

RESTORATIVE PRACTICE AND BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS: DISCIPLINE MEETS CARE¹

WENDY DREWERY AND MARIA KECSKEMETI

Department of Human Development and Counselling

Faculty of Education

The University of Waikato

ABSTRACT *The history of restorative practices in New Zealand schools is directly related to projects such as the Suspension Reduction Initiative (SRI) and the more recent Student Engagement Initiative (SEI); thus the origins of restorative practices in schools are linked with behaviour management and school discipline. During the same period, teachers' work has become more complex: They are working with an increasingly diverse range of students, which in turn requires epistemologically diverse teaching and relationship-building approaches to ensure maximum participation for all. Teachers are looking for new and better ways to interact with students in their classrooms, and those responsible for disciplinary systems are looking to restorative practice for new ways to resolve the increasing range and number of difficulties between teachers and students, students and other students, and between the school and parents. Restorative practices (RP) are currently seen as a way of achieving all this, so they carry a huge burden of hope. Relationship skills are a key competency in the new curriculum, and the philosophy of restoration offers both a basis for understanding and a process for putting this agenda into practice. In effect, it means educating for citizenship in a diverse world, including teaching the skills of conflict resolution. If we accept this philosophy, the curriculum for teacher education will require significant changes in what students are taught about behaviour and classroom management.*

KEYWORDS

Restorative practices, behaviour management, inclusion, classroom practice, discipline in schools, teacher identity

BACKGROUND TO RESTORATIVE PRACTICE IN NEW ZEALAND SCHOOLS

During the 1990s, the use of restorative conferencing in schools was given a big push by a remark made by a Youth Court Judge, that so many of the youth appearing before him were dropouts from school, and was there nothing that could be done to keep them in school? At about that time, the notion of restorative justice was also being discussed for introduction into the Youth Court. The then Department of Social Welfare had been using Family Group Conferences since 1989, and this practice had shown significant promise (Morris & Maxwell, 1998, 2001). Concern about the fate of young offenders, a huge increase during the 1990s

in numbers of suspensions, combined with high rates of truancy and concern about school discipline in general, were all part of the mix. Thus restorative practices (RP) in schools were linked from the beginning with behaviour management and school discipline. The first objective for this paper is to argue that to see RP as primarily about behaviour management is a narrow interpretation of the power of the concept of restoration as a social practice.

Conferencing was initially introduced into New Zealand schools to reduce suspensions, which had been increasing hugely since the early 1990s. The Suspension Reduction Initiative (SRI) and the Student Engagement Initiative (SEI), which have encouraged the use of RPs, have been only partially successful. Although suspensions and perhaps exclusions have reduced since the inception of RPs in the late 1990s, the number of stand-downs is still high. The over-representation of Māori and Pasifika students, particularly boys, in the figures is still of concern. Those responsible for disciplinary systems in schools are looking to RP for new ways to resolve the increasing range and number of difficulties between teachers and students, students and other students, and between schools, teachers and parents, so the idea carries a huge burden of hope. The second objective of this paper is to consider what it is reasonable to hope for. What can RP really do for schools and what could it mean for the role of the teacher?

The principles of restorative practice in schools are strongly linked with restorative justice, the primary principle of which is respect (Zehr, 1990). This includes respect for the victims of crime, for the perpetrators, and for all others involved, for example their families and communities. In contrast to retributive justice, restorative justice is non-adversarial. From a restorative justice perspective, crime is seen as a breach of relationship and trust, an offence against persons rather than against the state. Despite the initial focus on behaviour and discipline in the appropriation of these principles by Education, the language, practices and expectations of restoration in schools are similar to but not the same as in the policy field of justice. But the importance of care and restoring relationship are common to both.

The conferencing models which are still the basis of many professional learning opportunities in RPs echo the genesis of restorative conversations in Youth Justice and Family Group Conferencing. Restorative practices in schools may include conferencing, but increasingly they include “chats”, mediation, circle time, brief interviews and casual but intentional conversations. To claim the focus as “restorative”, these practices normally take on particular forms and should be conducted in full consciousness of the principles articulated above. It should be noted here that this position may not be shared by all “restorative” practitioners.

