Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

2018

A Comparison of Restorative Justice Ideology Between Administrators, Teachers, and Parents

Renée J. Alger
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Renée Alger

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Barbara Benoliel, Committee Chairperson, Human Services Faculty
Dr. Gregory Hickman, Committee Member, Human Services Faculty
Dr. Garth den Heyer, University Reviewer, Human Services Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

A Comparison of Restorative Justice Ideology Between Administrators, Teachers, and

Parents

by

Renée J. Alger

MA, Walden University, 2014

BS, University of Phoenix, 2012

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Human Services

Walden University

November 2018

Abstract

Researchers suggest that restorative justice processes in schools are a successful alternative to traditional punishments for school discipline, and are used for both reactive and proactive responses to behavior issues. However, the processes are not sustainable if the administration implementing restorative justice do not promote a restorative justice ideology (RJI), and if all systems that impact the student are not aligned. Therefore, study was conducted to compare the level of restorative justice ideology between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents with a validated restorative justice ideology survey instrument that includes cooperation, restoration, and healing, and an accumulative score for RJI as a whole. Data were collected and analyzed with a One-Way ANOVA test at a selected convenience sample of 45 schools in a Western state. Using the theories of restorative justice, pedagogy, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems model, the comparison of ideologies between these groups indicated a statistically significant difference between administrators and parents in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration, and in the overall belief of restorative justice ideology, showing a lack of alignment. The findings can impact social change by the identification of barriers in sustainable implementation of restorative justice in schools. The findings can also be used to suggest an evidence-based model that includes parents and families in all stages of planning, implementation, and continued practice, along with consideration that restorative justice is a belief system rather than a behavior intervention.

A Comparison of Restorative Justice Ideology Between Administrators, Teachers, and

Parents

by

Renée J. Alger

MA, Walden University, 2014

BS, University of Phoenix, 2012

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Human Services

Walden University

November 2018

Dedications

This dissertation is dedicated to my four children. Devinee, my first born and only daughter who continues to teach me love and acceptance; Eamon, the oldest twin who has always showed a strong sense of social justice and teaches me to trust and communicate; Elias, the second twin who has become an inquisitive scientist, and who reminds me how important it is to take the time to go fishing; and Blue, the last of the tribe, and the one who shows me how valuable a simple hug is in revitalizing the soul. You are each amazing and unique humans, and even though this journey has been rough, we somehow made it to the end together.

This dissertation was also written in loving memory of my best, best friend in the whole wide world. I started this journey soon after she passed. No longer able to continue a life that I only knew how to live with her by my side, I hid from the world using the excuse of school, not realizing I was protecting myself and starting a healing process. Nicole was my support system, encourager, and partner in crime while she was by my side, and after leaving this earth she evolved into my spiritual guide.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to acknowledge my four children, three of whom have become adults through this process. They endured ten straight years of me working full-time and attending school full-time, with many nights of cereal or pizza for dinner while I was writing essays, and they had to learn how to wash their own laundry before most of their friends out of necessity for clean clothes. Thank you for not disowning me through this process.

Just as important, I would like to thank my mother, Karen for always showing me anything is possible, and encouraging me to "just go for it" any time I was hesitant. Just as she courageously pushed through more obstacles than she ever let anyone see I have learned from her to be unstoppable. To my sister Robin, who is the one person I know will be there no matter what. Even if I run off across the country she will show up as the big sister she has always been, and to my brother Curt, who has taught me how to fix more things throughout the years than one would even think possible to break. Thank you both for starting as my second parents and becoming my best friends.

An extremely special thanks to Dr. Barbara Benoliel, my committee chair, who spoke to my soul with our shared passion for restorative justice. I had a vision and she guided me through this process until there was a finished product to share. Another special thanks to Dr. Gregory Hickman as my methodologist through this study. He speaks my quantitative language, and when I grow up, I want to be the perfect combination of these two—an expert football statistician for my son, and a restorative

healer who inspires others with compassion. They both possess immense grace in their

areas of study.

Last, and definitely not least, my Q Family, Karen Barnes, Rarkimm Fields,

Sharon Cox-Bevley, and Terrance Hinton. You have become my family through this

journey. We somehow all ended up together and have been inseparable since. We have

made it through as a team, and I look forward to changing the world together.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The following chapter introduces the study and provides support and reasoning for the development of the study. The research included a comparison of restorative justice ideology between administrators, teachers, and parents. Major sections of this chapter include the background of the study, problem statement, purpose, research questions, hypotheses, theoretical framework, nature of the study, definitions, assumptions, scope of delimitations, limitations, significance, and a summary.

Background

Beliefs and practices associated with restorative justice originated in indigenous populations from around the world (Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, & Frey, 2012). The traditional practice typically involved some form of healing circles that included the person or persons who caused harm, the victim, community members who may have been impacted by or witnessed the harm, and community elders who served as peacemakers (Hand, Hankes, & House, 2012). The focus of the healing circles is on regaining harmony in the group or community instead of placing the focus on the actual act that caused the harm (Hand et al., 2012).

The use of restorative practice in the United States and the Western democracies first began as a movement in the 1960s and 1970s and then was introduced into the criminal justice system (Lippens, 2015). Restorative justice gained momentum from there and is currently being used in a variety of settings: criminal justice and legal systems, schools, in some places of employment, and in other settings with forms of

healing circles (Garbett, 2015; Hand et al., 2012; Lippens, 2015; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012, & Roland et al., 2012). Education for restorative justice can also be found in academic disciplines including schools of social work, sociology, theology, criminal justice, law schools, education, and interdisciplinary studies (Armour, 2013). Restorative justice encompasses many values such as empathy, harmony, dignity, openness, inclusion, self-determination, human interconnectedness, collaboration, accountability, repair, making amends, equality, victim centered, honesty, restoration, cooperation, trust, healing, and respect (Armour, 2013; Hopkins, 2015; Gilbert, Schiff, & Cunliffe, 2013; Hand et al., 2012; Roland et al., 2012). Roland et al. (2012) also identified three principles of restorative justice to distinguish restorative justice ideology: healing, cooperation, and restoration.

The discipline structure in schools has traditionally operated on principles that are punitive based with the use of corporal punishment (Sparks & Harwin, 2016) and school resource officers (McKenna & Pollock, 2014). School policies have also been enforced that conflict with restorative values. Zero tolerance policies resulting from the war on drugs in the Reagan era mandated specific punishments and even court referrals for certain behaviors that administrators were previously allowed discretion based on the incident (Schept, Wall, & Brisman, 2015). Multiple researchers found that zero tolerance policies resulted in suspensions, detentions, expulsions, and the criminalization of students (Bell, 2015; Mallett, 2016; Schept et al., 2015; Triplett, Allen, & Lewis, 2014; H. H. Wilson, 2014; M. G. Wilson, 2013). Alternative methods such as a restorative

process have emerged after findings that zero-tolerance policies result in more harm than good (Bell, 2015).

Restorative justice is a common alterative practice that has been used in schools (Vaandering, 2014). Methods of implementation have varied from an occasional alternative to expulsions to a whole school preventative approach (Roland et al., 2012; Skiba, 2014). Some schools have attempted an entire cultural shift, whereas others have only used the practice under specific circumstances (Vaandering, 2014). The one consistency with the different methods found in the literature was some form of circle conferencing (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012; Roland et al., 2012; Skiba, 2014; Vaandering, 2013, 2014). Additionally, literature featuring elementary and secondary school training for restorative justice emphasized pedagogy in the process to intentionally make restorative processes a part of the daily learning experience (Vaandering, 2014). The values and principles of the educators who implement the processes and work with the children daily are also a significant aspect of training (Mullet, 2014).

Some of the challenges that threaten the implementation and sustainability of restorative processes in schools include conflicting school policies (Pavelka, 2013), lack of resources (Evans & Lester, 2013; Eyler, 2014; Gardner, 2014), transitioning from theory into practice (Rinker & Jonason, 2014), clashing philosophies (Evans & Lester, 2013; Gardner, 2014) as well as ideologies (Roland et al., 2012), and lack of parental involvement (International Institute for Restorative Practices [IIRP] staff, 2016). Although there are challenges, the long-term benefits from restorative justice processes

outweigh the cost of punitive methods that show increased dropout rates, lack of academic success, additional prison space needed, and the loss in social principle resources (Fields & Suvall, as cited in Evans & Lester, 2013). The literature showed consistencies between the challenges when the systems that are meant to benefit the students in the restorative process fail to align (Roland et al., 2012). For example, it is important that those who implement the processes have or are trained in restorative justice ideology (Roland et al., 2012). When there is a lack of consistency and alignment in restorative justice ideology at each level (i.e., administrators, teachers, and parents), the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice practices are compromised.

Though I identified one study where the restorative justice ideology of teachers was evaluated to determine if one sample of teachers possessed ideologies that were closer to punitive principles or closer to restorative justice principles of cooperation, restoration, and healing (Roland et al., 2012), I have not identified any research including attempts to identify alignment between the primary systems that impact the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice practices in schools, which include groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. Comparing these groups for levels of restorative justice ideology allows for the identification of alignment or lack of alignment in these primary systems and provides a starting point to identify where additional training in values, principles, and ideology is needed. Without identifying the levels of restorative justice ideology between these groups, the implementation and sustainability of the processes are at risk of failure.

Problem Statement

In many areas of the world restorative justice processes are now being used in some schools as a component of behavior management and to hold the student accountable, build relationships, and encourage healing (Ahmed & Braithwaite, 2012). In recent years, schools in the United States have implemented alternative methods that are consistent with restorative justice models, with a shift that moves away from the traditional punitive model still held by some schools (Hurley et al, 2015). Restorative justice practices have included an alternative to suspension or detention as well as a school-wide approach to establish a restorative environment (Hurley et al., 2015).

School policies play a significant role in the culture of the school and establish a foundation for either supporting punitive ideologies with zero-tolerance policies that require suspension or expulsion, or restorative ideologies that encourage inclusiveness, restoration, and cooperative relationships among adults and students (Knight & Wadhawa, 2014). Several researchers have suggested that zero-tolerance policies negatively impact students such as disproportionately suspending minority students and hindering resilience in students (Dubin, 2015; Hantzopoulos, 2013; Knight & Wadhawa, 2014; Teasley, 2014). Additionally, there is a correlation between suspensions and dropout rates (Hantzopoulos, 2013). Therefore, some schools across the United States are shifting from the zero tolerance, punitive based policies to policies that support restorative processes (Dubin, 2015; Hantzopoulos, 2013).

The main principles of restorative justice are based on social and emotional healing, reintegration, empowerment, and restoration (Ahmed & Braithwaite, 2012).

Improved grades and reduced office visits have been related to restorative justice theory when implemented in practices in schools (Roland et al., 2012). Although there is significant support for restorative justice in school, implementation and sustainability are threatened when the teachers who implement the processes do not share restorative justice ideology beliefs, which includes cooperation, healing, and restoration (Roland et al., 2012). Additionally, traditional discipline models support authoritarian punishment and conflict with the processes and ideology of restorative justice (Hantzopoulos, 2013). Although school policies may be shifting away from punitive models of discipline, school administrators, teachers, and parents may continue to possess authoritarian and punitive beliefs that conflict with restorative justice ideology, such as the belief that failing to punish is an act of permissiveness (Roland et al. 2012; Santa Rosa City Schools, 2016). It is difficult to implement behavior modification programs in schools when all levels of systems (e.g., district policy, school values and vision, staff values and beliefs, and parent values and beliefs) fail to align (Diaz & Zirzel, 2012).

Although previous research illuminates important findings of challenges in the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice processes when ideology and ecological system levels are not aligned (Hong & Eamon, 2012; Roland et al., 2012), I found no research on comparing the restorative justice ideologies of cooperation, healing, and restoration between groups of school administrators, teachers, and parents. Thus, this study was necessary to examine the differences in the restorative justice ideologies of administrators, teachers, and parents of students to understand the documented problem

of non-sustainable implementation of restorative justice processes in the setting of schools (see Roland et at., 2012).

Purpose

The purpose of this quantitative exploratory comparative study was to compare the restorative justice ideologies of cooperation, healing, and restoration between groups of school administrators, teachers, and parents in a regional area of the United States to compare the levels of restorative justice ideologies and identify alignment or lack or alignment between the groups. I used a descriptive, nonexperimental comparative design with a cross-sectional survey to compare differences in restorative justice ideology traits of cooperation, healing, and restoration with the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument, comparing the levels of restorative justice ideology between the groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States. The responses to the survey determine the level of restorative justice ideology held by respondents in each of the groups of school administrators, teachers, and parents. Consistencies and inconsistencies are determined between each group.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0 1$: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$1: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$2: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$2: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 3: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$3: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$3: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 4: What are the differences, if any, in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$4: There are no statistically significant differences in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$4: There are statistically significant differences in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study includes components of restorative justice theory as described by Strang and Braithwaite (2017), Watkins and Mortimors' (1999) theory of pedagogy, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Hong & Eamon, 2012; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012). Restorative justice theory described by Strang and Braithwaite identifies a process of planned encounter and dialogue between the victim of an offense and the offender together with members of the immediate family and community to repair harm and redefine relationships that include all stakeholders. It is important to focus on interconnectedness in relationships, with an inclusive approach that encourages a respectful environment and supports caring interactions (Vaandering, 2014). Restorative justice theory when applied in schools is not a behavioral modification but a culture within schools. The origins of the theory are based in values and beliefs of indigenous cultures, where community peace and cohesiveness were significant to community survival and success (Payne & Welch, 2015; Roland et al., 2012; Vaandering, 2014). Restorative justice is an alternative process for managing behavior in the school environment that requires all stakeholders be engaged (Strang & Braithwaite, 2017). The opportunity for this engagement comes through education and a pedagogy in the school system that is supportive of restorative options, resilience of

youth, and belief in the ability to learn from past mistakes to avoid repeating them in the future (Payne & Welch, 2015).

Important to restorative justice theory is pedagogy, which Watkins and Mortimore (1999) defined as the conscious activity of a person that is developed with the intention of enhancing another person's learning. Pedagogy is the vehicle to deliver expectations for behavior to children in schools and to the larger community of stakeholders including parents and teachers. Implementation of restorative strategy in schools involves educating the community together (IIRP, 2017). However, some challenges in the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice programs in schools are due to sometimes preexisting embedded culture in the education setting that seeks compliance and control, focusing on the individual, behavior, or broken rule and punishment instead of addressing the harm done and focusing on the relationship (Vaandering, 2014). Morrison and Vaandering (2012) identified teacher training pedagogy with the potential capacity to either significantly support or undermine restorative justice implementation in schools with concepts of conscientization, humanization, and praxis. The role of pedagogy in implementing restorative processes highlights the roles of parents, teachers, and school administrators, indicating a systemic approach to ensure successful implementation (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012). This systemic requirement brings Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory model into the framework, because ecological systems theory helps to explain the roles of each significant player in the implementation of restorative justice.

Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems model defines systems that impact the development of a person (Hong & Eamon, 2012). Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems model suggests the importance of the relationships between the components of ecological systems. Applying Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory to children's development begins with a microsystem—with the child at home and the relationship with parents. Simultaneously, there is a mesosystem, with the connections and activities between at least two settings of the developing person such as the connections between extended family, peer groups, and school teachers. Then there is an exosystem, which may include the connections between school administrators who take responsibility for school discipline policies, procedures and enforcement as aspects in the development of children (Bronfenbrenner, 1974). The alignment of systems creates an ecological force that works together to ensure individual socialization and overall internal community school safety (Strang & Braithwaite, 2017).

With Bronfenbrenner's model as a theoretical framework for successful implementation and sustainability of restorative justice, behavior programs in education and the relationships between child, parent, teacher, school administration, and school policies and regulations should be evaluated to measure the consistency among these groups that support the environment if there is intent on change. The levels are connected, and each of these levels or groups influences the other through the established relationships and structures. The administrators are responsible for the development and implementation of school policies and discipline, placing them as a control mechanism for the groups of teachers and students. As an example, if the mesosystem of teachers

and parents are promoting restorative approaches and repair of harm, while senior school administrators in the exosystem require punishment, the system will be in conflict and not function. The teachers are responsible for the enforcement or support of administrative policies. For the purposes of this study, the measures of ideological alignment between the various stakeholders representing the three levels of the restorative justice ecological system come from the responses of each representative sample of stakeholders in the school system to the previously validated survey instrument. The goal of the study was to see how aligned, if at all, are the stakeholders in their ideology toward restorative justice. More discussion of the instrument used in the study is in Chapter 3.

Each of the incidents a student is involved in may be considered a micro experience for that student; however, the incident expands to the mesoexperience of the other students in the class. There is also a connection between the child and parent in relation to school discipline in the microsystem. The ideology of the parent impacts the experience of the child, even if that experience occurred in school. A particular discipline model or approach may be used in school to deal with an experience of a child, but if that approach conflicts with the ideology of the parent the child may be left confused, reducing the impact of the approach used at school. In comparison, when a parent possesses and demonstrates ideologies in-line with an approach used at school to deal with an experience of a child, that child may experience more clarity in the experience. Therefore, each of these levels significantly impacts the relationships and experiences in other levels (Strang & Braithwaite, 2017).

The measures of each of these groups of administrators, teachers, and parents are grounded in the theory of ecological systems by categorizing each of the groups as directly related to the microsystem, mesosystem, and exosystem of the developing child. For the purpose of this study the parents are categorized in the microsystem of the child, with the child's immediate environment. The teachers are categorized in the mesosystem of the developing child with their relationship with the child and their relationship to the hierarchical structure with the administrators and established policies and procedures for discipline. The administrators are categorized in the exosystem level due to their indirect influence on the environment. The policies and procedure of discipline, which are not evaluated in this study, can be associated with the macrosystem, as they are the structure for the social and cultural values of the environment. Although there are multiple levels of systems, each of the systems impacts the other, grounding this study in the ecological systems theory and confirming the importance of alignment in ideology of the three groups, administrators, teachers, and parents for a social change from the traditional punitive approach to a restorative healing approach in the environment to occur.

Nature of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental comparative design was to examine differences or lack of differences in the overall rating of restorative justice ideologies of administrators, teachers, and parents. The comparative design employs a cross-sectional survey for data collection that uses an established measurement instrument for measuring restorative justice ideology with a Likert scale for response options ranging from 1 to 5 or from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* (Roland et al.,

2012). The restorative justice measurement instrument is a 16-item Likert scale survey

that was developed to measure the beliefs of teachers that are consistent with restorative

justice ideology (Roland et al., 2012). The questions within the scale are meant to

measure three main principles of restorative justice ideology including cooperation,

healing, and restoration (Roland et al., 2012).

