

This article was downloaded by: [Western Washington University]

On: 09 March 2014, At: 16:59

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Educational Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rere20>

Restorative justice in schools: a New Zealand example

Janice Wearmouth^a, Rawiri Mckinney^b & Ted Glynn^c

^a Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

^b RTL B Māori, New Zealand

^c University of Waikato, New Zealand

Published online: 20 Feb 2007.

To cite this article: Janice Wearmouth, Rawiri Mckinney & Ted Glynn (2007) Restorative justice in schools: a New Zealand example, Educational Research, 49:1, 37-49, DOI: [10.1080/00131880701200740](https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880701200740)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131880701200740>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Restorative justice in schools: a New Zealand example

Janice Wearmouth^{a*}, Rawiri Mckinney^b and Ted Glynn^c

^aVictoria University of Wellington, New Zealand; ^bRTLB Māori, New Zealand;

^cUniversity of Waikato, New Zealand

Background

Many responses to students whose behaviour is considered unacceptable at school fail because they treat young people as isolated individuals and do not operate in the context of the community of people who know and care about them. In some parts of the world there is a move towards exploring how to support such students by moving away from retributive justice and the primacy of assigning blame and punishment to an alternative means of preventing, managing and controlling behaviour by establishing partnerships with students' home communities. One such approach is restorative justice.

Purpose

To examine how the process of restorative justice can make a positive response to unacceptable behaviour.

Design and methods

This paper draws together some of the literature associated with this approach, with a case example of restorative justice in action. It illustrates how community norms and values can help to encourage more socially appropriate behaviour. This example comes from a New Zealand Māori context and an intervention undertaken with 'Wiremu', a young man whose behaviour was of concern at home, in school and in the local neighbourhood.

Results

The intervention operated through traditional Māori protocols to shift the focus away from those affected by Wiremu's actions, and from Wiremu himself, on to the whole community in order to focus on 'putting things right' between all those involved in the wrongdoing. It shows how traditional community conflict resolution processes were able to address and resolve tension, make justice visible and more productive, and support the restoration of harmony between Wiremu, those upset by his wrong-doing and the collective.

Conclusions

Introducing restorative practices in schools is not straightforward. It requires considerable forethought and prior planning, negotiation and deliberation. Restorative justice requires that schools do not own or completely control the process, but have to learn to be responsive to families and local voluntary community groups who are, potentially, important sources of additional support for schools in addressing student behaviour that is seen as problematic.

Keywords: *Restorative justice; Home-school partnerships; Community-school partnerships; Challenging behaviour; Cultural responsiveness*

*Corresponding author. Victoria University of Wellington, Faculty of Education, PO Box 17-310, Karori, Wellington, New Zealand. Email: janice.wearmouth@vuw.ac.nz

Introduction

Over the years, within special education practice in many countries, there has been a variety of provision for students whose behaviour is seen as ‘difficult’, ‘disturbed’ or ‘disruptive’. Historically, the response to behaviour judged as challenging to the social order in schools has been to assume that the problem lies with the individual young person or with their families, communities or ethnic groups, and to resort to medical and/or psychological approaches to assessment and ‘treatment’. Some of the tensions between notions of good practice in special education stem from differences in theoretical orientation. Interventions have been retributive, punitive and harsh, rehabilitative or therapeutic. In the latter half of the twentieth century there was a growing international concern for equality of opportunity within the education system and social cohesion in society at large.

In countries that have adopted a principle of universal education for all their young people, the national policy contexts have had to reconcile principles of individuality, distinctiveness and diversity with principles of inclusion and equal opportunities. There are occasions in schools where the rights of individual students may conflict with the rights and entitlements of the majority. This issue may be particularly stark where individual behaviour is seen to have an adverse effect on others. Under Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe, 1966, p. 4), ‘everyone has the right to liberty and security of person’ except in a number of defined circumstances. These may include disciplinary exclusion from school. This issue of disciplinary exclusion raises an important issue of whose rights should be paramount, the individual’s right to education or a student community’s right to schooling in contexts that are safe and affirming, without disruption by the challenging behaviour of individuals. The real dilemma for schools is how to *act* in a situation that is beset by often irreconcilable tensions.

