have not been adapted or combined with other IY programmes. An even smaller number of studies have incorporated long-term follow-up data into study design. Finally, no IY studies have gathered qualitative data using in-depth interviews on how primary school teachers incorporate IYT into their teaching. Given the New Zealand Government has invested significant funding for IYT, the purpose of this study was to increase understanding of how primary school teachers incorporate IYT into practice, and the barriers and supports related to sustaining implementation.
METHOD
Interpretive description was used for this study because it allowed the researchers to generate knowledge about complex phenomena related to IYT implementation and apply this to practice settings (Thorne, 2013). This pragmatic and applied qualitative approach guided in-depth interviews with 12 participants in a variety of educational roles.

Sampling, Recruitment and Ethics
The study used purposeful sampling (Patton, 2015), involving selecting individuals with experience and/or knowledge about IYT implementation in New Zealand. This provided the opportunity to sample a range of perspectives from teacher participants involved in classroom-based IYT implementation and educator participants providing systems support (Special Education Needs Coordinator [SENCO] and principals) and practice support through coaching and mentoring (RTLB).

The District IY Coordinator provided a list of schools in the region of study where two or more teachers had participated in IYT between 2011 and 2015. Initial contact was made via email to school principals, inviting them, and relevant teachers and SENCO, to participate. Similarly, all RTLB in the region of study were invited to participate in the research via email to their managers. The study received human ethics approval, ensuring participants’ participation was confidential and informed consent was gained.

Participants
Participants were 12 educational professionals from nine schools within one New Zealand region, with the following main roles:

- 5 teachers
- 2 principals
- 1 SENCO
- 1 specialist teacher (ST)
- 3 RTLB, also IYT group leaders.

All participants had worked in their role for at least one year. There were six teachers in total, five teachers of Years 0 to 3 and one specialist teacher whose role is to provide individualised support for students with significant learning needs (Ministry of Education, 2015b). Other educators included a participant employed in a SENCO role with responsibilities for coordinating support for students with additional learning needs (Ministry of Education, 2015b) and two principals. The teachers and SENCO/ST undertook IYT training across a range of years between 2011 and 2016. These participants’ schools ranged from low to high deciles, small to large student rolls, and small to large percentages of IYT-trained teachers in their junior school classes. Further, three of the nine schools participated in the Ministry of Education’s PB4L-School-Wide (PB4L-SW) programme, which provides a framework for schools to consider behaviour and learning across a whole school (Ministry of Education, 2015c). The three RTLB participants worked in collaboration with the teachers and educators across a variety of schools.

Data Collection and Analysis
Individual semi-structured interviews of between 30-60 minutes were audio recorded and transcribed. The interview questions were designed to explore the two components of the study’s purpose; firstly, to describe how teachers were implementing IYT and, secondly, to identify any barriers they encountered. The interview protocol featured a mixture of experiential and reflective questions adapted to accommodate the different lenses for the teacher participants and the educators in supporting roles. For example, teachers were asked: ‘In what way has your teaching been influenced by IYT training?’ and educators were asked: ‘Tell me how you think IYT influences teachers’ practice.’

Thematic network analysis (TNA) (Attride-Stirling, 2001) was selected for the data analysis procedure as it includes flexible, inductive and iterative procedures which align with interpretative description (Thorne, 2013), and allow the researcher to identify patterns within qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The interview transcripts were initially coded through NVivo software (QSR International, 2012) and open coding was conducted through repeated readings of the transcripts. The categorisation of codes followed the first four TNA steps (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Patterns evolved from the coding of data related to how teachers incorporated IYT into their teaching which led to the development of an interpretive model. This model was then used as a lens for interpreting interview data pertaining to facilitators and barriers. In accordance with the fifth TNA step, the connections between the analyses were summarised and represented in a visual network.