The instrument has established validity and reliability identified as most valid for

teaching staff (Roland et al., 2012). This study expanded the research to include

administrators, teachers, and parents to identify alignment or lack of alignment in

restorative justice ideology between these groups or levels of systems. The independent

variable included groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The dependent

variables included a rating score for cooperation, healing, restoration, and an

accumulative score for all three principles together to determine a restorative justice

ideology score.

Data were collected through a Likert scale survey that was sent to potential

participants in electronic email with a SurveyMonkey link. The participants included a

sample of administrators, teachers, and parents in a western region of the United States.

The data were analyzed by importing the results from SurveyMonkey into an Excel file

for calculating, and then to an SPSS file, and using an ANOVA test to identify

differences, followed by a Tukey HSD post-hoc test to identify where the differences are.

Definitions

Definitions for this study include the independent variable, the dependent

variables, restorative justice, and restorative justice ideology. The independent variable

for this study includes categorical groups of administrators, teachers, and parents or primary caretakers. The dependent variables in the study include a scale rating of restorative justice principles of cooperation, healing, and restoration, in addition to a total combined score that rates restorative justice ideology.

Administrators: For the purpose of this study, administrators are defined as professionals who manage the staff and faculty within the school and who employ and enforce the rules of the school. School administrators hold the position of principal, vice principal, or assistant principal (https://www.scoe.org, 2017).

Cooperation: For the purpose of this study, the definition of cooperation was created with the combination of items directly from the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument. The combination of five items on the measurement instrument create the dependent variable of cooperation, including the reverse score of items # 6, 10, 11, 12, 15 (see Appendix A).

Healing: For the purpose of this study, the definition of healing was created with the combination of items directly from the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument. The combination of four items on the measurement instrument create the dependent variable of healing, including items # 9, 13, 14, 16 (see Appendix A).

Parents and *primary caretakers*: For the purpose of this study, parents and primary caretakers are identified as the parent who has primary custody of the child, a legal guardian, or the adult who is primarily responsible for and provides the majority of the care for the student.

Restoration: For the purpose of this study, the definition of *restoration* was created with the combination of items directly from the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument. The combination of seven items on the measurement instrument create the dependent variable of restoration, including items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 (see Appendix A). The items of the measurement instrument and the variables are explained further in Chapter 3.

Restorative justice ideology: Created to provide the foundation for the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument (Roland et al., 2012). The beliefs identified as restorative justice ideology were developed through a factor analysis, which include cooperation, restoration, and healing as the three main beliefs (Roland et al., 20012). Restorative justice ideology as a dependent variable was created with the total score of the measurement instrument (see Appendix A).

Restorative justice: There were many definitions found for restorative justice, along with many contexts for which restorative justice could be used. However, for the purpose of this study *restorative justice* is defined by Cormier "as an approach that focused on repairing the harm caused by offending behavior, while holding the offender accountable for his/her actions" (as cited in Roland et al., 2012, p. 435). The primary focus in this study addresses restorative justice in the context of schools.

Teachers: For the purpose of this study, teachers are defined as professionals who lead the classroom and are licensed to teach with an active teaching credential in the state of California.

Assumptions

It was assumed that participants responded honestly in the self-administered online survey. Participants were assured confidentiality to encourage true and honest responses.   The assumption of honesty was made for the following reasons: participation is voluntary; the survey was distributed to the administrators, teachers, and parents with information showing the survey was from a third party and not through the local region office of education; confidentiality precautions were communicated; participants were reminded to answer honestly; and participants were notified they were able to withdraw at any time throughout the data collection process. Communication and action to support these precautions is important in the validity of the data collection and research process.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of this study limited the school staff that participated in the study to groups of administrators and teachers, although many other staff classifications have daily contact with students and are considered vital in the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice processes in schools. Teachers are the primary contact for students in their daily activities and teachers hold the position that carries the heaviest responsibility for the implementation of restorative justice. Teachers also can embed restorative justice in daily learning through pedagogy. Administrators were added to the study because they hold the power to suspend students and assign detentions, along with making other administrative decisions on budget, policy, and school values. Parents were added to the study because the ideologies of parents can contradict or support the

methods used during the school day, which could impact the response of a child while participating in restorative processes.

In the original study that portrayed the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument only teachers were used, but this study aimed to establish validity for the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument for administrators and parents as well. Multiple studies have been identified that show the connection between school, home, and the success of the student using Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory as a framework (Hong & Eamon, 2014; Lucero, Barrett, & Jensen, 2015; Mengya, Fosco, Feinberg, & Xia, 2016). Adding the populations of administrators and parents in addition to the group of teachers contributes to the overall body of knowledge on restorative justice in schools.

Another delimitation for this study is a lack of generalizability for a wider range population. The study focused on one regional area in a western region of the United States. Although a sample was used that represents the administrators, teachers, and parents in this region, the sample is not representative of all administrators, teachers, and parents throughout the United States.

Limitations

There are a few limitations for this study. One limitation is that the data only provide a snapshot of the ideologies of those in the identified groups in this area, and this information can be used to understand a starting point for training needed and areas to address to increase the success and sustainability of restorative justice processes in the schools in the regional area of the study. There are two schools that were excluded in the

regional area due to personal conflict because my son attended one and is currently

attending the other to avoid any possibility of bias in the responses from participants and

from myself as the researcher in the interpretation of the data.

Some limitations exist that hold relevance to the internal validity related to design

considerations. The chosen design is nonexperimental, which means a narrow view of

the mean score of ideologies between groups is provided. This design does not provide a

history or identification of specific events between a first and second measure, which

could potentially identify factors that relate to a significant change. Even comparing the

original test results to the results of the current test would not be realistic for many

reasons, some of which include that the original test only used a sample of teachers, and

the current test expanded to groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. In addition,

the regional area of the study has been exposed to varying levels of training and policies

around the use of restorative justice. Another limitation is that there may be some level

of self-selecting bias for those participants who chose to complete the survey. Perhaps

those who chose to complete the survey are more educated on restorative justice, but this

element cannot be verified and cannot be considered in the analysis.

Ideally, future studies may include an element of statistical regression to further

examine extreme scores. In addition to statistical regression testing, I suggest adding the

consideration of level of exposure, use, or education regarding restorative justice, and an

evaluation of school policies in relation to the ideologies of each group. The ability to

prove or disprove a statistically significant relationship between the level of training, use,

or exposure of restorative justice and the level of restorative justice ideology could be valuable information to the professionals in the field.

Significance

Implementation and sustainability of restorative justice processes is successful when the beliefs and traits of those who are implementing restorative practices are aligned with restorative justice ideology (Roland et al., 2012). To shift from punitive discipline, it is suggested that there be a movement adopted by the entire school with a complete change in culture (Hurley et al., 2015). Consistencies in restorative justice ideology between all three groups of administrators, teachers, and parents provide a solid structure for establishing a whole school approach with a movement toward a cultural shift from punitive based discipline to a restorative environment.

This study is significant because it includes the initial identification of the restorative justice ideology beliefs and traits of the administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in a western region of the United States to establish alignment or lack of alignment between levels of systems, including the level of school administration, teachers who work daily with the students and parents who influence the students at home. Identifying alignment or lack of alignment between system levels categorized by participant groups of administrators, teachers, and parents can provide valuable information needed to determine which, if any, areas need to be addressed for all levels to become aligned. Each of these system levels of administrators, teachers, and parents impact the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice processes in schools. Understanding the current ideologies and cultural challenges from a systems level

approach in this regional area helps in determining what challenges need to be addressed before implementation of a restorative justice practice can be sustainable (Hurley et al., 2015). The theory of ecological systems is not being challenged in this approach, which is being used as a theoretical framework to justify the importance of alignment between the systems. This study aims to simply show alignment or lack of alignment between the levels or groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Summary

Restorative justice has been used in indigenous cultures with forms of healing circles to repair harm (Roland et al., 2012, Hand et al., 2012). Chapter 1 introduced the study by providing the background and identifying the problem, research questions, and limitations. Using the theoretical framework of restorative justice, pedagogy, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, I aimed to compare the restorative justice ideology between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Chapter 2 will review current literature in regard to restorative justice, focusing on restorative justice in schools. The history of restorative justice is discussed, identifying the origin of restorative justice in the indigenous cultures (Roland et al., 2012), the introduction of restorative justice in the criminal justice system (Vaandering, 2013), and the use of restorative justice in schools (Vaandering, 2013). In addition to restorative justice, the history of school discipline is also discussed with the use of punitive methods, zero-tolerance policies, and the shift from punitive methods in schools to restorative methods in schools.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

In recent years restorative justice processes have been implemented in schools in forms that include both alternative methods to suspension and detention and as an entire cultural shift from a punitive structure to a restorative environment (Hurley et al., 2015). Restorative processes are a positive way to hold students accountable for their actions, encourage healing, and build and maintain relationships (Ashmed & Braithwaite, 2012). Restorative processes can also lead to outcomes such as reductions in office visits and improved grades when restorative justice is implemented in schools (Roland et al., 2012). However, in addition to positive outcomes, there are also many factors that may inhibit the implementation and sustainability of restorative processes. School policies may either support or conflict with restorative processes (Knight & Wadhawa, 2014). Additionally, it is difficult to implement and sustain restorative processes in schools when teachers who implement the processes do not possess and demonstrate restorative justice ideologies (Roland et al., 2012).

This chapter includes an explanation of the strategies used for researching literature related to restorative justice. From findings in the literature the theoretical foundation was developed for the study, additional concepts related to restorative justice in schools were identified, and the methodology and variables for the study were chosen. Concepts discussed in the chapter include the historical perspective of restorative justice, values and ideologies of restorative justice, a history of discipline in schools, restorative justice in schools, training for restorative justice processes in schools, challenges, and

theoretical support for change with the theories of restorative justice, pedagogy, and

ecological systems.

Literature Search Strategies

The literature used for this literature review was found through multiple databases

and sources. EBSCO was used to access peer reviewed articles through Education

Source, ERIC, SocINDEX, and PsycINFO. ProQuest was used to review dissertations.

A variety of key words were used throughout the research process in combination with

others, and individually, which include *administrators, challenges, culture change,*

discipline, education, elementary, history, ideologies, interventions, origin, paddling,

pedagogy, policies, principles, punishment, punitive, restorative justice, schools, school

policy, shame, system, teacher, training, values, and *zero tolerance.* In addition to the

databases, some information was found on the International Institution for Restorative

Practices website, the Department of Justice website, and the California Department of

Education website.

Historical Perspective of Restorative Justice

Restorative justice beliefs and practices originated from indigenous populations

around the world (Roland et al., 2012). Some of the identified indigenous populations

known to use forms of restorative justice include native cultures of Japan, Australia, and

Africa, the Maori of New Zealand, aboriginal peoples of North America (Roland et al.,

2012), and Native American cultures of Northern America (Hand et al., 2012). The

populations with cultures that employ restorative justice practices traditionally use

healing circles (Hand et al., 2012), or peacemaking circles, as a way of healing after

damaging behaviors of community members (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012). The practices of restorative justice are not focused on the events of the damaging behaviors but instead on the disruption and restoration of harmony in the group or community (Hand et al., 2012). Elders in the community serve as peacemakers who facilitate the communication in the circles between the various parties involved in the events (Hand et al., 2012). The harm done is viewed as a violation of the relationships and humans' rights, and therefore all those impacted by the harm are invited and expected to participate in the processes intended for healing (Roland et al., 2012). The expected participants include the offender or wrongdoer, the victim(s), and community members impacted by the harm (Roland et al., 2012).

In Western democracies restorative justice emerged as a movement in the 1960s and early 1970s right after the counter-hegemonic or counter-cultural developments, though at that time restorative justice was seen as only an idea (Lippens, 2015). The practice or idea was first identified in the counter-hegemonic and counter-cultural literature by Thomas Mathiesen in *The Politics of Abolition*, published in 1974, communicating the need for unwavering justice as a continual goal of the community (Lippens, 2015). Following Mathiesen's pragmatism, the restorative justice movement continued to expand in the criminal justice field (Lippens, 2015). Mark Yantzi, a probation officer, reintroduced restorative justice into contemporary Western society in the criminal justice system by suggesting that two adolescents who were accused of vandalism meet the property owners who were the victims (Vaandering, 2013). Similar situations that followed began the shift away from rules or laws broken and toward a

focus on repairing the hurt that had been caused and the needs of the victim (Vaandering, 2013). In later years restorative justice moved to a hybrid of methodological, theoretical, and practical forms with an aspiration for a just and pure form of criminal justice (Lippens, 2015). The responsive nature and diverse structure of restorative justice has led the movement into becoming one of the dominant practices in the criminal justice field (Lippens, 2015).

In more recent years, restorative justice has become a worldwide movement (Garbett, 2015). Forms of restorative justice practices are currently used in the field of criminal justice, schools, in some places of employment, and in other settings with forms of healing circles (Garbett, 2015; Hand et al., 2012; Lippens, 2015; Morrison and Vaandering, 2012, & Roland et al., 2012). Restorative justice is also offered in academic disciplines such as social work, sociology, theology, criminal justice, law schools, education, and interdisciplinary studies (Armour, 2013). However, though there are numerous processes after an act of injury or harm that are claimed to function as restorative practices, Garbett (2015) found no consistent idea is used. In addition to the term *restorative justice*, multiple other terms have emerged such as *restorative approaches* and *restorative practice*, signifying a new phase that embraces the repair of harm through restoration in other settings such as schools, places of employment, neighborhoods, and social services in addition to the criminal justice system (Green, Johnstone, & Lambert, 2013).

Restorative Justice Values and Ideologies

Values

There were many values associated with restorative justice found in the literature, which included empathy, harmony, dignity, openness, inclusion, self-determination, human interconnectedness, collaboration, accountability, repair, making amends, equality, victim centered, honesty, restoration, cooperation, trust, healing, and respect (Armour, 2013; Hopkins, 2015; Gilbert, Schiff, & Cunliffe, 2013; Hand et al., 2012; Roland et al., 2012). Respect has also been acknowledged as one of the common values of process for restorative justice (Armour, 2013). All these values were found to be common across in literature on the restorative process, regardless of the setting.

There are various dimensions of restorative justice that contextualize the values and principles (Armour, 2013). The dimensions of restorative justice include fundamental principles, various restorative dialogue elements, the core practices of restorative dialogue, and the differentiation of roles in the process based on identification of who has been harmed, the needs of this person or group, who is obligated to address these needs, the appropriate person(s) to be included in the response, and the process most appropriate for the entire situation (Amrour, 2013). Furthermore, according to Zehr (as cited in Armour, 2013), the fundamental principles are comprised of ensuring the victim is at the center of the process, healing after harm has been endured, fulfilling obligations and accepting responsibility for accountability, making amends and repairing relationships, and transforming the situation from wrong to right. Umbriet and Armour (as cited in Armour, 2013) also stated that listening without bias or opinion, sharing

authentic dialogue, and speaking to and viewing the whole person are elements of a

restorative dialogue.

The way in which these values are used is just as important as the value itself,

such as repairing harm without instilling guilt into the wrongdoer or focusing on the

action instead of the person who carried out the action (Amour, 2013). For example,

according to Mirsky (as cited in Hand et al., 2012), contemporary practices employed by

the Navajo Nation communicate the importance of reintegration of the wrongdoer into

the community as more important than imposing a punishment. The action is separated

from the person, and the action should not be respected, but the person should (Mirsky, as

cited in Hand et al., 2012). Additionally, humans can recognize right from wrong and

desire harmony; therefore, the restorative practice can restore harmony for the victim and

community as well as the offender (Hand et al., 2012).

Ideologies

Along with values, specific ideologies have been identified as well. After an

extensive literature review, *ideology* can be defined by Roland et al. (2012) through the

definition of restorative justice ideology: "a deep structure personal beliefs orientation

that is consistent with the principles of healing, cooperation, and restoration" (p. 438).

This definition emphasizes on relationships and reinforces the belief that restorative

justice is both a reactive and preventative approach.

Ensuring the identified values and ideologies are embedded in the restorative

justice process creates the space for empathy and dialogue with a center as opposed to

dialogue with sides as described by Armour (2013). With the resistance of taking sides to

shift toward the center, participants must suspend their personal opinions and make efforts to see things from another angle (Armour, 2013). According to Gilbert et al. (2013), the participants must place the importance on human relationships, personal worth, and integrity.

Discipline in Schools

Discipline and correction of undesirable behaviors in schools have varied over the history of the education system in the United States. Corporal punishment has been used as a method of correcting undesirable behaviors in school since the 1800s, and in more recent years alternative methods have been introduced and implemented (Mallett, 2016). School policies around discipline and the stated values and vision of individual schools and school districts change with new trends in the education system.

Law Enforcement Officers

The presence of law enforcement officers in schools began in the 1950s (McKenna & Pollock, 2014). The officer presence initially started with their primary role of enforcement and protection, and the use of officers increased in the 1990s with the Safe Schools Act of 1994 and the launch of the Community Oriented Policing Services Office (McKenna & Pollock, 2014). According to McKenna and Pollock (2014), the increase of citations and arrests for minor offenses of students in schools directly reflects the increase of officers in schools.

Corporal Punishment

There has been a significant decline in corporal punishment in recent years; however, the method continues to remain legal and applied in multiple states across the

United States (Sparks & Harwin, 2016). In 2008 the United States Department of Education's office for civil rights shared that 223,190 students attending schools in the United States in 2006 received physical punished in some form (as cited in Morones, 2013). The number decreased to 109,000 students in the 2013-14 school year in classrooms across the United States (Sparks & Harwin, 2016). In 2013, corporal punishment including paddling was still legal in 19 states, which was a decrease from the 22 states in 2004 that allowed the method (Sparks, & Harwin, 2016). Although the use of corporal punishment is on the decline, there are still states that continue to use the method legally.

Policies

Discipline in schools in the United States has also been impacted by the continuous change in policies. Along with the War on Drugs in the Reagan administration era emerged zero-tolerance policies in schools (Schept et al., 2015). According to Triplett et al. (2014) federal criminal justice policies for weapons and drugs in the 1980s influenced policymakers in education, leading to a range of zero-tolerance policies in the 1980s. With these policies several states employed expulsion mandates for fighting, gang-related activity, and drugs (Triplett et al., 2014). However, zero-tolerance policies were not restricted to only high school or middle school students, and even students as young as kindergarteners were suspended for bringing items to schools such as toy guns, paper clips, and even cough drops (Summer, Silverman, & Frampton, as cited in Teasley, 2014). Prior to the zero-tolerance policies these issues would be categorized as minor offenses, but with the "get tough" policies in place administrators

had no choice other than the required suspension or expulsion (Schept et al., 2015). The criminal justice-based policies turned typical developmental behaviors of adolescents and children into criminal behaviors, establishing the school-to-prison pipeline, according to Mallett (2016). The shift not only increased suspensions and expulsions but also increased the likelihood of the adolescents experiencing punitive outcomes for these minor offenses (Mallett, 2016).