Teachers need critically to reflect on their understandings of students’ ‘behaviour difficulties’ and on their understandings of what might need to change if these students are to be ‘included’ rather than excluded. What is required is a view of behaviour, and therefore of difficulties in behaviour also, as situated, dynamic and interactive between learner and context. Young people’s thinking and behaviour are shaped by the social contexts in which they live and learn (Bruner, 1996). Family and culture are highly influential in shaping the thinking and behaviour of young people in schools. Within such a view of learning and behaviour as ‘situated’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991), issues of affiliation of teachers, students and families to different communities of practice are highly significant in contributing to a positive orientation towards activities of learning and construction of knowledge (Belenky *et al.*, 1997).

Compatible with a situative perspective on human development and learning is an understanding that humans have a fundamental need for a sense of belonging and acceptance in a social group. In some parts of the world there is an increasing interest in exploring how to support students whose behaviour is considered unacceptable at school by establishing partnerships with students’ home communities, so that those community norms and values might help to encourage more socially appropriate student behaviour.

An example of an approach deriving from this interest is restorative justice, which draws upon community values and individuals' responsibilities within communities. Restorative justice is becoming increasingly common in many countries as an alternative means of preventing, managing and controlling behaviour. Restorative justice is concerned to move away from a retributive justice approach and the primacy of assigning blame and punishment to an alternative means of preventing, managing and controlling behaviour by finding a mutually agreeable way forward by negotiation. This is in stark contrast to recent approaches advocating 'zero tolerance' in schools (Cavanagh, n.d.) that undermine conceptualizations of teachers and schools as caring, supportive communities.

Initiatives such as 'restorative justice' have been designed to focus on traditional community values in order to harness the necessary resources to address the problems that have resulted in unacceptable, unsociable behaviours (Schweigert, 1999). The prime focus in a restorative justice approach is on 'putting things right' between all those involved or affected by wrongdoing. Such initiatives have shifted the focus on to whole communities and away from a focus only on the victim or on the perpetrator.

Restorative justice in action

In a number of areas around the world, for example in North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand, restorative practices in the form of highly structured processes of victim–offender conferencing are being, or have already been, developed. The process of restorative justice has been introduced into a number of schools, in New Zealand and in the UK for example, where it can be seen as embodying a set of important skills required by mediators and facilitators but underpinned by a third view as an ethos or philosophy:

that encompasses the values of respect, openness, empowerment, inclusion, tolerance, integrity and congruence...and a philosophy which gives central importance to building, maintaining and when necessary, repairing relationships and community. (Hopkins, 2004, p. 20)

In New Zealand restorative justice practices are also influenced by traditional Māori cultural values and preferred ways of responding to wrongdoing, which emphasize restoration of harmony between the individual, the victim and the collective (tribe or sub-tribe). Victim–offender conferencing is a problem-solving process that is geared towards future solutions rather than an attribution of blame for past actions (Umbreit & Coates, 1992; Carey, 1996). Traditional community conflict resolution processes can employ culturally appropriate mechanisms to address and resolve tension and make justice visible and more productive (Anderson *et al.*, 1996). The process must ensure that all participants are respected and permitted to contribute to the solution. Individuals are trained as mediators to hold the space in which injury can be converted into personal healing and community development.

In New Zealand the Restorative Practices Development Team at the University of Waikato School of Education has set out a number of guidelines for restorative

practices in schools based on the outcomes of research projects intended to reduce student suspensions (Restorative Practices Development Team, 2003). The aims of restorative practice in schools are to:

- Address the problem.
- Encourage understanding of the effects of the offence on all individuals involved and on the school community.
- Invite the taking up of responsibility (not necessarily all by the offender).
- Avoid creating shame and blame.
- Promote the healing of hurt.
- Open up avenues of redress.
- Restore working relationships between those involved.
- Include everyone (including offenders) in the community envisioned by the process rather than divide people into insider and outsider groups.

Restoration requires that:

harm done to a relationship is understood and acknowledged and that effort is made to repair that harm. In order for that restoration to happen, the voices of those affected by the offence need to be heard in the process of seeking redress. (Restorative Practices Development Team, 2003. p. 11)

There is a long pre-European tradition of restorative justice in Aotearoa, New Zealand, where Māori have held meetings among community members to resolve conflict ‘for as long as many can recall’ (Restorative Practices Development Team, 2003, p. 1). These meetings were conducted according to the protocols and customs of individual tribes. Such protocols and customs included learning from elders; speaking in turn; not interrupting anyone speaking, and speaking until the elders judge that a consensus position has been reached, followed by a collective responsibility to uphold the decision of the *hui* (meeting) that is overseen by one or more of the elders.