RESULTS
The TNA provides a framework for organising the findings related to the participants’ perspectives on how teachers incorporate IYT strategies into their practice.
How Teachers Incorporate IYT Strategies into their Practice

The study found participants varied greatly in how they implemented IYT strategies in their classrooms. The thematic analysis revealed four main themes:

1) embeddedness; 2) fidelity; 3) cognitive shift, and 4) acceptability. Embeddedness refers to the extent to which IYT strategies were prioritised and incorporated into teaching practice. Fidelity considered whether the strategies implemented were consistent with IYT recommendations and if classroom adaptations maintained fidelity. Cognitive shift included the belief systems, theoretical understandings and thought processes contributing to teachers’ incorporation of IYT into practice. Acceptability embodied the level of passion towards IYT and belief in its effectiveness.

Based on the implementation themes, four implementation types were conceptualised: (1) evangelical; (2) pragmatic; (3) unrelated, and (4) no implementation. These are summarised in Table 1 with examples of participants’ responses. An ‘evangelical implementation’ style was utilised by teachers with a strong belief in IYT who strived for it to be deeply embedded in their teaching and school-wide practices. Participants indicated that they or the teachers they had supported had made a significant cognitive shift, developed a deep and broad understanding of IYT, and maintained a high degree of fidelity. Teachers who used a ‘pragmatic implementation’ style utilised preferred strategies and disregarded others. Teachers using this style had made a moderate cognitive shift and stated that IYT aligned generally with their existing belief systems. However, they did not always demonstrate an understanding of the deeper theoretical underpinnings of IYT and there was some evidence of slippage where IYT no longer seemed to be prioritised. Teachers either implemented IYT strategies literally and with high fidelity, or not quite accurately. In summary, teachers using a pragmatic implementation style demonstrated liking, rather than a passion, for IYT.

‘Unrelated implementation’ occurred when teachers incorporated IYT-like strategies in their practice but believed that these were unrelated to participating in IYT training. Unrelated implementation involved no cognitive shift; that is, teachers’ pre-existing philosophies and practice appeared to align with IYT, and they reported that IYT offered them nothing new or was viewed as “common sense.” Further, IYT was not seen as valuable, particularly for children with severe challenging behaviour. The ‘no implementation’ style featured no evidence of the implementation of strategies and practice change or cognitive shift after participating in IYT.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>IYT Implementation Approach</th>
<th>Quote Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>Deep and intense understanding, passion, and use of all IYT strategies</td>
<td>‘I’m a geek about IY’ and ‘can talk about it ’til the cows come home.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Selective approach, mostly using easy-to-implement IYT strategies</td>
<td>‘I just chose the ones I felt comfortable with.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>Implementation of IYT-like strategies unrelated to participation in IYT</td>
<td>‘I don’t think the training added anything.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No implementation</td>
<td>No implementation</td>
<td>‘Couldn’t pick out any IY strategies he was using.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four implementation types provided a framework for understanding patterns in how teachers implemented specific IYT strategies. Most participants reported that they, or the teachers they supported, used quick and easy-to-implement IYT strategies. For example, eight out of 11 participants supported, used quick and easy-to-implement IYT strategies. For example, eight out of 11 participants supported, used quick and easy-to-implement IYT strategies. For example, eight out of 11 participants supported, used quick and easy-to-implement IYT strategies.

Similarly, teachers seemed to be implementing IYT strategies to build positive teacher-student relationships with relative ease and frequency. All participants noted the importance of teacher-student relationships, with one participant summarising, ‘Relationships are at the heart of everything.’ Strategies to build positive teacher-student relationships were similar amongst evangelical, pragmatic and unrelated implementation types, and involved teachers spending time, checking in, and talking with students.

While participants valued the importance of creating positive relationships between home and school, many commented that this could be difficult. Pragmatic implementation of strategies to
IYT revealed four overall themes: (1) IYT delivery; (2) prioritising IYT; (3) consistency, and (4) reviewing, reflecting and refreshing IYT.

**IYT Delivery**

Overall, IYT was delivered in ways that supported teachers to incorporate IYT strategies into practice. Most participants considered the content of IYT courses relevant. The group format was highly valued, with many participants commenting that discussion with other teachers was the most useful aspect of the course. Similarly, most participants valued the monthly, off-site workshops, spread over six months and were complimentary about the IYT textbook.