The zero-tolerance policies experienced a significant increase in 1994 with the federal Gun-Free School Act, which mandated schools who receive federal funding to expel students for at least 1 year and make a court referral for any firearm incident (Bell, 2015; Mallett, 2016; Schept et al., 2015; Skiba, 2014; Triplett et al., 2014; H. H. Wilson, 2014; M. G. Wilson, 2013). Under this act any student caught bringing any weapons, firearms, explosives, or committing arson would receive a court referral and be expelled, and failure for the school to comply with this mandate could result in the loss of federal funding (H. H. Wilson, 2014). Multiple researchers agreed these mandates removed the freedom of using any form of discretion by the administration and increased the criminalization of students (Bell, 2015; Mallett, 2016; Schept et al., 2015; Triplett et al., 2014; H. H. Wilson, 2014; M. G. Wilson, 2013). Stemming from the federal Gun-Free School Act of 1994, many other minor acts were added to the list for mandatory expulsion, increasing the exclusion of students in the education system (Bell, 2015).

Initially, the zero-tolerance policies were thought to be an effective deterrent for school gun possession and violence, along with the idea that the policy was keeping the nonoffending students safe (Bell, 2015). But Bell (2015) found no studies that

determined school expulsion or suspension as an effective way to keep schools safe or even reduce disruption. In addition, Skiba (2014) proposed that out-of-school suspensions and expulsions resulting from zero-tolerance policies increased juvenile justice system contact, increased rates of dropouts, and decreased graduation rates are all moderately associated with out-of-school suspension rates. Monahan, VanDerhei, Bechtold, and Cauffman (2014) also found out of school suspension and expulsion also increase the risk of contact with the juvenile justice system.

In the aftermath of failing zero-tolerance policies there has been a shift in federal and state polices around discipline in schools. In 2014 the United States Department of Justice and the United States Department of Education published a letter that acknowledged the problem of racial discrimination in processes of school discipline and aimed to provide guidance in delivering equal opportunities of education to all students through alternative programs that are evidence-based with demonstrated outcomes of reducing misconduct and disruption, an emphasis on character development and positive behavior, and support to help students reach achievements (United States Department of Justice and Education, 2014). Some of the identified successful strategies in the letter included counseling, positive intervention systems, conflict resolutions, and restorative practices (United States Department of Justice and Education, 2014).

The California Department of Education implemented Assembly Bill 420 in 2015, which eliminates the use of in and out-of-school suspensions for students in kindergarten through third grade for willful defiance and disruption as identified in the California Education Code Section 48900(k) (Torlakson, 2016). The California Department of

Education published a letter February 2, 2015, signed by Tom Torlakson, the State

Superintendent of Public Instruction about the assembly bill becoming law, and

discussing the implementation (Torlakson, 2016). Torlakson (2016) stated the change

would show a significant impact on suspensions, considering of the approximate 600,000

students who were suspended each year that forty-three percent were for this single

category of discipline. AB 420 also excludes the offense of willful defiance and

disruption as recommendation for expulsion for any grades kindergarten through 12, and

offers resources through the California Department of Education Behavior Intervention

Strategies and Supports Web page (Torlakson, 2016). Both the federal and state changes

in educational codes and policies recognize the zero-tolerance policies as ineffective and

support restorative processes.

Alternative Methods

According to Skiba (2014) after extensive research and documentation have

appeared showing the lack of desired outcomes and harm caused by the zero-tolerance

policies, alternative methods to school discipline and dealing with undesirable behaviors

have developed. Preventative discipline was the recommendation of Skiba (2014). The

preventative discipline approach simultaneously targets three levels of intervention,

including school-wide prevention, assessment of serious threats, and established plans

and procedures that effectively respond to the identified threats (Skiba, 2014).

Some positive behavior interventions have been implemented with the intention

of addressing undesirable behaviors and positively reinforcing desirable behaviors with

an approach viewed as less punitive than zero-tolerance policies and anti-bullying

policies (Vaandering, 2013). School-wide positive behavior interventions support directs a focus on teacher-centered interventions to address inappropriate or recurring problems of undesirable behaviors (Vaandering, 2013). Similarly, Triplett et al. (2014) identified positive behavior interventions support, as the alternative most researched, and stated studies of positive behavior interventions support showed increases in scores for standardized reading and math, and significant suspension and referral reductions.

Social emotional learning is student-centered and focuses on self-management, relationships, social awareness, self-awareness, and responsible decision-making (Vaandering, 2013). According to Vaandering (2013) both social emotional learning and school-wide positive behavior interventions support are beneficial in self-regulation and personal development and are major methods in the area of school discipline interventions, however, each of these interventions continues the focus on individual behaviors. By continuing the focus on individual behaviors there is still a minimization of culture that supports relationships, continuing the dynamics of inequality of power, and supporting control instead of engagement (Vaandering, 2013). Buckmaster (2016) identified a restorative justice approach as an ethically superior and viable replacement to make school environments more stable and safe.

Restorative Justice in Schools

Restorative justice has been used in communities of indigenous people, in the criminal justice system, in the workplace, and in the education setting according to Roland et al., (2012). Davis (2014) identified the use of restorative justice in schools as a practice and others may offer restorative justice as an alternative program. Lawrence and

Hinds (2016) identified restorative justice as a culture, stating restorative justice is more sophisticated than just another program.

According to Vaandering (2014) restorative justice in schools follows a few key principles that are common among literature that address restorative justice in schools. Vaandering (2014) continued to describe the key principles as follows: the focus not on the broken rule, but the harm caused; nurturing relationships are fostered, and the process promotes caring and thoughtful communication and health; dialog is facilitated for all those who were impacted by the harm, including the person who caused the harm and that person's community members in an effort to identify and then deal with the needs of all those affected by the act that caused harm. Even though the core principles may be similar, variation is found in the implementation and the identification of the methods throughout the literature.

Knight and Wadhwa (2014) identified restorative justice as a way to create opportunity for youth and as an alternative to the previously mentioned zero-tolerance policies in schools. Knight and Wadhwa (2014) also identified this method in schools as restorative discipline. Calhoun (2013) identified restorative justice in schools as restorative practice, and places the focus on identifying whose needs in the aftermath of an event or issue as paramount, along with distinguishing who should be identified as the responsible person in the event. Pavelka (2013) identified restorative justice in schools as a transformational approach with the core principles of repairing harm, reducing risk, and empowering community. According to Pavelka (2013) the collaborative approach

provides solutions to violations of discipline with four common practices of restorative justice that include peer mediation, peer accountability boards, conferencing, and circles.

Hantzopoulos (2013) also recommended restorative justice as a response to the harmful impact of over-policing and zero-tolerance policies. A school in New York implemented the Fairness Committee that includes all school members, such as teachers, students, and staff from the office (Hantzopoulos, 2013). The committee is part of the discipline policy that intends to be more inclusive, and consists of committee hearings to address issues that arise (Hantzopoulos, 2013). Each committee is developed depending on that particular issue, rotating in students from throughout the school and then the committee discovers the consequence most appropriate for that situation (Hantzopoulos, 2013). According to Lawrence and Hinds (2016), the sophistication of restorative justice requires that the cultural norm must be explicitly engrained in the classroom experience, embedded in the activities for professional development of all staff, and well established in the events and communication with the parents and families of students.

Just as zero-tolerance policies applied to all levels of students, kindergarten through 12th grade, restorative justice can also be found in all grades, including preschools according to Lawrence and Hinds (2016), and colleges according to Rinker and Jonason (2014). Lawrence and Hinds (2016) found restorative justice in preschools difficult to implement due to language development restrictions from the young children who may be developmentally unable to accurately articulate through verbal language at that stage. In preschools, objects and images can be used to help the children communicate (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016).

Kindergarten through 12th grade may take a variety of approaches as mentioned above. Some schools may implement a program that is an entire cultural shift, rich with supportive inclusive values, and as a whole school approach according to Vaandering (2014). Roland et al., (2012) and Skiba (2014) found some schools implement as a preventative method, while others implement as a secondary option to a traditional disciplinary system, resulting in a reactive response to a behavior issue (Roland et al., 2012). Even though there is a wide range of varied implementation approaches, the majority of the literature found included examples of some form of circle conferencing (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012; Roland et al., 2012; Skiba, 2014; Vaandering, 2013, 2014).

Restorative Justice Training and Implementation

Seeing that restorative justice is found in multiple settings, including the justice system, grade schools, the workplace, community settings, and colleges in both the coursework and in the student experience (Armour, 2013; Garbett, 2015; Hand et al., 2012; Lippens, 2015; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012, & Roland et al., 2012), there are also multiple forms of training and implementation. For the purpose of this study the following research will focus primarily on forms of restorative justice training in the educational setting. The literature related to training that was included in this literature review highlights training in early education, grade schools, and in colleges.

Early Education

In the early childhood education setting Lawrence and Hinds (2016) suggested a requirement for all staff members to exhibit competencies in positive communication and

de-escalation if he or she works with students or the families of students for

implementation of restorative processes. With the intention of identifying the natural

leaders for staff development Lawrence and Hinds (2016) also suggested the natural

choices of school social worker, school counselor, or assistant principal for developing

restorative justice training curriculum and materials for professional learning in the area

of restorative justice. Lawrence and Hinds (2016) continued by suggesting looking to the

less apparent choices of school nutritionists, health services, teaching staff, and clerical

staff who demonstrate outstanding relationship skills for facilitation and modeling

opportunities for relationship learning, consistent with restorative justice.

Another preferred support includes training for instructional assistants and

teachers in focused areas ranging from classroom procedure development, management

of the classroom, student behavior implementation plans, and the execution of behavior

curriculum with ongoing coaching in these areas as well (Lawrence, & Hinds, 2016). In

addition to the training and ongoing coaching for instructional assistants and teachers,

both should also be required to facilitate a variety of strategies for behavior instruction

with students, such as book studies with emotional and behavioral themes, the

development of oral fluency, and restorative/community circles (Lawrence, & Hinds,

2016).

Elementary and Secondary Schools

Effective restorative justice training was demonstrated with a framework of

productive pedagogies, emphasizing four main elements: connectedness, working with

and appreciating differences, intellectual quality, and an environment in the classroom

that is supportive (Vaandering, 2014). Because restorative justice aims to create a school culture that is relational, the pedagogies framework is an impactful approach according to Lingard, Hayes, and Mills (as cited in Vaandering, 2014), as the four elements of pedagogies are essential in efforts to impact all students' social and academic outcomes, regardless of the student's background. The practice connects social outcomes with the practice of teaching, which is vital for the relationship focus of restorative justice (Vaandering, 2014).

Restorative justice as a philosophy by Zehr (as cited in Mullet, 2014), while Mullet (2014) then suggested the importance of educators to focus on principles and values to lead their efforts in the implementation of the philosophy. Mullet (2014) described the possibility of creating more harm than good when a discipline method is used without the deliberate examination of the values behind the approach. Also according to Mullet (2014) a statewide Chicago network, the Illinois Balanced Restorative Justice (IBRJ) initiative offers consultation, technical support, and training based on the individual needs and questions of schools. Because restorative discipline varies, and is not applied the same across different groups the training and implementation may be situational according to Mullet (2014). Mullet (2014) suggested the majority of established school programs encourage a whole-school approach, however, the center of restorative practice is cautious notice of the questions asked and attention to the harm caused, and can be situational.

Unwind, Windup, and Rewind mini-chats are examples offered by Mullet (2014) that can be incorporated into the daily issues that arise when harm occurs in schools.

Each of the three mini-chat strategies include sets of common adaptable question choices

that are reconciliation focused and may be used in the moment the harm was identified,

or postponed for an intentional alternative time (Mullet, 2014). According to Mullet

(2014) the educator holds considerable responsibility and must be versed in hearing all

sides, and heed vocabulary that suggests ownership and growth because it is not

sufficient to simply ask the questions.

Unwind, the first of the three strategies described by Mullett (2014) focuses on

the person who endured the harm, as the wounded person will need the opportunity to

gain self-control and unwind. The unwind strategy provides a safe space for the harmed

child to express their feelings, allowing the child to unwind from the harm with

supportive questions asked by the educator about the situation and the needs of the child

(Mullet, 2014). Mullet (2014) suggested the questions are directly followed by positive

acknowledgement of courage and affirmation of the child's personal strengths in an effort

to rebuild the personal identity that is lost in harm.

Rewind involves the child who inflicted the harm, reflecting on the situation with

the intention of that child gaining an understanding of how the harm inflicted may have

felt, and how to make things right again (Mullet, 2014). In this second strategy the

educator encourages reflection by asking the child who committed the harm what

happened in a safe place, inviting the student to empathize, identify how his or her own

actions in the situation were piloted, and acknowledge responsibility for changing his or

her outlook (Mullet, 2014). The child then participates in creating a plan for apology, or

making things right (Mullet, 2014). The educator may participate in the preparation with role-play or a continuation of the conversation (Mullet, 2014).

The third and final strategy, windup, is compared to the wind up of a pitcher in baseball according to Mullet (2014). The windup strategy is intended to support the observers of the harm in the process of mending the harm and rebuilding the relationships either in a circle environment or in private (Mullet, 2014). The educator can prompt the observers with empowering questions about how the incident of harm made the observers feel, with the educator also following-up with acknowledgement of courage for their participation and pledge by each student to prevent acts of harm in the future (Mullet, 2014).

An online resource for anyone interested in learning about how to abolish severe punitive exclusion discipline approaches, and employ solutions that allow all students to succeed is provided at Fix School Discipline (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). The resource offers an electronic file identified as a toolkit for educators that provided justification for no longer using suspensions, and three alternative approaches, which include School-Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Support, restorative justice and restorative practices, and social emotional learning (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). With the explanation of alternative approaches, examples of restorative practice implementation were provided with sections about the Oakland Unified School District, Los Angeles Unified School District, and the Loyola Marymount University Center for Urban Resilience restorative justice project (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017).

The online resource suggested restorative circles with the facilitator, as either a trained student or teacher, a talking stick for one person to speak at a time, and discussion that includes positive agreements and values for the circle experience (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). In the beginning of the circle time each participant can check-in by sharing how he or she is emotionally, mentally, or physically feeling and each student can also check-out at the end of the discussion (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). These circles help build relationships and community, prevent conflict, and establish a sense of belonging for students (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). The circles can also be used for establishing core values for the classroom environment, establishing academic goals, and exploring curriculum with students (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). The circles can also be used to repair harm after it has occurred, with other participants who may include other students, community members, parents or families, and a neutral and trained facilitator (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). The online resource suggested about 80% of the restorative practices in schools should be focused on building relationships and establishing a shared culture, while 20% may be responding to harm or conflict (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017).

The specific example of implementation in the Oakland Unified School District suggested a shift in school-wide culture with the understanding that restorative justice is for the entire community and school, meant to include all those who contribute to the behavior of the student, which may include administrators, teachers, other staff members, school security or officers, students, families of students and other community members

or organizations (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). This particular school district utilizes a multi-tier approach that begins with a restorative justice facilitator creating a work plan and scope of work with the restorative justice program coordinator and principal of each school (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). Priorities are identified in the plan and a timeline is established to achieve the priorities (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). The restorative justice facilitator establishes intentional relationships with as many people possible at the school, facilitates proactive circles to build community, and may establish a leadership team that can be trained for when the facilitator transitions out of the school (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017).

The Fix School Discipline online resource recommended approximately 80% of the entire school receives at least eight to 24 hours of training, with the first tier of training to include everyone at the school (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). In this first tier the school staff learn to use restorative strategies, such as talking circles in class, and the development of shared guidelines and values between students and teachers in the classroom (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). Tier two there is training provided for the use of circles for conflict resolution, and as an alternative to suspension (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). Throughout the year, the circles facilitator transitions from the restorative justice facilitator to the assistant principal, school counselors, or peer restorative justice leaders as they receive training and participate in circles (www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017). In the third tier the training curriculum is focused on circles for reentry of students who have been incarcerated, suspended, or who are not feeling welcome in the school, and these circles can include administrators,

probation officers, case managers, teachers, students, and families

(www.fixschooldiscipline.org, 2017).

Higher Education

An ethnographic exploration study of restorative justice conferencing in a college

setting with undergraduate students in a Conflict Studies Program (CSP), with the

students as facilitators for restorative justice conferencing was identified (Rinker &

Jonason, 2014). The study evaluated the experience as reflective practice with

appreciative inquiry, rather than distinguishing challenges (Rinker & Jonason, 2014).

Rinker and Jonason (2014) recognized the importance of closing the gap between theory

and practice and argued the need for conflict intervention pedagogy, restorative justice as

applied pedagogy, and reflective practice to influence campus change.

The deep and complex learning that was essential in the training, preparation, and

planning for the pre-conferencing of restorative justice conference facilitation involved

empathy, practice, creativity, and deep listening in addition to learning and following a

script developed as a safety net with controlled communication in an effort for validity in

the evaluation (Rinker & Jonason, 2014). Rinker and Jonason (2014) acknowledged the

controlled communication method was not consistent with traditional reflective practice,

but was necessary for the evaluation. Although the restorative justice conferencing was

beneficial for the participants in the process of repairing harm and creating social change,

the study found the benefits of the student facilitators and observers by far outweighed

the benefits of the participants, with significant outcomes in the learning process, the

facilitator's role in conflict transformation, and in the challenges of applying theory in practice (Rinker & Jonason, 2014).

Restorative justice training was also discussed in the setting of higher education with a discussion of higher education professionals and resident advisors of college with considerations for access for people of color and communities of color (Blas Pedral, 2014). Sin regards to student affairs professionals and higher education professionals there should be mindfulness when taking a colorblind approach in the application of restorative justice, as whiteness may be perpetuated (Blas Pedal, 2014). It is suggested to recognize people of Color when the setting is in a place where White is the privileged identity according to Blas Pedreal (2014). Patton, McEwen, Rendón, and Howard-Hamilton (as cited in Blas Pedreal, 2014) recommend a means of disruption to the dominance of racism and White privilege embedded in the approach of being colorblind by paying attention closely to color.

The International Institute for Restorative Practices provides education programs that include a variety of courses that may qualify for continued education units for some degrees, conferences and symposiums, graduate certificate, and a master of science in restorative practices (International Institute for Restorative Practice, 2017). As part of the continued education courses there are opportunities for professional development, with one option being the SaferSanerSchools™ Whole-School Change (WSC) Program, which is a model for implementing restorative practices in schools (International Institute for Restorative Practice, 2017). IIRP (2017) has licensed trainers and trains more than 10,000 people each year in restorative practices.