The Restorative Practices Development Team (2003, p. 20) outline the process of a restorative conference as follows:

1. A conference, as appropriate, begins with *karakia* (prayers) and *mihimihi* (greetings) that acknowledge the presence and dignity of all in attendance.
2. ‘The problem is the problem, the person is not the problem’ goes on the board or is spoken about.
3. What is hoped to happen in the *hui* (meeting)? Each person has a chance to speak.
4. What is the problem that has brought those present at the meeting? Each person will tell their own version.
5. What are the effects of that problem on all present at the meeting (and others)?
6. What times, places and relationships are known where the problem is not present?

7. What new description of the people involved becomes clear as those times and places are looked at where the problem is not present?
8. If people/things have suffered harm by the problem, what is it that needs to happen for amends to be made?
9. How do the factors that have been spoken about and recognized in the alternative descriptions help planning to overcome the problem? People will contribute ideas and offer resources that will help to overcome the problem.
10. Does the plan meet the needs of those harmed by the problem?
11. People are granted responsibility to carry forward each part of the plan. Any follow-up is planned.
12. *Karakia* (prayers) and thanks and hospitality may be offered.

The principles of restorative justice can be illustrated through one example of this practice, as recently recalled by a resource teacher of learning and behaviour (RTLb). The concepts and practices of restorative justice as a positive and constructive approach schools might use in responding to challenging student behaviour and the harm that this behaviour does to others can be illustrated through the eyes of this RTLb teacher.

Background

‘Wiremu’ was 15 years old and a student at the local area school (an all-age, mixed school serving the whole district). Teachers at the school, as well as members of his immediate family and wider circle of relatives, were concerned about Wiremu’s increasingly negative attitudes in school and his antisocial activities outside it. He had been referred to the learning and behaviour support service as a result of unacceptable and challenging behaviour in school. Outside school, he had taken his mother’s car joyriding several times, without her permission and despite being unlicensed and under-age. Things had come to a head when he had, again, gone joyriding in his mother’s car, crashed into the fence of the adjoining garden, and damaged a number of trees and plants and broken several garden ornaments. His mother was very upset about this incident but Wiremu expressed no remorse about the damage done to the car, just amusement over the demolition of the neighbour’s garden gnomes.

Hui whakatika

The Maori RTLb to whom Wiremu was referred decided to organize a *hui whakatika* (*hui*: meeting; *whakatika*: putting things right) to address the situation. The RTLb knew that the place in which the *hui* was to be held would be very important to the outcome. Wiremu was a very good rugby player and a member of the area team, so the teacher decided to organize it at the local club. In keeping with the Māori custom of involving all those closely associated with the wrongdoer (Wiremu) who might support him in taking responsibility for his actions and putting things right, the RTLb discussed his ideas with the boy’s *whanau* (wider family), friends and anyone else who might support him. As the RTLb teacher explained: ‘I wanted to organize a *hui* with

Wiremu's *whanau* and supporters and there were many of each...I laboriously contacted and talked to many friends and *whanau* about this *hui*'.

Mihimihi

The RTLB teacher recalled the sequence of events:

Wiremu was brought into the clubrooms after a rugby game by an uncle. He was unaware as to why he was coming. Everyone was seated. Wiremu and his uncle arrived late and sat in the front facing an empty speaking area [a visual indication of his uncle's standing within the community]. His uncle then stood up and apologized for being late and explained that he had picked up Wiremu from rugby.

Right from the beginning, the story of Wiremu's misconduct was set within a very positive portrayal of the boy as a person:

He [the uncle] went on to tell everyone how talented Wiremu was at rugby and how he was going to be the first All Black from the local area...how neat it was talking to him in the car before and after his games...he wished he had got married so he could have had a son...he did have a whangai [adopted] son he was proud of and he was sitting right over there.

The RTLB teacher recalled how other people who knew Wiremu well then contributed to this positive picture:

Wiremu's rugby coach, James, who Wiremu adored, got up and said he agreed with the uncle's comments on Wiremu's rugby. He told everyone about how Wiremu had won a game for them when everyone else had given up...The score was 14-6 with ten minutes left. The opposition had just scored and all Wiremu's mates were standing in a huddle, heads down under the posts.

The teacher remembered the coach's words:

I had heard several expletives come out of Wiremu's mouth as they were watching the ball sail through the posts. I was going through the motions of walking towards the throng with the intention of dragging him off but I stopped when the *korero* [talk] became clearer. Wiremu was yelling at his mates: 'Pick ya ***ing heads up ya clowns. You shouldn't be ashamed. Everyone here has played their best. Those dicks at school said we were gonna get a hiding. Stuff them, man. Is 14-6 a hiding, eh? Na! And are those ****better than us? ****! No! So get your lazy ****s out there and show them who we are. Ko wai ra? [Who are we?] Ko wai ra? We're warriors, not ****s.' The language wasn't ideal, but boy, did they turn it on for those ten minutes and we won, fairytale stuff. They only won because they believed in you, boy,' cos they respected you. I respect you for that.