Work on safer schools, including the work of our colleague Dr Tom Cavanagh (2009), has brought a new emphasis on the responsibilities of care in and by schools, including the ways schools deal with conflict. Many of the practices we have named as “restorative” have a quality of mediating and resolving conflict. We have come to think that restoration is not only about resolving conflict; it is about maintaining the basic values of a diverse and civil society, including generosity, care, and respect for difference. Also RP is about the skills required to live peaceably in a diverse society.

CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES

Over time our understanding of RP in schools has developed to include various practices which reflect the values of inclusiveness and fairness. Inclusion is a central value underpinning education. Initially the term inclusion may prompt educators to think about children with special needs, but this is surely a narrow conception of inclusion. From six years of age all children in Aotearoa are required to attend school, and classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse, not just in terms of the different abilities of students, but also their socio-economic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Schools are legally bound to embrace this diversity, and within their classrooms teachers are expected to practise a pedagogy that is accordingly inclusive. It is not possible, within the initial teacher education curriculum, to prepare teachers separately for every eventuality, and so we need to underpin their practice with sound principles which can orient a teacher when she or he is overwhelmed by the complexity of the task before them.

According to *The New Zealand Curriculum*, foundations of curriculum decision-making in this country include the Treaty of Waitangi, cultural diversity, inclusion and community engagement (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 9). The values underpinning the curriculum include innovation, inquiry and curiosity, diversity, equity, integrity, and respect (for self, others and human rights) (p. 10). But the implications of this visionary document do not stop there. Relating to others is a key competency in the new curriculum. We are talking here not only of teaching the skills of relationship practices to students. We are proposing that our teachers also learn how to develop and maintain quality relationships, and to demonstrate that sustainably. The ability to relate to others is something that in the past has been taken as an implicit “personal attribute”; we are suggesting that it is something that can be made explicit, taught, monitored and improved upon. This understanding and these skills can help managers of schools and teachers in classrooms manage diverse relationships. Further, embracing RP explicitly enables teachers to orient their professional identity within a moral framework which articulates both values and process. Teachers’ sense of their own professional identities, what drives them and what they conceive as their purpose in their professional lives are at stake in this discussion.

The philosophy of restoration offers a way of understanding this broad agenda, and RP offers a process for putting it into practice. If we accept this, the curriculum for teacher education will require significant developments in what student teachers are taught about behaviour and classroom management. They will still require good understanding of the principles of behaviour management, but the shift is away from a primary focus on maintaining control and compliance, to an understanding of how teachers’ own language and behaviour can produce, and damage, quality relationships. Te Kotahitanga is a project built on the idea that Māori students learn better from teachers with whom they have a warm relationship (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003). This project has already proven successful in raising student achievement levels (see <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/>). Indeed, it is well understood in Education circles that the quality of the teacher-student relationship is a primary determinant of the success of students’ learning.

We are suggesting that the issue of quality of relationship both includes and is more broad-ranging than focusing on relationships with students from specific cultures and ability levels, or teachers having “good” relationships with their students. We do not deny the importance of such projects. We are arguing that there is a broader task, which is about inclusion, diversity and citizenship. And we are claiming that RPs have something to offer, wherever inclusive values prevail.

In effect, a restorative philosophy means educating for citizenship in a diverse world, including teaching the skills of conflict resolution. We propose that the central responsibility of schools is to prepare the children of today to be citizens of tomorrow: They will need to embrace increasing cultural and social diversity respectfully, without colonising others. They will need to find ways of moving forward that do not undervalue or give away their own cultural values. If respect for difference is embraced by our society, and we believe it is, then we all must uphold this social value. It is about the right of all people to participate in producing the conditions of their own lives; it is not about doing what you like! Central to this proposal is the idea that the “work” of teaching in schools is not mainly about transmitting instrumental knowledge. Fundamentally, it is about imparting a moral stance of citizenship. We need above all to teach students to cope with diversity and to maintain a civil society. This aspect of teaching has sometimes been referred to as the “hidden curriculum”, the practices of relationship that are modelled, rather than the material that is taught. We believe that the new curriculum offers an opportunity to centralise relationship practices as part of the school curriculum—no longer hidden.