In early childhood education Lawrence, and Hinds, (2016) provided examples of identifying natural leaders and embedding restorative customs within the learning material for the children to be exposed to in their daily educational experience. Elementary and secondary school training literature portrayed a few different approaches to training, but there was an emphasis placed on using pedagogy to make restorative processes intentionally a part of the every day learning experience (Vaandering, 2014), along with placing significant importance on values and principles of the educators who are implementing the process (Mullet, 2014). Again in the discussion of restorative justice in higher education the importance of pedagogy is emphasized, concluding pedagogy as a primary means of training and implementation for restorative processes in schools, no matter the age of the students (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Rinker & Jonason, 2014; Vaandering, 2014).

Restorative Justice Challenges

With the variety of settings and forms of implementation for restorative justice there are many challenges faced with the training, implementation, and sustainability of restorative justice as well. In the educational setting there is a tradition of control, obedience, compliance, and conformity with the intentional hierarchical structures of the system that are extremely resistant to change, as education with the intent for obedience profoundly implanted in the educational system structure (Vaandering, 2014). With a culture dating back to the inception of schools in the United States among other countries, changing the deeply engrained culture can prove extremely difficult on many levels.

Institutional Policies

The implementation of restorative justice in schools through the lens of practices and policies was discussed, and Paveka (2013) identified two major challenges that include institutional policies such as zero-tolerance policies that are constructed with punitive sanctions, and the degree of restorativeness in the implemented program. The punitive sanction of zero-tolerance polices and those similar are in direct conflict with the values and principles of restorative justice, causing conflict in the implementation and sustainability (Pavelka, 2013). The degree of restorativeness is described by Pavelka (2013) with an explanation that many self-identifying restorative justice programs lack the result of true restorativeness, possibly through an absence of inclusion of the victim or stakeholder, failing to justly hold the wrongdoer responsible for his or her actions, or failing to award the level of respect necessary to the victim in the situation. Morris and Maxwell (as cited in Pavelka, 2013) suggested consistency, and the installation of a set of established principles, rather than taking on one specific practice.

Lack of Resources

Minimal challenges were identified with ideologies of school staff not matching restorative justice ideologies, but a strong significance was placed on lack of school resources (Gardner, 2014). Sending a student home on a five-day suspension is easier to deal with and requires less resources than providing the support that is needed to make a transformation in the actions of the student that caused harm, and ultimately in his or her thinking according to Gardner (2014). Evans and Lester (2013) agreed that resources and the time required to implement sufficiently as challenges, with a suggestion of three to

five years as a possible requirement for systematic change significant enough to show results. Additionally, Fields and Suvall (as cited in Evans & Lester, 2013) found that in addition to the program development time requirement, and energy from staff in the initial stages of implementation the programs also require funding for restorative justice facilitators and for training staff. Consistent with Gardner (2014), and Evans and Lester (2013), Eyler (2014) also identified patients as a major challenge, in addition to the need for districts and individual schools to transform the structures of the schools into an environment that is devoted to implementing restorative strategies.

Theory into Practice

A challenge in the facilitation process was identified, as the student facilitator may experience difficulty in extracting the information during the actual conference that was shared during pre-conferencing (Rinker & Jonason, 2014). The challenge is expressed with difficulty in extracting the information previously shared without prompting the participant with guiding questions, while maintaining equal support for the needs of all parties (Rinker & Jonason, 2014). Practice and extensive experience were seen to help with this challenge, showing real situation experience as an essential component in the process of becoming proficient in facilitation (Rinker & Jonason, 2014).

Another difficulty identified includes the transformation of theory into practice (Rinker & Jonason, 2014). Although the theory of restorative justice may show as ideal for repairing harm and implementing inclusion, Rinker and Jonason (2014) brought light to the difficulties in transforming theory into practical application with college students

attempting to do so with coursework, training, and then facilitating restorative circles

with other students. In a college setting with graduate student facilitators, developing a

structure based on theory showed difficult in the area of deciding to use a referral process

for student participants (Rinker & Jonason, 2014). In theory, the participation should be

voluntary if holding true to restorative process philosophy, consequently creating a

referral process that allowed potential participants the choice to participate, rather than

mandating participation created a challenge in the momentum for both systems and

interpersonal change (Rinker & Jonason, 2014).

Clashing Philosophies

  Although there is significant research on restorative justice and outcomes in the

field of criminal justice Morrison and Vaandering (as cited in Evans & Lester, 2013)

found that there continues to be a lack of clarity for what restorative justice should look

like in schools. According to Evans and Lester (2013), clashing philosophies pose as a

challenge when implementing in schools due to the traditions of schools being engrained

with policies that support values aimed to control the student population in an effort to

maintain compliance, which is in contradiction to the statement of Gardner (2014), who

found minimal challenges related to ideologies. With the conflicting philosophies there

is a higher probability of resistance, and when implemented often the punitive methods

supersede the restorative approach. The contradictions can show in many ways, such as

the use of circle conferencing that is not led by peers, but led by teachers who hold power

over the students, conflicting with the true restorative justice principles (Evans & Lester,

2013). According to Evans and Lester (2013), a change of the control and punishment

paradigm is necessary to shift the philosophy from control to a focus on relationships that nurture well-being and growth.

Restorative Justice Ideologies

A multiple stage study was completed, beginning with a literature review to define ideology, and restorative justice ideology, an exploratory factor analysis, focus group interviews, comparative components, and multiple regression analysis (Roland et al., 2012). The exploratory factor analysis was completed with a sample of teacher candidates in an effort to assess the measurements of the restorative justice ideology instrument, the development of sub-factors, and to establish the foundation for measuring construct validity (Roland et al., 2012). Focus group interviews were conducted with administrators, teachers, and child and youth workers with the intention of gaining the perceptions of the beliefs and understanding of restorative justice in schools from restorative justice practitioners (Roland et al., 2012).

Through an analysis and discussion of the findings from the exploratory factor analysis and focus group interviews a few trends were identified, which included a difference between the secondary division and the elementary responses, and a difference in some of the interpretations of instrument items between the administrators, teachers, and child and youth workers due to their professional roles (Roland et at., 2012). The restorative justice ideology instrument was then used to measure restorative justice ideologies of teachers and comparative components assisted in the determination of the three main ideologies of restorative justice, restoration, healing, and cooperation (Roland et al., 2012). Measures of the restorative justice ideologies were compared to findings

from additional validated instruments that were administered to secondary and

elementary school staff including perspective taking (PT), which determines the three

dimensions of empathy, the Interpersonal Reactive Index, which measures empathic

concern (EC), personal distress (PD), pupil control ideology (PCI), and self-efficacy for

teachers (Roland et al., 2012).

Through a bivariate correlation computation, findings showed the restorative

justice ideology of restoration was positively related to EC, and PT, while the other two

restorative justice ideology of cooperation and healing were not positively related to EC,

and PT (Roland et al., 2012). However, all three restorative justice ideology of

restoration, healing, and cooperation were negatively related to PD, showing higher

levels of restoration, cooperation, and healing are associated with lower levels of PD

(Roland et al., 2012). Restoration, cooperation, and healing were also positively related

to PCI scores (Roland et al., 2012). Multiple regression analysis was also conducted with

the restorative justice ideology and teacher self-efficacy aspects, showing a positive

relationship between the restorative justice ideology and teacher self-efficacy (Roland et

al., 2012). These findings show the factors of the restorative justice ideology instrument

are measuring similar constructs as the measures of the PCI, and that higher levels of

teacher self-efficacy are needed to sufficiently and sustainably implement restorative

justice ideology beliefs in schools (Roland et al., 2012).

Challenges were summarized that included the implementation when teachers

demonstrate lower levels of restorative justice ideology, which is also related to teacher

self-efficacy (Roland et al., 2012). Within the study there are suggestions that future

training integrate aspects of empathy and self-efficacy, and that the measurement

instrument may be used in a baseline assessment to develop training, and in the

evaluation process (Roland et al., 2012). Roland et al., (2012) also suggested that the

measurement instrument be used in the prediction of classroom behaviors of teachers

with the implementation of restorative justice strategies, and to show the importance of

first focusing on the beliefs of the staff, before implementing restorative justice

classroom training for better outcomes.

Parent and Family Involvement

Numerous educators fail to inform and involve parents and families in

introductory phases of restorative justice implementation (IIRP staff, 2017). The

importance was recognized with the involvement of stakeholders at all levels of the

school community, and those stakeholders may include administrators at the school site

and the district level, school staff who are non-classified and classified, students, families

of the students, and organizations in the community that serve the students in some way

(IIRP staff, 2017). Failure to acknowledge the importance of family involvement early in

the process of planning and implementation poses the risk of families feeling defensive,

confused, uninformed, along with undesirable consequences to the implementation of the

process (IIRP staff, 2017).

Humans are more likely to change behaviors, and are healthiest and happiest

when authority figures involve them, and things are done with them, rather than to them

according to Ted Wachtel of IIRP (IIRP staff, 2017). Along with identifying the

challenge, the IIRP staff (2017) also identified five ways to inform and involve parents

and families with the intention of gaining support for implementing restorative processes,

which include written material proving information that the students can take home,

involve some families in the planning and implementation process, provide informational

meetings with varying times for working parents to attend, provide social media and

webinars for continuous learning and feedback, and utilize a consultant for technical

support and implementation of best practices. According to IIRP staff (2017), involving

the families early increases buy-in, and ultimately contributes to the success and

sustainability of implementing restorative practices in schools.

The challenges identified may give the perception that punitive models are more

efficient or more effective for immediate results, however, when compared to long-term

costs in the form of increased dropout rates, lack of academic success, additional prison

space needed, and the loss in social principal resources, the choice of restorative justice

outweighs the punitive attempts according to Fields and Suvall (as cited in Evans &

Lester, 2013). With consideration of the identified challenges of institutional policies

(Pavelka, 2013), lack of resources (Evans & Lester, 2013; Eyler, 2014; Gardner, 2014),

transitioning from theory into practice (Rinker & Jonason, 2014), clashing philosophies

(Evans & Lester, 2013; Gardner, 2014), and ideologies (Roland et al., 2012), the

literature shows consistency in a lack of alignment between systems that impact the

students who are meant to benefit from the restorative justice processes. Roland et al.,

(2012) discussed findings from significant research that those who are responsible for

implementing restorative justice practices should first have a level of restorative justice

ideologies for successful implementation. If this element is missing at any level,

administrators, teachers, or parents, the process or practice would not have the support

needed for successful implementation.

Theoretical Support for Change

There are three theories used as a framework for this study, which include

restorative justice, pedagogy, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Hong &

Eamon, 2012; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012; Restorative Justice, 2017). Restorative

justice is known in many ways, including a method, practice, process, theory, philosophy,

and more, however, the philosophy of restorative justice is one of the main elements of

this study. Restorative Justice website (2017) identifies restorative justice as a

philosophy or practice that is used in a variety of settings, including but not limited to the

criminal justice system, communities, workplaces, schools, faith communities, and in

families (Restorative Justice, 2017).

Restorative Justice

Restorative justice aims to repair harm, and repair damaged relationships,

focusing on the needs of the victim and establishing accountability for the person who

created the harm, and including all stakeholders in the process (Restorative Justice,

2015). The focus is the relationship, not the broken rule or law, and the process aims for

inclusion, instead of exclusion as in the punitive tradition (Vaandering, 2014). Although

restorative justice is sometimes used as a behavior intervention, Roland et al., (2012), and

Vaandering (2014) suggested restorative justice is best implemented as a culture or a

whole school approach. For an entire cultural shift within schools, many elements must

be aligned, including policies and legislation, administrative support, teacher

participation, and parent and family understanding and buy-in (Roland et al., 2012; Vaandering, 2014).

The pubic school system is impacted by legislation for government interventions, such as the zero-tolerance policies to address drugs and weapons in schools (Bell, 2015; Mallett, 2016; Schept et al., 2015; Skiba, 2014; Triplett et al., 2014; Wilson, 2014; Wilson, 2013), and anti-bullying legislation with the intention of keeping students safe (Vaandering, 2013). Even anti-bullying legislation is grounded in positional power, compliance, and the discovery of who is right and who is wrong, which continues to encourage youth to adhere to the agenda of adults and support the hierarchical structure (Vaandering, 2013). Newer legislation and policies are in place that are now in support of restorative justice practices in schools, yet the implementation and sustainability of the practice within the schools are still inhibited with challenges. Two major theories address and explain these challenges, including a systems approach that looks at multiple levels of systems that impact the students, and pedagogy approach to achieve sustainability for the implementation of restorative justice in schools.

Pedagogy

Pedagogy may be dinfined in the simplest form as "any conscious activity by one person designed to enhance the learning of another" (Watkins and Moretimore as cited in Vaandering, 2014, p. 65). A consistent theme throughout the literature was forms of pedagogy in the training, implementation, and elements that make restorative justice sustainable in schools (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Rinker & Jonason, 2014; Vaandering, 2014). Although multiple forms of pedagogy were discussed, the belief that restorative

justice should be embedded in the entire learning experience with intention was consistent, showing the appropriateness for pedagogy to be an instrumental part of the framework for this study.

A qualitative study was conducted with the intention of gaining a perspective of the experiences of educators who are implementing and committed to restorative justice in some form in schools by examining restorative justice in the context of productive and engaged pedagogies (Vaandering, 2014). On one end of the spectrum restorative justice is placed in the context of behavior and classroom management, and on the other end of the spectrum restorative justice is placed in the context of engaged, and productive pedagogy (Vaandering, 2014). The majority of the teachers, administrators, and school board members who were part of the study fell closer to the behavior and classroom management side of the spectrum, and very few participants in the study fell closer to the engaged, and productive pedagogy side of the spectrum (Vaandering, 2014).

After the initial part of the study further research was completed, interviewing administrators, and observing and interviewing teachers from both sides of the spectrum over a six-week period of time (Vaandering, 2014). According to Vaandering (2014) although the administrator who was portrayed in the study explained that her and other school members are committed to restorative justice within the school for all grade levels, an additional comment of "as long as they comply" (p. 69) followed that was contradicting to restorative justice values and practices. The administrator expressed that she was committed to "working *with* students," (Vaandering, 2014, p. 69), however, she also expressed that if the restorative processes did not work, and the student had to be

talked to additional times that she would move into the TO, which would turn to punitive measures to address whatever problem was at hand (Vaandering, 2014). These comments show the continued intention of rules, not a focus on relationships even though the statement indicated commitment for restorative justice practices (Vaandering, 2014).

Interviews and observations of two teachers from the same school portrayed different spectrums of restorative justice implementation (Vaandering, 2014). Both teachers received just one training, consistent with all of the other teachers at the school, and one teacher (teacher A) had been at the school and teaching only two years, while the other teacher (teacher B), had been at the school and teacher for around 10 years (Vaandering, 2014). Both teachers expressed they were committed to and excited about restorative justice implementation in the school they are teaching at, but their experiences were very different from one another (Vaandering, 2014).

Examples were used to demonstrate the perspective of teachers' understanding of restorative justice in multiple areas to demonstrate the discourse from either the behavior and classroom management aspect or the engaged, productive pedagogy aspect (Vaandering, 2014). One example includes the teacher understanding of restorative justice, under the discourse of behavior and classroom management the perspective included "confronting what was done wrong and fixing it" and under the discourse of engaged, productive pedagogy the perspective included "RJ is 'who I am", 'part of teaching the whole child'" (Vaandering, 2014, p. 70). Even though each of the teachers who provided the responses expressed their commitment to restorative justice, each perspective is very different.

Other than the comments provided by each teacher, they were also both observed for six weeks and the findings from the observations provided significant insights to the importance of pedagogy and the implementation of restorative justice practices (Vaandering, 2014). Teacher A was excited after receiving the restorative justice training and looked at the process as a way to deal with larger behavioral issues but she did not get the connection to curriculum or the overall classroom community experience (Vaandering, 2014). Teacher A created an exercise for her class for a social studies activity by diving the students in the class into groups to associated with particular political parties for a few weeks, with particular students acting as the politician and running political campaigns (Vaandering, 2014). When it came time for voting for the election the researcher observed the students and participated in a brief conversation with each of the students who were running as electoral candidates and reported that one felt sick to his stomach, one felt as though he would wet his pants, and the other was emotional and did not believe he would get any votes (Vaandering, 2014). Some of the students who were assigned one political party actually threw their support to another candidate and one of the running candidates only received one vote (Vaandering, 2014). The students who were running were deeply affected by the social process, and the teacher had no awareness of the damage caused by her exercise, stating she believed the class participated with maturity and teamwork (Vaandering, 2014). In an interview, teacher A stated she did not believe restorative justice did not impact or change her teacher, that is was merely a way to deal with conflict (Vaandering, 2014).

Teacher B believes her role as a teacher is to listen to and support the students, and she identifies with the lower socio-economic students who may struggle with the academic aspect of school because she can see herself in them (Vaadering, 2014). Teacher B also made the comment that she is restorative justice and reported a feeling of belonging in this particular schools (Vaandering, 2014). Teacher A also values each and every student just the way they are, in or out of her classroom, whereas teacher A sees the potential in students and believes they need the right guidance and training to reach their potential in life (Vaandering, 2014). In the classroom of teacher B each student is greeted with a warm welcome of respect and dignity no matter what time he or she arrives, confirming their value and not focusing on tardiness (Vaandering, 2014). In the classroom there is a consistent and intentional focus on community and giving each student a voice with meaning (Vaandering, 2014).

In many ways, teacher B ran her classroom in very similar ways before the restorative justices training, so many aspects have not changed and have continued to be inclusive and relationship based, but one example provided would not have been possible before her restorative justice training (Vaandering, 2014). One of the students in the classroom of teacher B physically harmed another student, and was receiving complaints of sexual harassment from many of the students, and teacher B immediately facilitated circle conferencing where the teacher invited each of the students to share any of their feelings or concerns (Vaandering, 2014). The student had to spend some time away from the classroom and elements of the issues were considered, but when the student returned to the classroom, with the support from administration teacher B held a reentry circle

where the student was given the opportunity to apologize, and where another student voiced the feeling that this student should be given another chance and that he is a valuable part of the classroom community (Vaandering, 2014).

The examples of teacher A and teacher B show the difference of restorative justice implementation in the same school, under the same administration, and with the same training experience, however, the difference is found in the deeply embedded ideologies of each teacher, and in the use of pedagogy to focus on the learning experience, not the chosen intervention. By teaching from an aspect of engaged, and productive pedagogy one classroom experience was inclusive and relationship based, with restoration and healing intentionally embedded into the curriculum and the entire classroom experience (Vaandering, 2014). Simultaneously at the same school the other classroom used restorative justice only as a means to gaining compliance and control of student behaviors and classroom management (Vaandering, 2014).