The video vignettes caused much consternation amongst participants and had the potential to cause confusion. For example, a participant commented, ‘Sometimes I could watch them and think I’m not sure … what they want me to get.’ Participants described the vignettes as out-dated with classrooms and cultures that were quite different to the current New Zealand educational context. Many participants commented that the discussion after watching vignettes “was more useful.”

Several participants were positive about the group leaders’ delivery of IYT during the workshops, valuing the structure, activities, and facilitated discussions. The teachers reported that they valued the group leaders’ visits to classrooms in between workshops and the follow-up workshop after IYT. However, some teachers wanted more group leader coaching support. For example, one teacher noted that although she received one consultation visit “that was valuable … they could’ve come back a bit later on.” Another teacher did not receive classroom visits from group leaders, and three teachers were not offered a follow-up workshop. All of the teachers who demonstrated evangelical implementation accepted classroom visits (if they were offered) and attended the follow-up workshop if it was offered, whereas teachers using a pragmatic implementation declined coaching or follow-up opportunities.

**Prioritising IYT**

School leadership that prioritised, understood, and valued IYT was a particularly influential factor in its sustained implementation, including its incorporation in curriculum, planning, and policy documents. For example, a principal’s school had a teacher-only day around IYT strategies and PB4L-SW and required all junior teachers to participate in IYT training. Other school leaders supported IYT through the allocation of financial and human resources; for example two schools established peer coach positions.

**Supports and Barriers for Sustained Implementation**

The inductive analysis of the interview data related to supports and barriers for sustained implementation of IYT revealed four overall themes: (1) IYT delivery; build positive home-school relationships included traditional communication methods (e.g. newsletters, reading logs and notes) as well as Webster-Stratton’s (2012) happy-gram. Teachers implementing IYT in an evangelical style facilitated home-school communication methods with inventive, low-cost strategies. One example involved children dictating text messages to their caregivers (for the school office to send) when they achieved a behavioural goal. Another example involved the school phoning parents about school assemblies when children received certificates.

Participants indicated that complex IYT strategies were implemented less frequently. For example, participants varied widely in their reports of the use of social, emotional and academic coaching strategies to teach children problem-solving, persistence, emotional regulation, and friendship skills (Webster-Stratton & Reid, 2002). Teachers using an evangelical implementation style frequently used the full range of social and emotional coaching strategies. For example, the SENCO’s school promoted circle time as a specific focus, creating videos and plans, requiring teachers to conduct circle time at least once a week, and modelling circle time in staff meetings. She described circle time as, ‘So powerful when it’s done well.’ In contrast, teachers using pragmatic implementation rarely utilised social and emotional coaching strategies.

Similarly, participants varied widely in their reports of IYT strategies used to decrease inappropriate behaviour (e.g. ignoring) and the use of behaviour plans. In evangelical implementation styles, teachers routinely included written behaviour plans, whereas these were not evident in pragmatic and unrelated implementation styles.

Reports on the use of incentives, particularly with regard to using tangible versus social rewards (i.e. praise and encouragement), varied. Similarly, there were variations in participants’ personal beliefs and school-wide values about the use of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. Evangelical implementation of incentive programmes involved individualised, class-wide and school-wide incentive programmes using a range of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. In contrast, pragmatic implementation typically featured some individualised incentive schemes, which were less formalised and focused on a limited range of tangible rewards.

**Supports and Barriers for Sustained Implementation**

The inductive analysis of the interview data related to supports and barriers for sustained implementation of IYT revealed four overall themes: (1) IYT delivery; (2) prioritising IYT; (3) consistency, and (4) reviewing, reflecting and refreshing IYT.
**Consistency**

Participants reported that when there was consistency among IYT strategies, school behaviour management practices, and the personal beliefs of other teachers and teacher-aides, teachers implementing IYT, were more able to incorporate and sustain strategies in their classroom practice. School behaviour management approaches consistent with IYT, such as restorative practice and PB4L-SW, supported its implementation.

School-wide behaviour management programmes that were inconsistent with IYT strategies and a lack of consistency between teachers at the same school created barriers for sustained implementation of IYT. For example, teachers found it difficult when children got different messages from different teachers. Even when a school had multiple teachers who had participated in IYT, this alone did not create consistent practice between teachers. Several participants commented about the importance of teacher-aides being trained in IYT to support consistent practice.