A HABITUAL STANCE OF RESPECTFUL INQUIRY

What is often lost in descriptions of teaching and learning is the focus on the quality of relationship that is required for learning to occur. It is well established that students learn from teachers with whom they have a good quality of relationship. So we need to pay attention to how such quality can be both developed and maintained.

Relationship is often assumed when the focus is on delivering curriculum. We believe that the basic attitude of the teacher can determine much about what kinds of relationships they will have with individual students, and this in turn will determine who will respect them and who they are able to teach. Taking respect as a basic principle means at least that one’s habitual stance is to anticipate that each person normally acts with goodwill, within their own world view. Other practitioners have called this variously appreciative inquiry (in organisation development, see for example Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008), respectful curiosity (Foucault, 1989), and a not-knowing stance (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992). An important assumption underpinning this approach is that, even with goodwill, it is possible that there are different, and sometimes conflicting, understandings of how the world should be. This includes, of course, the possibility that teachers cannot know everything about a student.

A stance of respectful curiosity focuses on finding out what is going on, recognising that our own assumptions may not always be correct. This stance

recognises diversity and the fact that different people make meaning differently—they come from different backgrounds and use different tools for understanding what is going on. The production of unsatisfactory relationships is demonstrated in the following example, observed in real school life.

Recently at Middle High School a young man returned from suspension in alternative education. On his very first morning back, in his very first class, he plugged his MP3 player into a computer station to charge. This was not allowed, according to the rules. A teacher entering the room saw him do this and was heard to say, in a censoring tone,

Is that what you are supposed to be doing?

You can imagine the boy's reaction. The teacher had some choices in this. S/he could have said, for example,

Hello James, it's good to see you back! Have you forgotten the rules about charging your iPod? You need to plug it in over there, not over here.

The first intervention was born of a habitual stance of judgementality and the expectation of compliance. The second is more welcoming, and invites the student into quite a different relationship with the teacher, and, note, with the school. It is borne of a stance of goodwill and hospitality, as well as care and respect. In one simple exchange, at that particular moment in that student's life, one teacher very likely set up the kinds of interactions the student would have for the rest of the day, and conveyed something about the school's intentions towards him as well.

Appreciative inquiry (as we define it) is based on a habitual stance of respectful curiosity, as opposed to making assumptions and thinking that our own interpretation or meaning is the right one. It requires a patient and persistent exploration of the meanings that others make of the same event, and in particular, it requires attention to the effects of different ways of speaking. For example, compare the effects of the following pairs of statements:

I didn't know you cared so much about your friend. (See Laws & Davies, 2000.)

It's all very well to want to protect your friend, but you can't go round whacking people.

The first statement assumes that the student was acting out of goodwill. The second gives priority to judgement and correction of what is seen as a problematic behaviour.

So who started it?

What happened here?

The first question may appear to be about getting the facts, but in effect it will set up an argument about who is to blame. The second question exemplifies the "not-knowing stance", and genuinely seeks information.

Who is going to take the book home first?

How will you share the book?

The first question sets up a relationship of competition between two students, whereas the second invites them into a relationship of collaboration.

What we ask teachers (parents, police, corrections officers or anyone responsible for correcting others) to reach for is language that opens options, and invites the other into useful dialogue, rather than offering them positions that they may object to, such as wrongdoer or problem student. Such inferences are not facilitative of good relationships. One of the regular objections to RP that we hear is it takes too much time and money. But as can be seen here, it does not take extra time to speak differently to students. It may however take concentration and persistence to unravel habitually judgemental ways of speaking.

Kecskemeti (2010) taught the skills of respectful inquiry to teachers and introduced a process of focus group reflection. Reflecting on the stance of respectful inquiry, the teachers noted that it is different from problem solving, and they became better listeners, which was ultimately more satisfying. They learned to look for, and offer, new identities to students, rather than noticing only negative aspects of a student. For example,

For me, in the past I was too concerned about solving people's problems and giving them advice, so now I don't feel this burning need to solve all their problems and make them perfectly happy. I'm doing more listening and curious questioning and I think it has reduced my stress a little, I don't feel I have to do that, so I found that quite helpful. (Teacher 1)