Although it was not clearly stated as the use of pedagogy, Lawrence and Hinds, (2016) suggested the intentional use of learning materials such as books and activities that teach restorative values and lessons to the preschool students. Pedagogy was also the common theme in training and implementation for elementary, secondary, and higher education settings (Rinker & Jonason, 2014; Vaandering, 2014). The example used in Vaandering (2014) demonstrates an example of an educator who uses restorative justice as an alternative form of discipline, and an educator who uses restorative justice as integrated values in all lessons throughout the day, showing two completely different experiences.

Ecological Systems and Restorative Justice

The general ecological model shows human development occurs through a process of reciprocal complex interactions that occur regularly and are progressive over a lengthy time period (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). These interactions are experienced in child-child and parent-child activities, education activities, physical activities, reading, participating in difficult tasks, or playing independently, and are known to Bronfenbrenner (1994) as *proximal processes* in proposition one of the general ecological model. Bronfenbrenner (1994) continued to describe the second property of the human development, which included the proximal processes within the environment, both immediate and distant as a joint systematic function in the development of personal characteristics. Stated in simpler terms, the interactions of the child within the environment are what contribute to the child's development.

The ecological systems model consists of those interactions and relationships within and between a set of structures that are nested within one another, beginning with the structure closest to the child as an inner level and then moving outward to larger overarching systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). According to Bronfenbrenner (1994) there are five types of systems including microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems, macrosystems, and chronosystems. Bronfenbrenner (1977) provided descriptions of the first four systems, and did not yet mention the chronosystems. For the purpose of this study the first four systems are used to for an explanation of how each system impacts the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice processes in schools.

The microsystem is the system closest to the developing person, which involves the face-to-face situation and instances with complex interactions of the immediate environment with the developing person in a particular role, such as child, parent, student, teacher, friend, etc. (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Bronfenbrenner, 1994). In this study the microsystem includes the child at home as a child, the relationship with parents or primary caretakers, the child as a student in the school, the teachers and relationships between the students and teachers, and the student in relationships with other students as peers. The immediate environments, both at home and in schools, and the relationships with the primary care provider, teachers, and peers are the closest system to the development of the child.

The mesosystems was described as the connections and activities that occur between at least two of the settings of the developing person (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). As an example related to this study, the mesosytems includes the relationship between school and home. Bronfenbrenner (1994) also described this system as "a system of microsystems" (p. 40). Bronfenbrenner (1994) described the exosystems as the connections and activities that occur between at least two settings, where at least one of the settings does not include the developing person, or student in this case. For this study the exosystems include the connections between school administration and teachers.

Macrosystems consist of the all-encompassing configuration of the three lower systems, micro-, meso-, and exosystems with features of a particular culture or subculture, also including life-styles, material resources, hazards, belief systems, customs, knowledge base, and the options of life course that are intertwined in each of

these systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Bronfenbrenner, 1994). Bronfenbrenner (1977, 1994) described this system as the "blueprint" of a culture or subculture (1977, p. 515; 1994, p. 40). This may include a work environment, which is appropriate for the teachers and administrators in the study, the school environment for the student, and the state and local culture of the educational setting (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Looking at these systems at the macrosystems level shows how the developing person is impacted by the particular psychological and social characteristics of the larger cultural norms and expectations within the smaller microsystems level (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Multiple studies were found that employed Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems model within research pertaining to students (Hong & Eamon, 2014; Lucero, Barnett, & Jensen, 2015; Mengya Xia, Fosco, & Feinberg, 2016). Hong and Eamon (2014) used Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems model as the framework for a study that examined the students' perceptions of school environments that are not safe. The perceptions were examined with factors or the micro-, meso-, and exosystems and found that male youth in the category of older teen showed a higher level of perceived risk (Hong & Eamon, 2014). Additionally, the study showed factors at each level that contributed to higher levels of perceived risk and unsafe school environments for the students (Hong & Eamon, 2014). As an example, poverty was one of the factors that was found in relation to higher levels of perceptions of unsafe school environments, however, after additional variables of parenting and school were added, the variable of poverty was no longer significant (Hong & Eamon, 2014). In the study, Hong and Eamon (2014) concluded that the

relationship and interactions of the parent and child or student and teacher may be more important than the child living in poverty.

The ecological theory and family systems theory was used in a study that examined the school success of adolescents and implications of domains of the individual, family, and school (Mengya, Xia, Fosco, and Feinberg, 2016). Findings of the study showed a more positive family climate as supportive influence for academic self-regulation, and showed a school attachment increase over time (Mengya et al., 2016). Additionally, the findings of the study also showed that a more positive school attachment contributed to a more positive family climate, highlighting the point that school and family factors impact the other, and both impact success in school (Mengya et al., 2016).

A different study was based in the context of the school and family of the individual child, and used the ecological framework to examine individual factors that include ethnicity, race, and gender in the setting of the microsystem for identification of a relationship between the factors and early delinquency (Lucero, Barnett, and Jensen, 2015). Lucero et al., (2015) confirmed that risk of early delinquency fluctuates by ethnicity, nativity status, race, and gender, with findings consistent with pervious studies from Aud, Fox, and KewalRamani; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Goodkind Shook, Kim, Pohlig, and Herring; Greenman and Xie; Hernandez; the National Center for Educational Statistics; Walters (as cited in Lucero et al., 2015). The study also showed findings that identified a positive relationship between early delinquency and parental stress, and a negative relationship between early delinquency and school

belonging (Lucero et al., 2015), again demonstrating the link between family and school experiences and environments and the impacts on children.

All of the school related studies mentioned above that use Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory as a framework show the connection between school, and home on the development and effects of the student (Hong & Eamon, 2014; Lucero et al., 2015; Mengya et al., 2016). The restorative justice theory is used for the framework of this study because the process studied is restorative justice. The pedagogy theory is used due to the substantial research that showed how changes in school programs, and even more specifically, changes toward restorative processes are more successful when fully embedded into the intentional teaching and curriculum for the student (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Rinker & Jonason, 2014; Vaandering, 2014). Finally, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1994) supports the connection of all systems impacting the child, both directly and indirectly for alignment of ideologies and better success in the implementation and sustainability of restorative processes in schools.

<div align="center">**Selected Variables**</div>

The selected independent variable for this study includes categorical groups of administrators, teachers, and parents or primary caretakers. This study groups each of these populations for a comparison of restorative justice ideologies between each group. Each of the groups is described below.

Administrators

School administrators typically experience less direct contact with students than teachers, however, administrators are responsible for school policies, and decisions on

disciplinary actions. The Association for California School Administrators (2017)

identifies school administration as the formal leadership of the school. According to

Bell, (2015); Mallett, (2016); Schept et al., (2015); Triplett et al., (2014); Wilson, (2014);

Wilson, (2013), some policies have previously been implemented on a federal, state, or

district level that require particular disciplinary mandates, and the policies did not allow

school administration to deviate from these disciplinary standards. Vaandering, (2014)

demonstrated the importance of support from administration in the implementation of

restorative processes, and also demonstrated how restorative processes were implemented

completed different between two teachers with the same training under the same

administration.

Teachers

Teachers are the adults who have the most daily contact with students during

school hours and in many cases are directly responsible for implementing restorative

practices, or are at least responsible for circle conferencing on some level (Hantzopoulos,

2013). As Vaandering (2014) demonstrated, the values, ideologies, and pedagogy theory

of the teacher have a direct impact on the implementation of restorative processes in

schools. The teacher also has to carry out the policies and rules developed by

administration or higher-level authorities.

Parents and Primary Caretakers

Parents and primary caretakers for the purpose of this study are defined as any

primary caretaker in the home of the student. Lawrence and Hinds (2016) claimed

communication and events with parents and the families of students should be embedded

with cultural norms that support restorative processes. Additionally, restorative processes

involve all of those who may have been impacted by the harm caused and should

participate in restorative circle conferences when their child is either the victim or

offender in a situation (Fix School Discipline, 2017). Bronfenbrenner's ecological

systems theory also showed the connection between family and school in the

microsystems level of development, with the importance of relationship between home

and school (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Summary of Literature Review

Beginning in the cultures of indigenous populations restorative processes have

been used in communities for many years (Roland et al., 2012), but the processes are just

showing up in schools in more recent years (Garbett, 2016; Hand et al., 2012; Lippens,

2015; Morrison and Vaandering, 2012, & Roland et al., 2012). Although there is a

lengthy list of values and ideologies associated with restorative processes, the main

ideologies that are measured in this study include cooperation, healing, and restoration

based on a previous study that developed a measurement instrument for these restorative

justice ideologies (Roland et al, 2012). Discipline in schools has evolved from corporal

punishment with a punitive culture (Sparks and Harwin, 2016), to alternative methods

leaning toward preventative models that include restorative processes (Skiba, 2014).

With any major change in school practices or culture there are challenges, and

some of the identified challenges of the implementation and sustainability of restorative

justice processes include the application of theory into practice (Rinker & Jonason,

2014), the deeply embedded hierarchy of punitive structure in the education system

(Vaandering, 2013), policies that are in direct conflict with restorative processes

(Pavelka, 2013), and conflicting ideologies of those who are implementing restorative

processes or who have direct influence over the student (Rolend et al., 2012). The

theoretical framework for this study includes restorative justice (Restorative Justice,

2017), pedagogy (Vaandering, 2014), and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory

(Bronfenbrenner, 1994). School administrators, teachers, and parents or the primary

caretaker were identified as the most meaningful groups to be evaluated, as their direct or

indirect influence may effect the implementation and sustainability of restorative

processes in schools. In this study the restorative justice ideologies of cooperation,

healing, and restoration are compared between groups of administrators, teachers, and

parents or primary caretakers of students.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

Considering the theories of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems showing the connection between family and school (Bronfenbrenner, 1994), and the theory of pedagogy with engraining restorative justice ideology into every aspect of the teaching for social change (Lawrence & Hinds, 2016; Rinker & Jonason, 2014; Vaandering, 2014), this study was aimed to identify differences or alignment in restorative justice ideology between administrators, teachers, and parents. The following chapter includes the research design, variables, research questions, hypotheses, population, setting and sample, data collection method, the research instrument, data analysis, validity, and ethical considerations. The chapter concludes with the summary of methodology.

Research Design

The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental comparative design study was to examine statistical differences in the overall rating and subscale ratings of restorative justice ideology between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The comparative design employs a cross-sectional survey for data collection that uses an established measurement instrument for measuring restorative justice ideology with a Likert scale that has response options ranging from 1 to 5 with *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* (Roland et al., 2012). The 16-item scale ratings provided a total accumulative score for overall restorative justice ideology, and three subscales for individual scores in cooperation, healing, and restoration (see Appendix A).

Rationalization of Quantitative Approach

The quantitative approach was chosen because I identified a measurement instrument that measures restorative justice ideology with scores from responses in a Likert scale. The questionnaire was administered to a large sample of the population in electronic form for a sufficient response rate at a low cost. The measurement instrument is validated with teachers and because the questionnaire allows responses on a Likert scale the scores from the responses are easily analyzed by importing from SurveyMonkey to SPSS.

Variables

The independent variable included three categorical groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The dependent variables include scores for predetermined factors of restorative justice ideologies of cooperation, healing, and restoration. In addition, the responses were calculated to determine an accumulative score for the entire instrument to account for the dependent variable of restorative justice ideology. As previously defined the independent variable for this study is in three categorical groups: administrators, who who manage the staff and faculty within the school, and who employ and enforce the rules of the school such as principals, vice principals, or assistant principals; *teachers,* who lead the classroom and are licensed to teach with an active teaching credential in the state of California; and parents and primary caretakers, who have primary custody of the child or are a legal guardian or the adult who is primarily responsible for and provides the majority of the care for the student.

Additionally, the dependent variables, as defined earlier, included cooperation, healing, restoration, and restorative justice ideology. The definition of *cooperation* was created with the combination of the reverse score for five items on the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument, including items # 6, 10, 11, 12, 15 (see Appendix A). The definition of *healing* was created with the combination of four items on the measurement instrument, including items # 9, 13, 14, 16 (see Appendix A). The definition of *restoration* was created with the combination of seven items on the measurement instrument, including items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 (see Appendix A). The context and operational definition for *restorative justice ideology* as a dependent variable for this study includes the combination of beliefs identified as restorative justice ideology restorative justice ideology as a dependent variable was created with the total score of the measurement instrument (see Appendix A).

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0 1$: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1 1$: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$2: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$2: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 3: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$3: There are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$3: There are statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Research Question 4: What are the differences, if any, in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States?

$H_0$4: There are no statistically significant differences in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents.

$H_1$4: There are statistically significant differences in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents.

Populations

There are 177 schools located within 40 school districts in the participating county of the western region of the United States, which was the area chosen for the study (https://www.scoe.org, 2017). The public school staffing records for 2015-2016 school year show approximately 401 administrators and 3,733 teachers according to the regional office of education. In addition to the administrators and teachers, there are approximately 3,283 other staff members that include counselors, nurses, teaching assistants, and all other staff members in the public schools for the 2015-2016 school year (https://www.scoe.org, 2017). Although the other staff positions have exposure to the children, for the purpose of this study only the administrators and teachers were included.

According to the United States Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates (2017), for the participating county there are approximately 78,007 school age students from kindergarten through 12th grade. The regional office of education described school districts in both rural and urban areas, with enrollment for each district varying from approximately 11 students in the smallest district to over 11,00 students in the largest district. Adding the published enrolment numbers in each district shows there are a total of approximately 70,393 students enrolled for the 2016-2017 school year (https://www.scoe.org, 2017). One parent or primary caretaker for each student is counted for the population of this study, with the understanding that some households may have more than one school-age child. The population for the survey

included administrators, teachers, and parents or primary caretakers of students attending

the schools in the participating regional area.

Setting and Sample

With access to all the names of potential participants in the groups of

administrators and teachers available in the school directories, the sampling included a

single-stage sampling procedure. The sample is identified as a purposeful convenient

sample, as the participants had to meet the criteria of being an administrator, teacher, or

parent of a student attending one of the schools in the participating county.

The survey was sent to the administrators and teachers through e-mail, and

parents accessed the survey electronically as well. However, the group of parents did not

receive an e-mail due to limited access to parent e-mail addresses. The sample size was

calculated with G*Power 3.1 sample calculator, using the F test, ANOVA fixed effects,

omnibus one-way test, between groups with a priori type of power analysis, effect size .5,

error probability of .05, 80% power, and an alpha of .05, with three groups, which are the

administrators, teachers, and parents who rated the measure of restorative justice

ideologies of cooperation, healing, restoration, and then combine for an overall score.

With the use of G*Power 3.1 and the above-mentioned guidelines, the recommended

sample size was 42 participants for this study. The sample number from each group

totals 14 so that the responses from each group are even.

The survey was originally intended be open for a total of 2 weeks, unless there

were not enough responses in that time, in which case the survey was to remain open for

1 additional week. If a sufficient number of responses were received in the 2-week

period, a sample of 14 responses was to be taken from each group by entering the responses into excel and using the random sample calculation. Previous researchers presented a cross-sectional survey study that used a sample of 119 parents and 142 teachers from primary schools with a random sample strategy that requested the participation of 200 teachers from a public list in Ireland to represent the 21,000 primary school teachers of the area (Mcgovern & Barry, 2000).

The surveys were sent to at least 100 potential participants in the groups of administrators and teachers, and at least 100 paper invitations were handed to parents with the goal of receiving a 20% response rate from each group. The administrators make up the smallest population in the study with a total of approximately 401 in the regional area. Because sending 100 surveys to administrators was the goal for a sufficient sample, and that is approximately one fourth of the total population, the study obtained the sample participants from approximately one fourth of the schools in the regional area.

There are a total of 177 public schools, and the school names were entered into Excel and a random sample of school names was generated, identifying 45 schools to participate in the study. Once those 45 schools were identified all the administrators from each school and all the teachers from each school were entered into Excel to generate a random sample of potential participants to send the survey to their school electronic mail address. The survey was sent to a random selection of three teachers from each of the 45 schools. The potential participants from the groups of teachers were

selected through a random sample by retrieving e-mail addresses from the regional office of education webpage.

Parent e-mail addresses are not public information. Therefore, the invitation to complete the parent survey was issued through a paper invitation that includes a typed web address for the survey on SurveyMonkey. The paper invitations were distributed in person at the Parent Teacher Association meetings of each of the 45 schools that were randomly selected for the sample of administrators and teachers. I distributed approximately 20 paper flyers at each of the Parent Teacher Association meetings I was able to attend out of the 45 schools.

The original plan was to review the response rates of the administrators and teachers after 1 week, and if a sufficient sample was not received yet, an additional e-mail was to be sent weekly until a sufficient sample was received. If enough participants from the group of parents did not complete the survey within a 2-week period after the flyers with the web address were handed out to at least 100 parents, I planned on attending three additional Parent Teacher Association meetings to hand out at least 20 more flyers at each location in an attempt to obtain a sufficient sample from the group of parents. Locations of three follow-up schools were determined by the schedule for the first three that were holding the soonest meetings.

Data Collection Method

Data were collected by means of a self-administered questionnaire, known as the restorative justice ideology measurement instrument. The questionnaire was administered in electronic form through SurveyMonkey to the participants in each of the

groups. The online survey was accessible from a computer or any smart phone through

an electronic link that was included in an electronic mail message sent to the potential

participants, or the web address listed on the paper invitation for the parents. Considering

some of the parents or primary caretakers may not have a smart phone or access to

Internet, this is identified as a limitation within the study.

The questionnaire was available in English for all groups, and English and

Spanish for the group of parents. Other languages were considered, however, the

population in the regional area where the survey was administered consists of primarily

English and Spanish speaking adults according to the United States Census Bureau,

2011-2015 American Community Survey five-year estimates (American Fact Finder,

2017). The percentage of the adult population age 18 and over in the regional area

identified as a county in California who speak a language other than English or Spanish is

approximately 1.6% according to the United States Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American

Community Survey five-year estimates (American Fact Finder, 2017).

The electronic form of the survey for the administrators and teachers was issued

through an electronic mail message providing a brief description of the study, a simple

explanation of how the information will be used, and a hyperlink in the message

automatically directing the reader to the survey through SurveyMonkey. The email

address for each of the groups of administrator and teacher participants was sent to the

school issued email addresses. Many of the schools compile a school directory that

contains contact information with electronic mail addresses of parents and primary

caretakers of students. However, directories were very limited and all parent and primary caretaker survey responses were solicited through a handout in person only.