**Reviewing, Reflecting, and Refreshing IYT**

Reviewing IYT strategies in team, syndicate or staff meetings provided a strong support for teachers to sustain IYT strategy implementation. Reflection ranged from formal professional inquiry processes to informal personal review processes, such as referring back to IYT resources. Pragmatic implementation of IYT involved informal personal review processes, whereas evangelical implementation involved formal and informal review.

Most participants valued highly the support they received from other teachers at their school. Although participants valued the support they received from other teachers on the IYT course, no participants maintained contact with teachers on their course after completion. For many participants, RTLB support after IYT training was an important factor associated with sustaining incorporation of IYT strategies in practice. For example, a participant explained, “I did IYT, I was great and then two years later I had the most difficult class I’ve ever had … I lost everything … I needed an RTLB to come in and redirect me.” Several participants recommended RTLB run refresher courses in IYT and one participant suggested running a symposium. Several participants mentioned lack of time and stress as barriers for implementing IYT strategies.

**DISCUSSION**

An interpretative description of participants’ perceptions and experiences of implementing IYT provided insight into how teachers incorporated IYT into their everyday practice and participants’ perceptions about the supports teachers require. The conceptual categories of evangelical, pragmatic, unrelated and no implementation types formed an interpretive framework for considering various factors that influenced each teachers’ practice within these implementation types. The TNA was summarised and presented as a visual representation (Figure 1) of the relationships between the implementation types, the frequency and complexity of strategy implementation, and the level of support required for implementation.

![Figure 1. Conceptualisation of IYT implementation types](image-url)
Three continua, visually represented in Figure 1, indicate the frequency of strategy use, strategy complexity and the level of support for implementation. The associations between these dimensions and teachers’ implementation type provides an in-depth understanding of the factors that influence the way teachers incorporated IYT into their practice. For example, teachers categorised in the evangelical implementation category frequently used a variety of strategies with fidelity and those in the pragmatic implementation category used a limited range of less complex strategies. This association was apparent when participants reported that the most commonly used and easily embedded IYT strategies were proximal praise and developing positive teacher-student relationships. Although there is evidence for the effectiveness of promoting home-school relationships (Biddulph, Biddulph & Biddulph, 2003), social and emotional coaching (Church, 2003), and behaviour plans to support students’ improved behaviour (Voorhees, Walker, Snell & Smith, 2013; Wylie & Felgate, 2016c), participants reported that these more complex IYT strategies were used less frequently and with limited fidelity.

The degree to which supports and barriers influence implementation is highly likely to influence the type of IYT implementation. The interview analyses revealed that group leaders were not routinely undertaking coaching between IYT workshops. This reflects Wylie and Felgate’s (2016c) finding that 12 percent of primary school teachers reported their IYT group leader never or rarely observed their classroom practice. Correspondingly, 52 percent of IYT group leaders reported difficulty having sufficient time to work with teachers between workshops (Wylie & Felgate, 2016a). Yet coaching is a key component of IYT, often cited as necessary for sustained implementation (Reinke, Herman, Stormont, Newcomer & David, 2013; Stormont et al., 2015). Further, many studies citing the effectiveness of IYT include regular coaching visits in their evaluations (Murray, Rabiner & Carrig, 2014; Raver et al., 2008; Snyder et al., 2011). This study’s findings indicate that teachers in the evangelical implementation category were more likely to have experienced coaching visits when these were available aligns with the literature findings that highlight the value of personalised coaching for supporting teachers’ practice change (Wood, Goodnight, Bethune, Preston & Cleaver, 2016).

Unsurprisingly, the study highlighted school leadership that prioritised IYT as a particularly important factor in supporting teachers to implement and sustain IYT. This finding reflects the literature, which attributes supportive leadership as a core component of effective teacher growth (Timperley et al., 2007), with school leaders’ promotion or participation in PLD the most impactful leadership activity related to affecting student outcomes (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009). The current study added a deeper understanding of the specific factors that supported teachers practice, such as the routine use of coaching, modelling, and formalised feedback and review mechanisms. For example, where schools had not initiated formalised management support and review mechanisms for sustaining IYT strategies in classroom practice, teachers’ implementation slipped or was not embedded into practice as deeply as it could have been. This finding reflects Wylie and Felgate’s (2016c) evaluation, which found nearly one-third of primary school teachers desired follow-up support and review after IYT.