With the children in this school and some staff, they feel no responsibility for their own behaviour. It is always somebody else's fault, and it is always being caused by you doing something or whatever. And my traditional role is that you are the person who cracks heads. You come over and yell at someone and put someone in their place, then you stomp off and it all carries on. They've got to accept a different role from us, we are not Mrs Fix-It, there are no answers to some of these children, some will always have difficulties. Self-management has got to become part of it, for all of us. We have to manage ourselves, these children have to learn to manage themselves, and if you can open a positive dialogue with these children, and I think that this is the true value of restorative practice, you've done something hugely important. (Teacher 2)

Most of us are only too familiar with the frustration of being addressed by people giving us advice and offering their solutions to our problems. There are times when unsolicited advice might be useful and helpful. However, such conversations do not often allow for consideration of different meanings and other possible "truths". By contrast, suspending assumptions and putting aside prior understandings leaves space for the exploration and articulation of many different meanings. A genuinely curious stance can interrupt fixed meanings and has the potential to destabilise potentially problematic assumptions. This can bring forward different perspectives based on other experiences rather than one strong perspective getting support and other possible positions being silenced.

DEVELOPING A PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Embracing the values of restoration involves a particular “habitual stance” on the part of teachers, replacing ways of interacting which are based on control and compliance with distinctly different ones, based on appreciative inquiry and respect for difference. We think this is a more satisfying stance than one which must get on top of problems in the classroom at all costs.

When one of us (Wendy) was a beginning classroom teacher, she was advised by the principal to “Go in there and be a bitch!” I had told her of previous experiences where I had felt profound disappointment that the largest part of my time in the classroom had been spent trying to keep order so that I could teach. “Bitch” is a familiar stance; its focus is on getting compliance and maintaining control. This stance is “instrumental”; the teacher’s focus is on making students behave in order to get teaching done. I found the position she recommended utterly exhausting, and not at all reflective of who I was and how I wanted to be as a teacher. With her support I ran a class conference (though I did not have the name for it then), which did help. But eventually I left schoolteaching, disillusioned. I could not be a bitch. I wanted to impart my love of learning and of my subject, but students did not seem to come with the expectation of finding that kind of appreciation.

Student teachers, by and large, set out with idealism and optimism to make their contribution to the youth of our country. In initial teacher education, our job is not to armour them so that they can survive in the “classroom jungle”, but to develop a sense of teacher identity, which is supported and supportable through the difficult as well as the good times. We have used the term “habitual stance” to try to encapsulate the dominant mode or state of mind, or professional identity, of the teacher. My principal invited me into a habitual stance of exerting control and expecting compliance. Our broadened understanding of the potential of RP invites a habitual stance that focuses explicitly on the quality of relationships in the classroom. It includes the expectation that life is not always easy, that punishment may occasionally be a useful tool, and prioritises respect for the personal agency of both teacher and students. It does not ask teachers to give away their power as *teachers*, which is appropriate and necessary to perform the teacher role. This approach centralises quality relationships as a primary objective, a baseline for school communities, and for the staff who make them “educational”.

Although we want to draw attention to the teacher-student relationship here, it should be no surprise that RPs have been mainly associated with situations where things go wrong. In a complex, diverse society, breaking the boundaries of what counts as “good” behaviour is to be expected, and in schools we are charged with caring for young people who almost by definition are experimenting with the rules. For most of us who have completed our schooling and appear to be grown ups, the world in which many of our young people live is an unknown place. We have largely lost control of that world, and where it is heading is anyone’s guess. We can just do our best. But if we believe we can get control of it, we should think again. Our students are different from us, and from one another. What this means for schools is that we can no longer expect or assume a homogeneous community;

neither can teachers expect to know sufficiently what our students are coping with in their lives. To complain about parents who don't care about education, and expect police and social welfare to make them toe the line, is to give away the professional agency of the teacher.