A notice of informed consent and confidentiality was included at the beginning of the survey accessed through SurveyMonkey as the first page preceding the actual 16-item survey. Participants must check continue after reading the informed consent and confidentiality before continuing to the survey. All items on the survey are required fields to complete before submitting the survey. If a completed response was not received within one week after the initial email by enough participants to fulfill the needed sample size a follow-up email was sent exactly one week after the first email. If enough participants did not provide a completed response within one week after the second email, the plan was to send a third and final email as a reminder to complete the survey. Survey responses were monitored for completion rates to ensure a sufficient number of survey responses were received from participants in each of the groups. Once a sufficient amount of responses was received from each group according to the appropriate sample size for each population the results in SurveyMonkey were exported to Excel for calculation, and then to an SPSS file for analysis.

Research Instrument

The restorative justice measurement instrument is a 16-item Likert scale survey that was developed by four researchers and published in a study in 2012 to measure the beliefs of teachers that are consistent with restorative justice ideology (Roland et al., 2012). Karen Roland, one of the original researchers authorized the use of the research instrument in the current study through electronic mail (See Appendix C). The questions

within the scale were created to measure three main components of restorative justice

ideology including cooperation, healing, and restoration (Roland et al., 2012). These

three dimensions of restorative justice ideology were identified through a factor analysis

that narrowed down the factors to three restorative justice principles of cooperation,

healing, and restoration.

Factors

After the factors were established the validity and reliability of the instrument

were tested (Roland et al., 2012). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to test

reliability and bivariate correlations were used with each of the factors (Roland et al.,

2012). Cronbach's alpha coefficients assessment showed $a = .87$ for restoration, $a = .85$

for cooperation, and $a = .70$ for healing, with a combined measurement of $a = .81$

(Roland et al., 2012). According to Kaplan and Succuzzo (2005) the overall reliability

with this measure was very good (as cited in Roland et al., 2012).

Reliability and Validity

In the original study scores from each of the factors were cross-analyzed with

other validated measurement instruments in an effort to validate the factors, and the

restorative justice measurement instrument as a whole (Roland et al., 2012). The other

instruments used to cross-analyze each of the factors of restoration, cooperation, and

healing with bivariate correlations included three empathy dimensions by using the

Interpersonal Reactive Index to measure PD, PT, and EC (Roland et al., 2012). The

results from the bivariate correlations conclude higher levels of restoration are connected

to higher levels of EC and PT, with scores from Cronbach's alpha coefficient showing as

significant for restoration and PT with a score of .414, and not significant for cooperation

and healing and PT with scores of .207 for cooperation and .202 for healing (Roland et

al., 2012). Cronbach's alpha coefficient showed positive significant results for

restoration and EC as well, with a significant score of .226, and not significant scores for

cooperation and EC with a score of .210, and not significant scores for healing and EC

with a score of -.026 (Roland et al., 2012). The study also showed that higher levels of

restoration, cooperation, and healing are connected to lower levels of PD, with significant

scores of -.332 for restoration, -.298 for cooperation, and -.335 for healing, ultimately

associating restorative justice ideology with empathy (Roland et al., 2012). PCI was also

positively related to all restorative justice ideology factors of restoration, cooperation,

and healing by computing bivariate correlations, concluding participants with higher

levels of restorative justice ideology are associated with PCI scores that are more

humanistic (Roland et al., 2012).

   With the consideration that the original measurement was only tested on a group

of teachers and this study aimed to test on groups of administrators and parents

Cronbach's alpha was re-administered to test the reliability of the measurements for the

groups of administrators and parents. Each of the measures; restoration, cooperation, and

healing were individually analyzed as a measure, just as the original study did with the

group of teachers (Roland, et al., 2012). This additional step tests and ensures

identification of reliability of the measurement instrument with the slight changes that

were needed in an effort to make appropriate to take the test from the administrator or

parental view.

External threats to validity are minimal. However, the study is limited in the population it was administered to. The results are not generalizable to each of these groups throughout the United States, and only valid for the groups in the regional are that the measurement instrument was administered in.

Minor Changes

The restorative justice ideology measurement instrument was originally developed and validated with a group of teachers (Roland et al., 2012). This study added a group of administrators, and a group of parents or primary caretakers for students. Minimal words have been changed in the measurement instrument to make the instrument questions appropriate for each of the groups, as the instrument used is being expanded from the original use with teachers to include administrators and parents. The two questions that were changed for the surveys sent to administrators and parents include items four and five.   Item four originally states, "I have a moral duty to help students get back on track" and the words in this item have been changed to "Teachers have a moral duty to help students get back on track" for the survey that was distributed to the administrators and parents. Item five originally states, "It is my responsibility to develop empathy in students" and has been changed to "It is a teacher's responsibility to develop empathy in students" for the survey that was distributed to administrators and parents (Please see Appendix B). The instrument distributed to teachers was administered unchanged from the original measurement instrument. Given that the measurement instrument was originally developed and validated for teachers, additional measures were taken to validate the instrument with administrators and parents, such as

applying Cronbach's alpha to test for reliability of the measures of restoration, cooperation, and healing within the groups of administrators and parents.

The original instrument includes instructions at the top of the page that were not appropriate for the participation in the current study, considering the questionnaire was sent out through electronic mail links instead of administered in a group, face-to-face setting. Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, and Frey (see Appendix A) include a statement at the top of the original questionnaire as follows:

> For the purpose of this workshop this questionnaire will be self-scored and confidential. In the following section please respond to each of the items as an educator by checking the box that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement (para 1).

The statement that instructs the participants to self-score the instrument has been removed completely, as the scores were compiled and analyzed by the researcher, not the participants. The next statement has been altered for the instrument that was sent to the administrators and parents in a way that is appropriate for each of the groups of participants. The statement at the top of the instrument sent to the administrators states, "In the following section please respond to each of the items as an administrator by checking the box that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement," and the instrument available to the parents states, "In the following section please respond to each of the items as a parent considering your child's or children's school experience".

Scoring

There is a total of 16 items on the measurement instrument. The original survey shows responses labeled with numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, with the words *strongly disagree* above the number one, and the words *strongly agree* above the number five. Numbers two through four of the number choices are not labeled with words. The total score of the instrument is derived as follows according to the original study instructions: number responses from questions one, two, three, four, five, seven, and eight are added together for a total score out of a possible 35 total, followed by a calculation of a percentage score (See Appendix A). The percentage from this calculation provides the score for the restorative justice principle of restoration (See Appendix A). Number responses from questions six, 10, 11, 12, & 15 are reversed (i.e., 5=1, 4=2) and then added together for a total score out of a possible 25 total, followed by a calculation of a percentage score (see Appendix A). The percentage from this calculation provides the score for the restorative justice principle of cooperation (see Appendix A). Number responses from questions nine, 13, 14, & 16 are added together for a total score out of a possible 20 total, followed by a calculation of a percentage score (see Appendix A). The percentage from this calculation provides the score for the restorative justice principle of healing (see Appendix A). The total of the three percentages can then be combined for an overall total score of restorative justice ideology, with scores closer to 100% more in line with restorative justice ideology, and scores closer to 16% more in line with punitive ideology, and further from restorative justice principles. The original researchers who created the

restorative justice ideology measurement instrument developed the scoring process described, and no changes have been made to the original scoring process.

The scale was analyzed with a total score for the overall rating of restorative justice ideology, and with three subscales for each of the factors including, restoration, cooperation, and healing. There are an uneven number of questions that relate to each of the factors. However, the score from each factor were associated with a total percentage for individual analysis of factors, and the three total percentages were combined for an overall score.

The idea of using this measurement instrument again was not to compare the results with the original study. The main idea was to expand the use of the measurement instrument to administrators and parents, as these groups are also vital in the implementation and success of restorative strategies in schools. The original test results may be referred to in the final analysis.

Data Analysis

Once a sufficient sample of the data was collected an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to compare the restorative justice ideology scale measures of each participant to calculate the mean of each group and compare between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The ANOVA is appropriate for identifying differences between categorical groups, and after a difference was identified a post-hoc test was completed to identify where the differences exist. The data was imported from SurveyMonkey to an Excel spread sheet and calculated, and then to SPSS with the independent variable coded as follows: administrators (1), teachers (2), parents (3). A

score was entered for each participant in each factor of cooperation, healing, restoration, and the total, as they were computed as per requirements mentioned above in the scoring section of the measurement instrument first in Excel, ultimately resulting in four dependent variables: the total score of overall restorative justice ideology, and subscales of cooperation, healing, and restoration. Upon entering the data into SPSS and coding the data, cleaning of the data occurred by reviewing each of the responses for consistency and outliers. For survey responses that may have include a response that may have been by accident, determined by consistency with other responses on the survey, the survey was removed and an additional survey was added.

An analysis of the total mean score of the measurement instrument was compared between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. In addition, a subscale was used for independent analysis of each of the restorative justice ideology beliefs of cooperation, healing, and restoration (Roland et al., 2012). When there was a significant difference determined in the overall score of restorative justice ideology between each group with the ANOVA test a Tukey HSD post-hoc test was administered to determine where differences, if any, exist between administrators, teachers, or parents. There are a smaller number of administrators than teachers, and far less teachers than parents in this study, however, the sample for each group was evenly distributed by using 14 survey results from participants in each group.

Statistical Test Assumptions

An assumption of a statistical test shows the potential bias sources and acts as a condition in the process of showing the statistical test works or does what it is supposed

to do (Field, 2013). The assumptions of the one-way ANOVA include the assumption of independence, assumption of normality, and assumption of homogeneity of variance.

The assumption of independence requires the errors to be independent of one another, not related (Field, 2013). Independence in the identified statistical test would mean the responses or mean score of one group are not related to or dependent on the responses or mean score of another group (Field, 2013). If the assumption of independence is violated the significance test and confidence intervals are invalid and further techniques should be applied (Field, 2013).

The assumption of normality is the normal distribution of dependent variables in the population (Handon, 2015). With homogeneity of variance the spread of scores will be roughly the same, meaning there is an assumption that the spread in the range of scores within each group of administrators, teachers, and parents for each of the variables of cooperation, healing, and restoration are roughly the same. Ensuring these mentioned assumptions ensures the statistical analysis is working as designed. These assumptions are addressed and analyzed as part of the statistical analysis in chapter 4.

Internal validity threats include the inability to apply the results to be generalized in a larger population. The results may only be applied and appropriate for the regional area of the United States that actually participated in the study. The selection process for the survey participants may also pose a threat. Although the survey was sent to all potential participants on email lists from the office of education for administrators, and teachers, the potential parent participants were only accessed at parent association

meetings, which limited the variety of parent participants. A random sample of those responses is used in the analysis of data.

Statistical Test Limitations

Limitations exist that hold relevance to the internal validity related to design considerations. As stated in the introduction, the chosen design is non-experimental, and therefore simply taking a snapshot of the mean score of ideologies between groups. This design does provide a history or identification of specific events between a first and second measure, which could potentially identify factors that relate to a statistically significant change. Even comparing the original test results to the results of the current test would not be realistic for many reasons. Some of which include that the original test only used a sample of teachers, and the current test is expanded to groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. In addition, the regional area of the current study has been exposed to varying levels of training and policies around the use of restorative justice.

Maturation could be considered with the use of a pre- and post-test, with regard for increased time teaching or using restorative justice processes in the school environment. Without the use of a comparison group as potentially present in an experimental or quasi-experimental design, bias in the selection of the comparison group participants does not exist. However, there may be some level of self-selecting bias for those participants who chose to complete the survey. Perhaps those who chose to complete the survey are more educated in the area of restorative justice. This element is completely unknown and is not considered in the analysis.

Ideally, future studies may include an element of statistical regression to further examine extreme scores. In addition to statistical regression testing I would suggest adding the consideration of level of exposure, use, or training and education in the area of restorative justice, and an evaluation of school policies in relation to the ideologies of each group. The ability to prove or disprove a statistically significant relationship between the level of training, use, or exposure of restorative justice and the level of restorative justice ideology could be valuable information to the professionals in the field. Simply taking a snapshot without further research leaves many factors unknown and limits the knowledge gained.

Minimal limitations exist if assumptions for the ANOVA are valid, and this can work as a powerful tool for this problem. However, when assumptions are not met certain limitations emerge. With the assumption of independence the ANOVA is limited in the area of only being able to determine that there is a significant difference, however this test does not show or determine where the difference is. Once a difference is determined Tukey HSD post-hoc test was then administered to determine which groups the difference is between.

Ethical Considerations

This study poses a low risk for any human participants. Before any data was collected, I established approval from the International Review Board (IRB). A letter of cooperation was not needed from the regional office of education because all electronic mail addresses for the administrators and teachers are public record. Parent participants were recruited at times of parent association meetings and events, but I remained off

campus on public property. All participants were informed of confidentiality measures taken with a notice of confidentiality that was included in the first page of the survey, and each participant was required to check a continue box before continuing with the survey. All results were confidential and were not associated with the electronic mail address of any participant because the participants accessed the survey through a direct link to the survey. Identification of the independent variable social group was determined with coding for each participant response as follows: administrators (1), teachers (2), parents (3). Upon completion and formal approval of the dissertation the potential participants from the administrator and teacher email pool will be sent an executive summary of the findings. Because the survey is confidential and responses were provided anonymously there is no way to re-contact the parents and primary caretakers to provide an executive summary unless individuals contact me through email to request further information.

<div align="center">**Summary of Methodology**</div>

Chapter 3 discussed the methodology design of the study in sections that included: research design, rationalization of qualitative approach, variables, research questions, hypotheses, populations, setting and sample, data collection method, research instrument, data analysis, and ethical considerations. The comparative, non-experimental design used an ANOVA test to determine if there were statistically significant differences in responses between groups, and if there were differences, a Tukey HSD post-hoc was used to determine where those differences exist. Chapter 4 will provide a detailed analysis of the results along with a summary, and chapter 5 will conclude the dissertation with a discussion of the results and suggested next steps.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

Research discussed in Chapter 2 identified important findings of challenges in the implementation and sustainability of restorative justice in schools when ideology and ecological system levels are not aligned (Hong & Eamon, 2012; Roland et al., 2012). The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental comparative design study was to determine alignment or lack of alignment in restorative justice ideology beliefs of cooperation, healing, restoration, and restorative justice ideology between three levels of ecological systems in schools with groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. In Chapter 4 I describe data collection, sample demographic characteristics, tests of the assumptions, and results of the analysis with tables to demonstrate the data and analysis. The demonstration of a statistically significant difference or lack of statistically significant differences between these social groups was determined with the one-way ANOVA test, and identification of where the differences are, if any, between the groups was determined with the Tukey HSD post hoc test. The analysis can be used to inform practice with an ecological systems theory that all levels of systems should be aligned for sustainable implementation of restorative justice processes in schools.

Data Collection

Data were collected from participants through a self-administered electronic questionnaire that employed a Likert scale determining levels of cooperation, healing, restoration, and restorative justice ideology. As described in Chapter 3, there were 177 public schools listed on the regional office of education webpage. The names of all 177

schools were entered into an Excel spread sheet and a random sample of approximately 25% (45) of the schools was created. Of those 45 schools, all e-mails for administrators were entered into an Excel spread sheet. There were a total of 111 administrators for those 45 schools. A random sample of 100 administrators was created from the list. A list of all teachers from those 45 schools was created as well by visiting each school webpage and either documenting the e-mail addresses for the teachers from the school webpage or searching the regional office of education directory for each teacher e-mail address that was not listed on the school page. When this study was in the earlier stages of planning, teacher e-mails were all posted on the regional office of education webpage. At the time of data collection, the e-mails were no longer listed but were still available through a search in the directory. There was a total of 392 teacher e-mail addresses available and a random sample of 100 teachers was created from this list. Once the lists were created, an e-mail with an invitation to the survey and link to the appropriate survey for each group was sent.

The webpages for the 45 schools were searched and there were 15 parent association meetings or events in the first month that the survey was open. Of those 15 meetings or events I was able to attend 12. A few of the meetings were on the same date, at similar times, and in different areas of the region so I was unable to attend them all within the timeframe that there were still parents present. I stood off campus and talked to the parents, either arriving or leaving, handed them a flyer that included a written invitation and web address to the survey, and verbally requested their participation in the survey. At approximately three school locations I was not able to make contact with a

single parent due to the size of the parking lot because no parent walked from off

campus.

After 1 week of the surveys being open there were not enough responses from the

groups of administrators and teachers, and a second e-mail was sent out to all the

administrators and teachers. Consequently, a third and even fourth e-mail were sent in

the following weeks due to a lack of obtaining a large enough response rate. After 1

month there were also still not enough parent responses. Three additional parent events

were identified and attended through another week. To gather a sufficient number of

survey responses for each group it took approximately 5 weeks. At the end of the 5

weeks there were a total of 16 responses from administrators, 16 responses from teachers,

and 17 responses from parents and primary caretakers.

Sample Demographic Characteristics

The sample of administrators, teachers, and parents was created from all public

schools within the specific western region of the United States. The public schools

included in the creation of the random sample were all the elementary, middle, and high

schools in one geographical county. The public schools sample included traditional

public and charter schools. Private schools were not included in the sample.

According to the United States Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community

Survey 5-Year Estimates (2018) the approximate demographics for the county include a

population of just under 500,000 residents, with about 76% White, 1.6% Black or African

American, 3.9% Asian, and approximately 26% of the population Hispanic or Latino.

The median age in the county is just over 41, and the median household income is just

under $67,000 per year (United States Census Bureau, 2018). Schools from the sample

are located in both rural and urban areas.

Sample

The survey is completely confidential, and respondents did not provide any

personal or demographic identifiers. However, the random sample of public schools,

which then generated the samples of administrators, teachers, and parents are from public

elementary, middle, and high schools in the regional area, and therefore contain staff,

students, and families with varying portions of the demographics within the county.

Although the e-mail invitations for administrators and teachers were random, the sample

for parents and primary caretakers ended up convenient but originated from the random

sample of schools. Once the random sample of 45 schools was created the parents could

only be reached in person before or after parent association meetings and events. The

selection process limited the pool of parents because only parents who attended meetings

were invited to take the survey. The primary caretaker survey was available in English

and Spanish, but no Spanish responses were received.

A total of 16 responses were received from administrators, 16 responses were

received from teachers, and 17 responses were received from parents; however, only 14

from each group were used for the recommended sample size. The responses received

within each group are expected to be representative of the population within the regional

area, but cannot be generalized to larger groups of administrators, teachers, and parents

outside the regional area of the study. As stated in Chapter 1, administrators referred to

professionals who manage the staff and faculty within the school, and who employ and

enforce the rules of the school such as principals, vice principals, or assistance principals; teachers referred to professionals who lead the classroom and are licensed to teach with an active teaching credential in the state of California; and parents and primary caretakers were defined as the parent who has primary custody of the child, a legal guardian, or the adult who is primarily responsible for and provides the majority of the care for the student.

