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Discovering the restorative road...

- My own beliefs
- Limited research studies
- Anecdotal evidence
- RP in schools – answering the questions.... how, why and what?
Using Restorative Practices....

Addressing the myths
Myth 1: Only small schools can successfully use Restorative Practices

Myth 2: Restorative Practices only works in primary (secondary) schools

Myth 3: Restorative Practices only works in high socio-economic status (SES) areas!
(better parent education, income and levels of employment)
The current research

The purpose of the current research:

Explore ‘best practice’ by conducting research with schools who were established in using Restorative Practices

To understand:

- How they implemented and sustained the practice?
- The issues they faced and overcame
- How it has altered student behaviour
Research aims - *schools*

– Increase understanding of the current use and attitudes towards Restorative Practices in schools

– Understanding the issues facing schools in sustaining Restorative Practices
Research aims - *Teachers*

- To understand how and when teachers use Restorative Practices
- The understand the extent to which teachers use punitive discipline and for what reasons
Research aims - *Students*

- Establish how students perceive their teachers

- Understand student perceptions of school rules and the consequences if the rules are broken

- The students’ beliefs around the best way to deal with misbehaviour
Method

• Ethics
  – ACU, DEECD, CEO, and Independent Schools

• Data collection
  – One-on-one Teacher interviews
  – Focus groups with students
  – Principal questionnaire
Method cont.

Qualitative research design

– Interviews and focus groups
– Inductive (informs theory)
– Theory used to create interview schedule
  • Social Learning theory
  • Labelling Theory
  • Theory of mind and empathy
Participants

- 6 schools
- Primary and Secondary schools
- Independent, Catholic and State schools
- Teachers
- Students
  - Year 6
  - Year 9
The interviews stats!

If I'd known they wanted me to use all this info— I would never have asked for it!
Findings....

• Students

• Teachers
Comparing and Contrasting Student and teacher responses
Comparing the similarities....

- Calm
- Communication
- Shared values
- Relating to/think of other people
Comparing the differences...

- Circle time
- Nature of the using circle time
- A proactive ‘v’ reactive approach
- Teaching ‘v’ role model
Conclusions...

• Addressing the myths...
  – Size of the school
  – Primary or secondary
  – Schools or parental SES
Conclusions cont.

• Acknowledging the theory
  – Importance of modelling appropriate behaviour (social learning theory)
  – Addressing the behaviour and not labelling the person (labelling theory)
  – Understanding the perspective of other people and self-reflection (Theory of Mind and Empathy)
Broader Implications
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