We know that life is becoming very difficult for some teachers, parents and school managers. Teachers often tell me (Maria) that when they ask students to do things that are not enjoyable or fun but necessary for work to be done in the classroom, such as picking up their own litter or following the school rules relating to school uniforms, for example, they get resistance and, at times, abuse such as swearing in response. One teacher told me, "I am an experienced and competent teacher, yet I can't ask students to do anything they find unpleasant. They comply if someone from the senior management team demands the same, but not with me." Desperate teachers, at the end of their tether, tell me that the only work missing in their classrooms is the work of teaching the subject. What they do instead is to address constant interruptions and breakdowns that wreck interactions within the class. In short, there is an absence of the kind of atmosphere that is necessary to carry conversations to the end, such as listening, respectful consideration and engagement with the ideas put forward. Students tell me that at home if their mum or dad asks them to do something they don't feel like doing, like the dishes, they just take off. A parent told me that her child didn't like the form teacher so she wanted her child to be put in another form class. The school refused. The parent was very upset as she felt her child could not approach the form teacher about personal matters. The school told her to treat this seeming conflict as an opportunity for her child to learn to live and work with someone whom she doesn't like, as this is a situation she will encounter many times in life. The parent told me, "You can actually leave a job if you don't like it." She continued to threaten the school with taking her child to another school.

How do relationships that are not supportive of performing the ordinary functions of a classroom, a school or a family get called into existence? Why is it that increasing numbers of families find it difficult to get collaboration from children for daily tasks? Why is it that many students find it difficult to take responsibility for their part in their problems at school and at home? Why is it that parents so easily draw out the trump card of removing their children from the school if the school doesn't comply with their requests? Why do teachers who don't have a management position find it difficult to enforce rules?

We think such problems get produced by certain ideas, hidden rationalities or discourses that maintain unhelpful practices. The examples above demonstrate blaming as a relationship strategy. Teachers are often the target of such strategies. And if teachers accept the responsibility, they are in a no-win situation, where the other, students or parents or the public, has all the power, and the teacher has none.

It is an attitude that draws upon the right to challenge relations of power, without taking responsibility for one's own share in shaping the relationship. These ideas work and have their influence underneath daily practices and interactions, unnamed, unarticulated but influencing relationships nevertheless. Senge et al. (2000) say that if we don't name or expose these underlying beliefs and values, they will keep producing practices that no-one in an organisation agrees with. Within our

cultural context there are certain discourses or broadly held expectations that constitute particular kinds of relationships and practices in schools and they allow the performance of particular kinds of teacher and student identities. These ideas position students and teachers, parents and schools in relation with each other in ways that are not always helpful.

Our idea is that everyone has personal agency, including students, and abrogating responsibility is not to be encouraged. Some of the ways of thinking, or discourses, that influence schools', students' and teachers' daily lives relate to ideas of entitlement and rights, including children's rights, which put children in positions of power of which they are very well aware, producing in effect a kind of threat that has become familiar to those in authority: "If you don't do what I want, I will mess it up for you, I will not cooperate and I will make it impossible for everyone." The rights and entitlement ideas are not always used in a negative sense and they should not mean that children shouldn't have rights or that practices of power-over should never be challenged. However, discourses of entitlement can easily upset the balance between rights and responsibilities in ways that allow rights to be used as an excuse for laziness, non-cooperation and inactivity. It is the moments when rights turn into abrogation of moral responsibility that teachers need to be able to identify. This identification can lead to the formulation of some well-worded questions with which to call forth the student or the parent into a position of moral responsibility. So, for example, when students tell you that

We don't belong in this class. I think the teacher is racist. She just picks on us but nobody else. She doesn't let us do projects that she lets others do.

A teacher response might be

Is it possible that there is a misunderstanding here? Are you always there, or do you sometimes wag classes and then you fall behind with what you have to do? Could it be that sometimes your body language shows that you don't want to be there so I give attention to those who are keen?

In the real-life conversation from which this example was taken, the student responded with

Sometimes we wag these classes and then when we go back we don't know what to do. And also it is a hard subject, maybe we should have chosen something else.

The student stepped into an agentic, responsible position when invited—but it would be all too easy for the teacher to simply accept the blame and search her conscience for her racism, which is a very powerful card to play.