Results

Process

The data were exported from SurveyMonkey to three separate Excel spread sheets. One spread sheet with the responses from administrators, one with teacher responses, and one with English primary caretaker responses. No Spanish responses were received. From the spread sheets the data were then coded with numerical scores for each response rating from 1 to 5, with certain scores inverted as directed with the instructions from original survey, and then calculated as per the original survey instruction, which are provided in Chapter 3 and Appendix A. The calculations created a score for each respondent for the dependent variables of restoration, cooperation, healing, and the total restorative justice ideology score. Before entering into SPSS for analysis the cases with outliers were removed. Three cases were removed from the group of parents and two cases were removed from the groups of administrators and teachers. Each score was entered into SPSS with even groups of 14 cases for each, and a total of 42 cases all together.

Assumptions

There are six assumptions associated with the one-way ANOVA, and all six

assumptions were met. The dependent variables were measured in intervals in a score

ranging from 16-100 in each of the four areas, restoration, cooperation, healing, and the

total restorative justice ideology score. The independent variable consists of three

categorical, independent groups: administrators, teachers, and parents. There is

independence of observations, meaning there is no relationship between the three groups.

Each of the participants of the groups participated in the survey by taking the survey from

the perspective of his or her position. The administrators were addressed and invited to

take the survey as administrators, teachers were addressed and invited to take the survey

as teachers, and parents were addressed and invited to take the survey as parents. The

participants were informed that they were invited to take the survey based on their

belonging to one of the groups mentioned. Cases with outliers were removed.

The Sharpio-Wilk test of normality is appropriate to test normality with smaller

data sets ($<$ 50 samples) and was completed for each of the factors of restoration,

cooperation, healing, and the restorative justice ideology total. For the administrator,

teacher, and primary caretaker social groups the dependent variable of *restoration* was

normally distributed. Normality is showed with a significance value greater than .05,

with administrators' significance value of (p =.186), teachers (p =.364), and parents (p

=.117). For the administrator, teacher, and primary caretaker social groups the dependent

variable of *cooperation* was normally distributed, with administrators' significance value

of (p =.641), teachers (p =.211), and parents (p = .265). For the administrator, teacher,

and primary caretaker social groups the dependent variable of *healing* was normally

distributed, with administrators' significance value of ($p = .498$), teachers ($p = .677$), and

parents ($p = .077$). For the administrator, teacher, and primary caretaker social groups

the dependent variable of *RJI total* was normally distributed, with administrators'

significance value of ($p = .757$), teachers ($p = .719$), and parents ($p =.149$). The

Levene's test was used to show homogeneity of variances. The test showed all

significant levels higher than 0.05, and therefore equal. Results ranged from ($p = .242$)

to ($p = .856$), concluding they were equal.

The descriptive results in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 show the median scores in the three

social groups of administrators, teachers, and parents with each of the scales. Table 1

shows the median scores of each social group with the scale for restoration, Table 2

shows the median scores of each social group with the scale for cooperation, Table 3

shows the median scores of each social group with the scale for healing, and Table 4

shows the median scores of each social group with the scale for the RJI total. The highest

median score was for the social group of administrators in the belief of restoration ($n =$

14), ($M = 88.5$, $SD = 8.447$; see Table 6), and the lowest median score was for the social

group of teachers in the belief of healing ($n = 14$), ($M = 73.93$, $SD = 14.699$).

The social group of administrators consistently scored higher in all three beliefs,

and accumulatively for the RJI total score than both other social groups, showing the

social group of administrators possess beliefs more consistent with restorative justice

rather than punitive. The social groups of teachers and parents showed similar scores in

the belief of cooperation, healing, and the RJI total. Another notable description is the

spread of scores within individual groups for certain beliefs. Multiple areas show a spread of only 23 between the highest and lowest score. However, there was a 50-point spread in the scores of the social group of teachers in the belief of healing, with the highest score showing as 95 and the lowest score showing as 45 (see Table 2). The score of 45 indicates that teachers possess beliefs that are more punitive than healing, and not in line with restorative justice ideology.

Table 1

Descriptive Results: Cooperation

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Administrators	68	100	85.71	10.011
Teachers	56	92	78.86	11.251
Parents	52	96	76.86	12.666
Total	52	100	80.48	11.727

Note. Administrators ($n =14$), Teachers ($n =14$), Parents ($n =14$), Total ($n =42$)

Table 2

Descriptive Results: Healing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Administrators	70	100	82.86	9.139
Teachers	45	95	73.93	14.699
Parents	60	95	76.43	11.507
Total	45	100	77.74	12.307

Note. Administrators ($n =14$), Teachers ($n =14$), Parents ($n =14$), Total ($n =42$)

Table 3

Descriptive Results: Restoration

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Administrators	74	100	88.50	8.447
Teachers	77	100	87.00	5.974
Parents	69	97	81.71	7.488
Total	69	100	85.74	7.771

Note. Administrators (n =14), Teachers (n =14), Parents (n =14), Total (n =42)

Table 4

Descriptive Results: RJI Total

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Administrators	76	99	85.71	6.707
Teachers	62	96	79.21	8.17
Parents	67	90	78.21	6.253
Total	62	99	81.26	7.645

Note. Administrators (n =14), Teachers (n =14), Parents (n =14), Total (n =42)

Analysis

Four research questions were addressed with the one-way ANOVA test. The one-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences between groups. Table 5 below shows the ANOVA analysis with the independent variable of social groups, "Administrators", "Teachers", and "Parents" and the dependent variables of "Restoration", "Cooperation", "Healing", and "Restorative Justice Ideology total".

Research Question 1: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? Based on the ANOVA test the null hypothesis was accepted, meaning there are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents. The lack of statistically significant difference between social groups and the dependent variable of cooperation was demonstrated by the one-way ANOVA ($F(2,39) = 2.340$, $p = .110$). The significance level, ($p = .110$) is > .05, and therefore there is no statistically significant difference between groups.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? Based on the ANOVA test the null hypothesis was accepted, meaning there are no statistically significant differences in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, or parents. The lack of statistically significant difference between social groups and the dependent variable of healing was demonstrated by the one-way ANOVA ($F(2,39) =$ 2.063, $p = .141$). The significance level, ($p = .141$) is > .05, and therefore there is no statistically significant difference between groups.

Research Question 3: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? Based on the ANOVA test the alternative hypothesis was accepted, meaning there are statistically significant differences

in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The statistically significant difference between the social groups and the dependent variable of restoration was demonstrated by the one-way ANOVA ($F(2,39) = 3.272, p = .049$). The significance level ($p = .049$) is $< .050$, and therefore shows a statistically significant difference between social groups. The ANOVA test does not however show what groups the difference is between.

Research Question 4: What are the differences, if any, in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? Based on the ANOVA test the alternative hypothesis was accepted, meaning there are statistically significant differences in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents. The statistically significant difference between social groups and the dependent variable of RJI total was demonstrated by the one-way ANOVA ($F(2,39) = 4.328, p = .020$). The significance level ($p = .020$) is $< .050$, and therefore shows a statistically significant difference between social groups. The ANOVA test does not however show what groups the difference is between.

Table 5

One-Way ANOVA for Differences Between Groups

		Df	F	Sig.
RJI Restoration	Between Groups	2	3.272	0.049[*]
	Within Groups	39		
	Total	41		
RJI Cooperation	Between Groups	2	2.340	0.110
	Within Groups	39		
	Total	41		
RJI Healing	Between Groups	2	2.063	0.141
	Within Groups	39		
	Total	41		
RJI Total	Between Groups	2	4.328	0.020[*]
	Within Groups	39		
	Total	41		

* The mean difference is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Once a statistically significant difference was determined with the ANOVA test for the dependent variables of restoration and the RJI total with the significance value being $p < 0.05$, the Tukey HSD post hoc test determined that with the dependent variable of restoration there was a statistically significant difference between the social groups of administrators and parents with a significance level exactly at ($p = .05$). However, there was no statistically significant difference between the social groups of administrators and teachers for the dependent variable of restoration, with ($p = 835$), and no statistically significant difference between the social groups of teachers and parents, with ($p = 153$) as demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 6

Tukey HSD Post Hoc, Multiple Comparisons for Dependent Variable RJI Restoration

(I) Social Group	(J) Social Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sign.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Administrators	Teachers	1.500	2.787	0.853	-5.290	8.290
	Parents	6.786	2.787	0.050*	0.000	13.580
Teachers	Administrators	-1.500	2.787	0.853	-8.290	5.290
	Parents	5.286	2.787	0.153	-1.500	12.080
Parents	Administrators	-6.786	2.787	0.050*	-13.580	0.000
	Teachers	-5.286	2.787	0.153	-12.080	1.500

* The mean difference is significant at the p< 0.05 level. (p=0.05 or <0.05 can be

considered significant)

Since the ANOVA test showed no statistically significant differences in between

the social groups and the dependent variables of cooperation, and healing there was no

need to follow-up with a post hoc test. Subsequently, the Tukey HSD post hoc test was

performed on the social groups and the dependent variable of RJI total, showing a

significant difference between administrators and parents, with ($p = .021$; see Table 7).

Table 7

Tukey HSD Post Hoc, Multiple Comparisons for Dependent Variable RJI Total

(I) Social Group	(J) Social Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sign.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Administrators	Teachers	5.875	2.680	.086	-.67	12.39
	Parents	7.500*	2.680	.021*	.97	14.03
Teachers	Administrators	-5.857	2.680	.086	-12.39	.67
	Parents	1.643	2.680	.814	-4.89	8.17
Parents	Administrators	-7.500*	2.680	.021*	-14.03	-.97
	Teachers	-1.643	2.680	.814	-8.17	4.89

* The mean difference is significant at the p< 0.05 level. (p=0.05 or <0.05 can be

considered significant)

In addition to the tests for assumptions, the ANOVA, and post hoc tests I

completed Cronbach's Alpha to measure for internal consistency of the scale to show

reliability with the scale and each of the social groups. Originally this scale was created

for use with teachers. Testing the reliability of the scale with the groups of administrators

showed reliable with Cronbach's Alpha at .784 (.809 on standardized items), reliable for

the group of teachers with Cronbach's Alpha at .772 (.821 on standardized items) and not

reliable for parents with Cronbach's Alpha at .506 (.609 on standardized items). A

coefficient of .70 or higher is considered reliable. The results from Cronbach's Alpha

conclude this measurement instrument is not reliable with the social group of parents and

should not be used to measure restorative justice ideology in the social group of parents

in this Western region of the United States.

Summary of Results

A quantitative, comparative study was completed with the one-way ANOVA to test for differences between social groups of administrators, teachers, and parents with a Likert scale that measured restoration, cooperation, healing, and restorative justice ideology as a whole. The sample included primary data gathered from groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in a Western region of the United States. There were statistically significant differences found between groups of administrators and parents for the dependent variables of restoration, and the total restorative justice ideology score, showing administrators possess higher levels of ideology in restoration and restorative justice ideology as a whole, and parents showed lower scores for restoration and restorative justice ideology as a whole. Administrators showed a mean score of 88.50 in the area of restoration, while parents showed a mean score of 81.71 in the area of restoration. In addition, administrators showed a mean score of 85.71 for restorative justice ideology total, while parents showed a mean score of 78.21 for restorative justice ideology total, concluding there is a statistically significant difference between these two groups in the area of restoration and the RJI total. In Chapter 5 I discuss interpretations of the findings, limitations of the study, recommendations going forward, and implications for social change.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the alignment on a systems level in the beliefs of groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in restorative justice ideology. The analysis for this study showed there are statistically significant differences between groups of administrators and parents in restorative justice ideology beliefs of restoration and in the total score of restorative justice ideology. Chapter 5 includes and interpretation of the findings, discussion of the theoretical framework and the findings, limitations, recommendations going forward, and implications for social change.

Interpretation of Findings

Research Questions

The research questions for the study are restated in this section with the significance levels for each question.

Research Question 1: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? There is no statistically significant difference between the groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in the restorative justice ideology belief of cooperation. The ANOVA results show a significance level of ($p = .110$; see Table 5), thus there is no statistically significant difference between the groups in the belief of cooperation.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of

schools in the western region of the United States? There is no statistically significant difference between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in the restorative justice ideology belief of healing. The ANOVA results show a significance level of ($p = .141$; see Table 5), thus there is no statistically significant difference between the groups in the belief of healing.

Research Question 3: What are the differences, if any, in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? There are statistically significant differences between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration. The ANOVA results show a significance level of ($p = .049$; see Table 5), thus there is a difference between at least two of these groups in the restorative justice ideology belief of restoration. The Tukey HSD post hoc test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups of administrators and parents ($p = .050$; see Table 6).

Research Question 4: What are the differences, if any, in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents of schools in the western region of the United States? There are statistically significant differences between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in the overall level of restorative justice ideology beliefs. The ANOVA results show a significance level of ($p = .020$; see Table 5), thus there is a difference between at least two groups. The Tukey HSD post hoc test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups of administrators and parents ($p = .021$; see

Table 7). Both post hoc tests showed differences between the same two groups of administrators and parents.

Comparison of Scores

Although the scores between the social groups of teachers and parents were close when comparing the median, a statistically significant difference was determined between the social groups of administrators and parents. On a scale, scores closer to 100 are in line with restorative justice ideology beliefs. Scores closer to 16 (the lowest possible) are in line with punitive beliefs. In the overall score for restorative justice ideology beliefs the administrators show ($M = 85.71$), teachers ($M = 79.21$), and parents ($M = 78.21$; see Table 4).

Although the group of teachers and parents show only a 1-point difference, only the difference between the administrators and parents are statistically significant. The statistically significant difference indicates all systems are not aligned in the belief of restorative justice ideology, and therefore, implementation of restorative justice processes in schools in this region will have difficulty in implementation and sustainability. For those groups that do not show a statistically significant difference there is a level of alignment that should be acknowledged as well.

Theoretical Framework and Findings

Three major theories were used as a framework through this study, which include restorative justice, pedagogy, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Hong & Eamon, 2012; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012; Restorative Justice, 2017). Scores from the ANOVA, followed by the Tukey post hoc show lack of alignment between the groups of

administrators and parents. Using Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, the development of the child is based in the experiences between child–child and parent–child activities in addition to the child in the environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). If the interactions, learning, and experiences of the child and parent involve more punitive beliefs, which conflict with restorative experiences in a school environment, then restorative processes in schools will not be sustainable. In addition, Hong and Eamon (2014) concluded that the relationship and interactions of the parent and child or student and teacher may be more important than additional variables that have been identified as impacting a successful school experience.

Within the analyzed data, the group of teachers showed the largest range in scores, with a 50-point difference in the belief of healing (*Min.* = 45), (*Max.* = 95; see Table 4). These variations in scores indicate that when restorative justice is present in the pedagogy it is not consistent in the regional area of the study. Variations like these can be addressed through the implementation of restorative justice as a school-wide approach, culture, or pedagogy, instead of using restorative justice as a behavior intervention (Roland et al., 2012; Vaandering, 2014).

In contrast to teacher scores, the administrators' scores were consistently higher. Administrators often possess a higher level of education than teachers and many parents. Administrators are also responsible for addressing the educational setting on a higher level than the in-classroom, hands-on experience of the teachers, and home setting with parents. Within the administrators' scope of work lies policies and procedures, budgets, and the school culture. The higher scores in restorative justice ideology for

administrators may have many contributing factors, such as their big picture view and scope of work. However, without additional research the reasoning behind the higher score is anecdotal and based on assumptions.

Participant Interactions

Through minimal interactions with survey participants, I also gained some additional insights. There were not only differences in restorative justice ideology scores, but there were also differences in opinions of the survey. An administrator from an elementary school e-mailed me after completing the survey and stated it was a great survey, and the administrator expressed excitement in learning of the findings. A teacher also responded by e-mail and stated she found the survey to be very subjective. The teacher found it difficult to choose a response to some of the questions because situations can vary significantly in the classroom environment. The teacher response tells me that restorative justice ideology is not part of her pedagogy.

I was also able to have a few conversations with parents as I handed out invitations and engaged in brief conversations with parents who wanted to know a little more about restorative justice. Many of the parents who asked questions had never heard of restorative justice and had no idea if or how it was being used in their child's school experience. Through this study I have found restorative justice in the scope of work and supported with budgets for public schools in the region. However, the implementation or practice is not being communicated with some parents, and inconsistencies were found through the casual conversations. In a separate conversation with a school administrator it was acknowledged that even though restorative interventions are embedded in the

policies and supported with funding in the budget, that no teachers at that particular

school are trained in restorative justice. The only person on this campus who was trained

in restorative justice was the restorative justice worker, which is one noneducational

position that is dedicated to restorative justice and implementing interventions.

Limitations

Limitations exist within this study in multiple areas. The nonexperimental design

of the study was only intended to provide a view of restorative justice ideology beliefs

between groups in one regional area to identify the alignment of the systems. Lack of

alignment in the belief of restorative justice ideology was identified between groups of

administrators and parents, but this identification does not provide the reasons for the

lack of alignment. There may be different levels of exposure, training, or implementation

regarding restorative justice that may contribute to the differences, but that was not

measured in this study. An experimental design could provide richer information and a

stronger comparison of more variables. The current study does not provide justification

for the scores.

Another limitation is that the findings of this study are not generalizable for

groups of administrators, teachers, or parents outside the regional area where the study

was completed. The study may be expanded to include a sample that is more

generalizable in the future. In addition, the scale was originally created and validated for

teachers. The current study expanded the sample to administrators and parents. After

evaluating the scale reliability with Cronbach's Alpha, I found the scale could be

expanded to measure restorative justice ideology in administrators, but the scale was not

found reliable for the group of parents who participated in the study in the regional area.
Additional validation would be needed to expand the scale to parents in the future.

Through minimal interactions with survey participants, I also gained some
additional insights. There were not only differences in restorative justice ideology scores,
but there were also differences in opinions of the survey. An administrator from an
elementary school e-mailed me after completing the survey and stated it was a great
survey, and the administrator expressed excitement in learning of the findings. A teacher
also responded by e-mail and stated she found the survey to be very subjective. The
teacher found it difficult to choose a response to some of the questions because situations
can vary significantly in the classroom environment. The teacher response tells me that
restorative justice ideology is not part of her pedagogy.