Participants also talked about the need for consistency between IYT and school behaviour management practices, teachers’ practices, and teachers and teacher-aides. This finding reflects the PLD literature, which argues PLD is strongly shaped by the context in which the teacher practises (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Timperley, 2008). Of note, the present study found schools participating in PB4L-SW also had high levels of school management support for IYT. These PB4L-SW schools had school-wide and multi-tiered behavioural strategies, providing contextual support for teachers’ implementation of IYT. Similarly, Boyd and Felgate’s (2015) evaluation of PB4L-SW, found schools which consistently implemented PB4L-SW also had active leadership.

The study found teachers, school leaders, SENCO/ST, and IYT group leaders, have a wealth of knowledge about how to incorporate and sustain IYT in teaching practice. Similar to Wylie and Felgate’s (2016b) evaluation, the teachers in this study greatly valued learning from each other. Although communities of practice are an important post-PLD element that support long-term implementation (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Sheridan, Edwards, Marvin & Knoche, 2009), the study found no teachers or schools established a community of practice that may have supported teachers’ long-term implementation of IYT.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The perceptions of teachers who had participated in IYT and educators in roles for supporting teachers’ practice provided a variety of lenses for understanding of how teachers implemented IYT. Implementation ranged from IYT strategies being deeply embedded in teaching practice to no changes at all. Rigorous and iterative thematic analysis procedures enhanced the trustworthiness of the representation of the participants’ voices, ensuring that the study’s interpretative framework was a valid
lens for considering the supports and barriers related to IYT implementation.

The findings confirm previous research evidence and evaluations of IYT in New Zealand but add a more comprehensive and multi-dimensional understanding of how factors related to teachers’ engagement with the IYT programme and the supports they receive in their school contexts influence the way they incorporate IYT strategies into their everyday practice. Participants’ responses highlighted the importance of facilitating engagement with the IYT content and learning activities. Where there was clear alignment between the content and teachers’ beliefs, values and pedagogy, they were more likely to embed IYT into their classroom practice and implement strategies consistently and with fidelity. As teachers identified challenges accepting some aspects of the IYT training, their engagement with this kaupapa (philosophy) could be enhanced through learning from other New Zealand teachers implementing IYT in their classrooms. For example, sharing video examples of teachers implementing specific strategies might provide more clarity around the more complex IYT strategies such as circle time, planned ignoring, time out, and descriptive commenting. Kaupapa Māori projects such as Hei awhina Mātua (Berryman, 2015) exemplify how IYT resources could be developed in culturally-responsive and collaborative ways with teachers, whānau, students, and community members. Further, it is recommended that group leaders facilitate discussions before and after teachers watch the IYT programme vignettes, contextualising them for New Zealand contexts.

Teachers also expressed a need for additional support to embed their IYT learning into their classroom practice. The participants highlighted the need for group leaders to increase the frequency of their between workshop coaching sessions and provide follow-up workshops. Strengthening school leadership was another consistent theme that could be addressed through the provision of tailored IYT workshops to provide school leaders with an understanding of what support their teachers need to embrace the practice changes. Participants identified PB4L-SW as a crucial systems support that provided a more consistent context for supporting their IYT implementation. This finding indicates that the continued roll out of PB4L-SW across New Zealand schools is a key support for sustained incorporation of IYT into teachers’ practice.

Given the evidence related to the importance of communities of practice in supporting teachers’ practice change, this study’s finding that values the support provided through reciprocal learning provides a strong rationale for promoting opportunities for teachers to showcase examples of their IYT practice and refresh their understanding of IYT strategies.

The development of opportunities to engage in a community of practice along with additional systems and coaching supports have the potential to enhance IYT implementation and ultimately promote positive behavioural and learning outcomes for New Zealand children.
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