THE PRODUCTIVE POWER OF LANGUAGE

The beginning teacher particularly needs our support to maintain their own personal and professional sense of agency: to resist being called into the position of the one who needs to fix it as well as the one who is solely responsible for problems. The teacher needs a conceptual and analytical framework that helps identify the

discursive context and/or those ideas or hidden rationalities that produce problematic relationships. Constructivist approaches to teaching and learning are reasonably familiar. We prefer to speak about constructionist ideas (Burr, 2003). Social constructionism focuses on the idea that language is productive; we bring conditions such as depression and dyslexia into being, largely by a long and complex historical process of naming. Just as importantly, we bring identities and relationships into being by the ways we speak. Not only what we say, but how we say it, have consequences for the kind of relationship, and the kind of identity, that is called into being. Thus it is important to look carefully at how teachers speak, in the classroom and elsewhere, not only for the purposes of discipline, but also for the purpose of good teaching and learning. We summarise this point in the phrase, “What we say matters”. The habitual stance of the teacher is central to this process.

To explain, let’s take the example of a primary school, where 6-year-olds have a good time pulling down each other’s pants in the playground. Let’s say that one teacher names it as silly behaviour and another teacher might name it as sexual harassment. There will be a significant difference in how the teachers and the school will treat the child, and how a school might position itself in relation to the child’s parents, depending on whether they name the event silly behaviour or harassment. You will be familiar with the way this goes: Staff may begin to develop ideas about what might go on in the child’s house; questions may be asked about whether we should alert Child, Youth and Family, and so on. Very soon, conversations in the staffroom may begin to develop a particular kind of identity for the child and the family; teachers may develop ideas about the parenting competencies of the child’s mother, and the actions of different family members, drawing on various prior knowledge. This may sound somewhat far-fetched, but it is taken from a real-life example. Another group of staff may challenge this interpretation. They may argue that this is normal behaviour for children and that it is simply a one-off, silly game which ought to be addressed without fuss and kept very low key. Clearly, how the school names the situation will determine a lot about how it then plays out.

BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT, DISCIPLINE AND CARE

We are proposing that it is also possible to teach, and to take up, a habitual stance in which teachers and managers are able to articulate and reflect on the dominating influences determining how their work is being understood both by others, and also themselves. Understanding is not sufficient though; they must then have the skill to reflect on and compare this understanding with their own preferences for the purposes and direction of their work. Reflection has been a buzzword in teacher education for a long time. A habitual stance of deconstructive reflection supports teachers to engage with their own moral and ethical positions on a daily basis. Deconstructive reflection involves being able to identify and name the ideas that shape teacher-student, teacher-parent and other relationships in schools, including the ideas that produce antagonistic and disrespectful relationships leading to distress and dissatisfaction. To do this, teachers can learn to use a conceptual framework that helps them identify and name at least some of those hidden rationalities, values

or discourses that call unhelpful student-teacher and teacher-parent relationships into being. A teacher who believes that learning should always be fun is vulnerable to students who complain that they don't have fun in her class. We are not saying that learning should not be fun, but this idea is far too simple and leaves all the responsibility with the teacher. Such values are components of the wider culture which directly produce the stressful effects for teachers of daily conflicts with students. They are part of the broader discursive context of education, and not directly or solely the responsibilities of teachers. Seeing these effects in this way is not an attempt to offload responsibility. Being able to name and unpack the discursive context distributes the burden of problems, and relieves the impact of blame and stress on teachers, who are only a small part of the whole picture.

The point we are making here is that how we name behaviour and the meaning we make of it, how we interpret a situation and how we think about our roles (and anything else for that matter), has consequences for how people go on—how they enact their role, how they treat others, what happens in their lives, in ongoing ways. If the teacher sees herself as responsible for keeping students actively learning all the time, she is set up for failure. Like teachers, students also have some autonomy. Neither can control the other completely. Students' learning cannot be done by teachers: It is an activity of students themselves. As children grow and develop, they require different things from teachers and caregivers. But all children need to know they have a place in the world, and that knowledge of self is developed through the experience of respect from those whom one respects (Erikson, 1968).

Teaching is fundamentally about supporting meaning-making. If good teaching requires a "good" relationship between the teacher and student, we can interpret this to mean that the teacher and student need at least to be "on the same side". "Managing behaviour" as a description calls us into a rather different kind of activity, one which tends to distance those who are managed from those who manage. Management is largely about compliance. Success as a manager lies in among other things getting others to support the rules. Maybe teachers need to do this some of the time, but we do not support it as a teacher's habitual stance. Joining with students in their learning journey, though, is a very different form of ethical activity, more in tune with the optimism of the aspiring teacher. It is, above all, an ethical and a relational action. Allowing another to "manage" your behaviour is like giving away your right to manage yourself. It is not surprising if students resist this stance by authority figures.