Recommendations

Now that a lack of alignment has been identified, the focus should shift to
creating alignment between all system levels. As mentioned earlier when identifying
challenges, IIRP staff (2017) found that involving the families early increases buy-in, and
ultimately contributes to the success and sustainability of implementing restorative
practices in schools. Restorative justice training for all levels of systems, but especially
for parents and teachers as the groups who showed lower levels of belief in restorative
justice ideology is one tool that can help create alignment. Roland et al (2012) found that
those with higher levels of training or exposure to restorative justice also show stronger
restorative justice ideology beliefs. Roland et al (2012) also suggested the restorative
justice ideology instrument could be used to develop a baseline of restorative justice

ideology beliefs, and then re-administered after consistent training to measure effectiveness of training and a potential increase in restorative justice ideology beliefs.

It is suggested that not only should all levels of systems work toward alignment in training and structure of restorative justice practices in schools, but that restorative justice should also be embedded in the pedagogy of the learning environment. With administrators showing the highest levels of restorative justice ideology, there should be administrative support for training and implementation. The administrative support is vital in allowing the teachers to not only take the time to participate in training, but to encourage or even require the training.

With the statistically significant difference identified between administration and parents, there are many suggestions already identified in the research that could help close this gap. Some of the main challenges identified in the literature were parent and family involvement. The parents who were surveyed were parents who attend school events, yet many were still unaware of the idea of restorative justice, including how it is currently being used in their child's school currently. Parents have been introduced to common core, as this is currently being used in their child's school, but had no idea about restorative justice.

According to IIRP staff (2017) failure to acknowledge the importance of family involvement early in the process of planning and implementation poses the risk of families feeling defensive, confused, uninformed, along with undesirable consequences to the implementation of the process. Also mentioned in the literature review, Ted Wachtel of IIRP (IIRP staff, 2017) stated humans are more likely to change behaviors, and are

healthiest and happiest when authority figures involve them, and things are done with them, rather than to them. Along with identifying the challenge, the IIRP staff (2017) also identified five ways to inform and involve parents and families with the intention of gaining support for implementing restorative processes. After identifying the lack if alignment between administrators and parents, I share these suggestions again as a way to work toward alignment. IIRP staff (2017) suggest the use of written material proving information that the students can take home, the involvement of families in the planning and implementation process, providing informational meetings with varying times for working parents to attend, providing social media and webinars for continuous learning and feedback, and utilizing a consultant for technical support and implementation of best practices.

Suggestions for further studies include an evaluation of policies that either support or restrict restorative justice, and other qualitative methods of research, such as focus groups for individual interviews to further explore the belied of these three groups, and identify perceived barriers to restorative justice in schools. By adding support for consistent training curriculum and implementation, and by identifying and addressing the perceived barriers alignment on the systems level should improve. Another way to add to the current study could include an evaluation of levels of training or exposure to restorative justice in relation to the restorative justice ideology scores in each group.

Additionally, there are evidence-based restorative justice practices that are identified on national clearinghouse databases. With the wide range of levels of exposure, training, implementation, and practice in schools throughout the regional area

of the study, my strongest recommendation includes the adoption of an evidence-based practice and implementing, including the parents and families with the planning and implementation, and pursuing the process with fidelity to the model. For this to happen and prove successful, policies region-wide would have to support the beliefs and implementation, and all system levels need to be involved with each stage of planning and implementation.

Implications for Social Change

The big picture with the conclusion of this study is that restorative justice in schools has already shown beneficial, however, the implementation and sustainability of this belief system in schools is not possible without alignment on a systems level, with the beliefs and practices embedded into the pedagogy of the entire school environment, and involvement with all system levels. There are current funding streams, and even school and district-wide policies in support of restorative interventions, but due to lack of alignment on a systems level these efforts are often unsuccessful, and even go unnoticed as I discovered through conversations with parents, and administration.

This study found administrators with the highest level of restorative justice ideology beliefs between the three groups. Therefore, categorizing the group of administrators as the visionaries who possess the legitimate positional power, there is a strong potential for widespread social change. With the top down support, consistent messaging, and parent involvement with each stage, an evidence-based model could be implemented successfully, even if it is just one school at a time. With the support of the administration, sufficient policies can be developed and supported, encouragement and

support for training can be provided and enforced, and community school events and parent involvement with planning and implementation could begin to bridge the gap between the system levels from administrators, to teachers, to parents and the community. By employing a whole school, and community approach alignment of the systems is possible, which means the restorative justice beliefs and practices in schools can be sustainable.

Policy makers in the regional area of the study have already implemented a certain degree of restorative justice policies for the school system. However, it is evident that additional research and support is needed for the policy makers to understand the substantial need for the complete adoption of the restorative belief system and alignment at all levels. Without the missing link of parent involvement, and buy-in, all of the restorative work that is present during the school day is reversed through parent interactions due to conflict in ideologies.

Through consistency in policies that support parent involvement, support from administration, training, and implementing an evidence-based practice with fidelity to the model, a shift in ideology is possible, ultimately allowing and encouraging alignment on a systems level. Once there is a stronger shift toward restorative beliefs and ideology aligning all systems levels there is a possibility for not only a change in the education experience of the students, but a larger shift throughout an entire community to believe in and support restoration, cooperation, and healing rather than the historical authoritarian punishment methods still being used.

Conclusion

In this study I have presented research on the history of restorative justice in schools, discussed alternative methods used in schools throughout history, and provided support for employing restorative justice in the current education system. Theoretical support was provided that suggests restorative justice can be sustainable when all levels of system are aligned, and when the belief system is engrained in the pedagogy with a whole school approach. The research study was developed with the purpose of either identifying alignment, or lack of alignment on a systems level, comparing the restorative justice ideology beliefs between groups of administrators, teachers, and parents in a Western region of the United States. Through a one-way ANOVA, followed by the Tukey HSD post hoc it was discovered that there was a statistically significant difference between the group of administrators and parents in the restorative justice belief of restoration, and in the restorative justice ideology as a whole.

My biggest acknowledgement throughout the course of this study is that restorative justice ideology is a belief system, not a process or behavior modification to just give a try in an effort to get a difficult child to behave. Adopting this belief system that includes restoration, cooperation, and healing, and letting go of a deeply engrained punitive structure is difficult due to the long history and overall authoritarian structure of the system, but it is possible. Continued research and influence from the visionaries throughout the educational system can provide the path for a needed change.

References

Ahmed, E., & Braithwaite, V. (2012). Learning to manage shame in school bullying: Lessons for restorative justice interventions. *Critical Criminology, 20*(1), 79-97. doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9151-y.

Armour, M. (2013). Ed White Middle School restorative discipline evaluation: Implementation and impact, 2012/2013, sixth grade. Retrieved from https://irjrd.org/files/2016/01/Year-2-Final-EW-Report.pdf

Armstrong, J. (2014). Rethinking the restorative–retributive dichotomy: is reconciliation possible? *Contemporary Justice Review*, *17*(3), 362-374. doi:10.1080/10282580.2014.944796

Bell, C. (2015). The hidden side of zero tolerance policies: The African American perspective. *Sociology Compass 9*(1): 14-22. doi:10.111/soc4.12230

Blas Pedreal, M. (2014). Restorative justice programs in higher education. *The Vermont Connection, 35,* 38-46. Retrieved from https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=101367078&site=eds-live&scope=site

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). Development research, public policy, and the ecology of the childhood. *Child Development, 45*(1), 1-5. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.ep12265367

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *Readings on the Development of Children, 2*(1), 37-43.

Buckmaster, D. (2016). From the eradication of tolerance to the restoration of school community: Exploring restorative practices as a reform framework for ethical

school discipline. *Values & Ethics In Educational Administration, 12*(3), 1-8.

Calhoun, A. (2013). Introducing restorative justice: Re-visioning responses to

wrongdoing. *Prevention Researcher, 20*(1), 3-6.

Evans, K. k., Lester, J. j., & Anfara Jr., V. A. (2013). Restorative justice in education:

What we know so far. *Middle School Journal*, *44*(5), 57-63.

Eyler, J. (2014). A restorative approach to school discipline. *Leadership*, *43*(5), 12-16.

Garbett, C. (2016). "And focused upon victims' needs": Towards an assessment of the

victim-friendly principles of restorative justice practice. *Contemporary Justice*

Review. Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice, 19(3), 307-324.

doi:10.1080/10282580.2016.1185948

Gardner, T. t. (2014). Make students part of the solution, not the problem. *Phi Delta*

Kappan, *96*(2), 8-12. doi:10.1177/0031721714553403

Gilbert, M. J., Schiff, M., & Cunliffe, R. H. (2013). Teaching restorative justice:

developing a restorative andragogy for face-to-face, online and hybrid course

modalities. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *16*(1), 43-69.

doi:10.1080/10282580.2013.769305

Green, S., Johnstone, G., & Lambert, C. (2013). What harm, whose justice?: Excavating

the restorative movement. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *16*(4), 445-460.

doi:10.1080/10282580.2013.857071

Hand, C. A., Hankes, J., & House, T. (2012). Restorative justice: the indigenous justice

system. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *15*(4), 449-467.

doi:10.1080/10282580.2012.734576

Handon, E. (2015). *An examination of the differential impact of University/College research emphasis on levels of counselors' resilience*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses @ Walden University (Order No. 3737085).

Hantzopoulos, M. (2013). The fairness committee: Restorative justice in a small urban public high school. *Prevention Researcher, 20*(1), 7-10.

Hopkins, B. (2015). From Restorative Justice to Restorative Culture. *Social Work Review / Revista De Asistenta Sociala*, *14*(4), 19-34.

Hong, J., & Eamon, M. (2012). Students' perceptions of unsafe schools: An ecological systems analysis. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 21*(3), 428-438. doi:10.1007/s10826-011-9494-8

Hurley, N., Guckenburg, S., Persson, H., Fronius, T., Petrosino, A., & WestEd. (2015). What further research is needed on restorative justice in schools? doi:10.23846/sr1009

IIRP Staff. (2017, February 15). Five keys for gaining parent and family buy-in for restorative practices. Retrieved from http://www.iirp.edu/

Knight, D., & Wadhawa, A. (2014). Expanding opportunity through critical restorative justice. schools. *Studies in Education, 11*(1), 11-33.

Lawrence, E., & Hinds, T. (2016). From Punishment and Discipline to Repair and Restore. Promoting restorative justice in the early childhood classroom. *Principal, 96*(2), 20-23.

Lippens, R. (2015). Ambivalent sovereigns and restorative justice: Exploring conditions

of possibility and impossibility for restorative justice in a post-communicative

age. *Critical Criminology, 23*(1), 125-139. doi:10.1007/s10612-014-9259-y

Lucero, J. L., Barrett, C., & Jensen, H. (2015). An examination of family and school

factors related to early delinquency. *Children & Schools, 37*(3), 165-173.

doi:10.1093/cs/cdv013

Mallett, C. (2016). The school-to-prison pipeline: A critical review of the punitive

paradigm shift. *Child & Adolecent Social Work Journal, 33*(1), 15-24.

doi:10.1007/s10560-015-0397-1

McKenna, J., & Pollock, J. (2014). Law enforcement officers in schools: An analysis of

ethical issues. *Criminal Justice Ethics, 33*(3), 163-184.

doi:10.1080/0731129x.2014.982974

Mengya, X., Fosco, G. M., Feinberg, M. E., & Xia, M. (2016). Examining reciprocal

influences among family climate, school attachment, and academic self-

regulation: Implications for school success. *Journal of Family Psychology, 30*(4),

442-452. doi:10.1037/fam0000141

Monahan, K., VanDerhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard

to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth &

Adolescence, 43*(7),1110-1122. doi:10.1007/S10964-014-0103-1

Morrison, B. E., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and

discipline. *Journal of School Violence, 11*(2), 138-155.

doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.653322

Mullet, J. H. (2014). Restorative discipline: From getting even to getting well. *Children*

& Schools, 36(3), 157-162. doi:10.1093/cs/cdu011

Pavelka, S. (2013). Practices and policies for implementing restorative justice within

schools. *The Prevention Researcher, 20*(1), 15-17.

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative justice in schools: The influence of race

on restorative discipline. *Youth & Society, 47*(4), 539-564.

Rinker, J. A., & Jonason, C. (2014). Restorative justice as reflective practice and applied

pedagogy on college campuses. *Journal of Peace Education*, *11*(2), 162-180.

doi:10.1080/17400201.2014.898628

Roland, K., Rideout, G, Salinitri, G., & Frey, M. (2012). Development and use of a

Restorative justice ideology instrument: assessing beliefs. *Contemporary Justice*

Review. doi:10.1080/10282580.2012.734574

Santa Rosa City Schools (2016). *Santa Rosa City Schools 2016-17 first interim report*

and multiyear fiscal projection as of October 31, 2016. Retrieved from

http://wsp.srcs.k12.ca.us/PublishingImages/Pages/Home/F_4_1stInterimReportAn

dMultiYearProjections_0.pdf

Schept, J., Wall, T., & Brisman, A. (2015). Building, staffing, and insulating: An

architecture of criminological complicity in the school-to-prison pipeline. *Social*

Justice, 41(4).

Skiba, R. J. (2014). The failure of zero tolerance. *Reclaiming Children & Youth, 22*(4),

27-33.

Sparks, S., & Harwin, A. (2016, August 23). Students still face paddling in U.S. schools.

Education Week, 36(1). Retrieved from https://www.edweek.org

Strang, H., & Braithwaite, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Restorative justice: Philosophy to practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Teasley, M. L. (2014). Shifting from zero tolerance to restorative justice in schools. *Children & Schools, 36*(3), 131-133. doi:10.1093/cs/cdu016

Triplett, N. n., Allen, A., & Lewis, C. W. (2014). Zero tolerance, school shootings, and the post-brown quest for equity in discipline policy: An examination of how urban minorities are punished for White suburban violence. *Journal of Negro Education*, *83*(3), 352-370.

U.S. Department of Justice and Education. (2014, January 8). *Department of Justice and Department of Education guidance on nondiscriminitory administration of school discipline*. Retrieved from

https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2014/01/08/dcl.pdf

Vaandering, D. (2013). Student, teacher, and administrator perspectives on harm: Implications for implementing safe and caring school initiatives. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 35(4), 298-318. doi:10.1080/10714413.2013.825514

Vaandering, D. (2014). Implementing restorative justice practice in schools: What pedagogy reveals. *Journal of Peace Education, 11*(1), 64-80. doi:10.1080/17400201.2013.794335

Vaanering, D. (2015). Relational restorative justice pedagogy in educator professional development. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*(4), 508-530. doi:10.1111/curi.12057

Wilson, H. H. (2014). Turning off the school-to-prison pipeline. *Reclaiming Children &*

Youth, *23*(1), 49-53.

Wilson, M. G. (2013). Disrupting the pipeline: The role of school leadership in mitigating

exclusion and criminalization of students. *Journal of Special Education*

Leadership, *26*(2), 61-70.

Appendix A: Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire, Teachers

Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire

In the following section please respond to each item as a teacher by checking the

box that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly agree 5
1. Wrong-doing should be addressed without removing the student from the classroom.	O	O	O	O	O
2. Consequences for wrong-doing should include for reintegration into classroom activity.	O	O	O	O	O
3. Collective resolution is an appropriate anti-bullying strategy.	O	O	O	O	O
4. I have a moral duty to help students to get back on track.	O	O	O	O	O
5. It is my responsibility to develop empathy in students.	O	O	O	O	O
6. Fear of punishment is a useful strategy in deterring wrong-doings.	O	O	O	O	O
7. When wrong-doing occurs, community members need to express their feelings.	O	O	O	O	O
8. Repairing hurt requires sustained efforts.	O	O	O	O	O
9. Students who do wrong are deserving of respect.	O	O	O	O	O
10. Examples should be made of students who are disruptive.	O	O	O	O	O
11. In righting a wrong only the victim's needs should be addressed.	O	O	O	O	O
12. The victim's voice is more important than the offender's.	O	O	O	O	O
13. Parents should have a voice in the process of righting wrongs.	O	O	O	O	O
14. A wrong-doer who is obnoxious always deserves to be treated with dignity.	O	O	O	O	O
15. Wrong-doing should be addressed based solely on the teacher's understanding of the situation.	O	O	O	O	O
16. All members of the class should have a say on how to deal with wrong-doing.	O	O	O	O	O

© Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, Frey (2012)

Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire

Self-Scoring Key

Factor (RJI Principle) – Restoration (Questions #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 35 total

Percentage Score = _____

Factor (RJI Principle) – Cooperation (Questions #6, 10, 11, 12, 15)
*For all of these items reverse the score of each item (i.e., 5=1, 4=2), and then add up the items to obtain your total score

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 25 total

Percentage Score = _____

Factor (RJI Principle) – Healing (Questions #9, 13, 14, 16)

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 20 total

Percentage Score = _____

© Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, Frey (2012)

Appendix B: Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire, Administrators and Parents

Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire

In the following section please respond to each item as an administrator or parent

by checking the box that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly agree 5
1. Wrong-doing should be addressed without removing the student from the classroom.	O	O	O	O	O
2. Consequences for wrong-doing should include plans for reintegration into classroom activity.	O	O	O	O	O
3. Collective resolution is an appropriate anti-bullying strategy.	O	O	O	O	O
4. Teachers have a moral duty to help students to get back on track.	O	O	O	O	O
5. It is a teacher's responsibility to develop empathy in students.	O	O	O	O	O
6. Fear of punishment is a useful strategy in deterring wrong-doings.	O	O	O	O	O
7. When wrong-doing occurs, community members need to express their feelings.	O	O	O	O	O
8. Repairing hurt requires sustained efforts.	O	O	O	O	O
9. Students who do wrong are deserving of respect.	O	O	O	O	O
10. Examples should be made of students who are disruptive.	O	O	O	O	O
11. In righting a wrong only the victim's needs should be addressed.	O	O	O	O	O
12. The victim's voice is more important than the offender's.	O	O	O	O	O
13. Parents should have a voice in the process of righting wrongs.	O	O	O	O	O
14. A wrong-doer who is obnoxious always deserves to be treated with dignity.	O	O	O	O	O
15. Wrong-doing should be addressed based solely on the teacher's understanding of the situation.	O	O	O	O	O
16. All members of the class should have a say on how to deal with wrong-doing.	O	O	O	O	O

© Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, Frey (2012)

Restorative Justice Ideology Questionnaire

Self-Scoring Key

Factor (RJI Principle) – Restoration (Questions #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 35 total

Percentage Score = _____

Factor (RJI Principle) – Cooperation (Questions #6, 10, 11, 12, 15)
*For all of these items reverse the score of each item (i.e., 5=1, 4=2), and then add up the items to obtain your total score

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 25 total

Percentage Score = _____

Factor (RJI Principle) – Healing (Questions #9, 13, 14, 16)

Total Score =_____ out of a possible 20 total

Percentage Score = _____

© Roland, Rideout, Salinitri, Frey (2012)