CONCLUSION

The moral integrity of both teachers and students is a primary consideration in the production of a restorative ethos. Moral responsibility can only be achieved when people have personal agency: Maintaining and/or restoring personal dignity or mana (the right to self-governance) is the underlying objective in RP. In restorative conversations of all kinds the aim is to maintain, restore and strengthen the moral stance of everyone involved. Restorative practice is not about making people behave so that they fit in to some predetermined whole, but about maintaining quality of relationship where inclusion, curious inquiry and equity are primary

goals. Hui Whakatika, making amends, was the name given by Angus Macfarlane to the restorative process initially developed here at Waikato (The Restorative Practices Development Team, 2004) (see also Macfarlane 2000, 2004, 2007). The values of Māori, the tangata whenua or first nation people of Aotearoa, have informed RP as we have developed it, and there is a lot more that could be learned from the practices of hospitality which permeate Māori culture. These practices include practices of care, or manaaki, for our own and also for strangers. This example of how to construct respectful relationships, together with work done to date on restorative justice and RPs in schools, provide processes and principles for achieving quality relationship.

The broader community is looking to schools to take a lead in supporting the development of the citizens of the future. Failure to respond adequately will leave education open to becoming a form of social policing—a trend that is already visible. As teachers and teacher educators, we need to embrace and teach our students to analyse the influence of the wider context of education. But more than this, we need to offer the teachers of the future the skills to maintain themselves as moral agents in this postmodern world. By developing a habitual stance of respectful curiosity, coupled with enabling systematic reflection on their moral position and professional identity, we can help teachers to maintain and restore their well-being and satisfaction. In so doing, we will also support, and restore where necessary, the mana of teaching and the teacher.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, H., & Goolishian, H. (1992). The client is the expert: A not-knowing approach to therapy. In S. McNamee & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 25-39). London, England: Sage.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga phase 1: The experiences of Year 9 & 10 Māori students in mainstream classrooms*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. London, England: Sage.
- Cavanagh, T. (2009). Creating schools of peace and nonviolence in a time of war and violence. *Journal of School Violence*, 8(1), 64–80.
- Cooperrider, D. L., Whitney, D., & Stavros, J. M. (2008). *Appreciative inquiry handbook* (2nd ed.). Brunswick, OH: Crown Custom Publishing.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *Foucault live*. New York, NY: Semiotext(e).
- Kecskemeti, M. (2010). *Improving teacher satisfaction and well-being: A discursive approach to restorative practices* (Doctoral thesis in preparation). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Laws, C., & Davies, B. (2000). Poststructuralist theory in practice: Working with “behaviourally disturbed” children. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(3), 205–221.

- Macfarlane, A. H. (2000). The value of Māori ecologies in special education. In D. Fraser, R. Moltzen, & K. Ryba (Eds.), *Learners with special needs* (pp. 77–98). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Macfarlane, A. H. (2004). *Kia hiwa rā! Listen to culture! Māori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER.
- Macfarlane, A. H. (2007). *Discipline, democracy and diversity: Working with students with behaviour difficulties*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Morris, A., & Maxwell, G. (1998). Restorative justice in New Zealand: Family group conferences as a case study. *Western Criminology Review*, 1(1), 1–18.
- Morris, A., & Maxwell, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Restorative justice for juveniles: Conferencing, mediation and circles*. Oxford, England: Hart Publishing.
- Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). *Schools that learn*. London, England: Nicholas Brealy Publishing.
- The Restorative Practices Development Team. (2004). *Restorative Practices in Schools: A Resource*. Hamilton, New Zealand: School of Education, University of Waikato.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

¹ An earlier version of this paper was a keynote presentation at the Teacher Education Forum Aotearoa New Zealand Conference at the University of Waikato, July 2008.

Copyright of Waikato Journal of Education is the property of Waikato Journal of Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.