After the coach, Wiremu's mother had stood up and related what a pleasure the memories of Wiremu's growing up still gave her. Many stories were told by his mother, with her eyes filled with tears and real *aroha* (love) for her son. When his mother had finished, others stood up to tell their stories about Wiremu: his brothers, friends, *whanau* (extended family) members and teachers. Everyone had the

opportunity to say whatever they wished about his strengths and achievements. After this, there was a 'long, very strong silence'.

The problem is the problem

At this point in the meeting, there had been a change. An old man had stood up and begun to talk about gardening, in particular, his own garden:

His quiet *korero* [narration] continued as he told how he and his wife, who had passed on, had planted all the trees in the garden and how proud she was of them. The gnomes in the garden were gifts from her each Christmas . . . he could even remember the years each was given. He talked about . . . how much he missed his wife.

The RTLB teacher remembered that then Wiremu's mother had stood up again and talked about her job. She did not like it, but it helped pay for food, clothes, presents and extras, including the family car: 'not much of a car, but it is mine and I am proud of it'. She talked about how necessary the car had been when Wiremu had broken his arm in a rugby match and had to be taken to hospital, and also when she 'had taken nana to Auckland for the *tangi* [funeral] of her friend'.

Acceptance of personal responsibility

What happened next had surprised everybody. Wiremu stood up to speak. He was crying. He turned to the elderly neighbour whose garden he had wrecked and asked to be forgiven. He offered to help mend the fence, to sort out the plants in the garden and to repair the garden gnomes. The RTLB teacher recalled him saying: 'As a child I remember your wife . . . she used to give my sister flowers to take to mum. She was always smiling and she had a nice face'. Wiremu hugged his mother and apologized over and over again:

There was not a dry eye in that *whare* [meeting-room] and I will not forget it in a hurry. The meeting ended with everyone walking away with their *mana* [personal standing] and *wairua* [sense of spiritual well-being] strengthened by what they had seen.

Restoration

Afterwards, Wiremu honoured his promise to the old man. He repaired the fence, glued together the garden gnomes and tidied up the garden. He did not fix the car, but he did not take it out joyriding again. There was a substantial improvement in his behaviour at school and his attitude to school work.

Each culture has its own worldview and its ways of constructing meanings, or understandings about behaviour and how to go about changing it. The Restorative Practices Development Team (2003) note that among the Māori people of New Zealand the concept of restorative justice is built around the concept of always maintaining personal *mana* (an individual's autonomy, integrity, self-esteem and standing within the group). Resolution of conflict between individuals must be

achieved in ways that respect and restore the *mana* of all parties, including both victims and wrong-doers. Attempts to repair any damage and hurt to those involved will follow from this principle. The ‘personal storytelling’ of Wiremu would indeed have acknowledged and built up his *mana*, to the point at which, now being a person of *mana*, he would himself see the need to put things right and to act appropriately.

Discussion

Individual student behaviour that is seen as challenging may be indicative of a range of contextual issues that need to be addressed at the whole-school or school-community levels. Sometimes challenging behaviour of individual students can be addressed through attention to school-wide practices that affect all students. Sometimes it requires decisions at whole-school level to introduce a new initiative or form of provision that will support individual students more appropriately. The episodes outlined in this paper offer an example of an initiative designed to address the behaviour of one errant student. The initiative raised issues of practices that impinge on the whole student population, as well as those that affect individuals more specifically. In this example, powerful mechanisms of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) were brought into play in a process that empowered community members to reclaim reciprocal accountability, respect and support. The concerns of social disintegration were addressed by enabling a community to respond to the wrongdoing, and by empowering that community to cooperate in solving the problem. Individual freedom and equal participation were combined with a communitarian preference for defining moral expectations and reparation at the level of the local community.

Braithwaite (1997) claims that many responses to young people with problems fail because these responses treat young people as isolated individuals and do not operate in the context of the community of people who know and care about a person. On the basis of their experience, the Restorative Practices Development Team advise that a restorative conference will need to include the senior administrators of a school, usually the head teacher/principal and deputy head/deputy principal and a trained facilitator. A very important preliminary task is to ‘identify the appropriate community of care around the young person on whom the conference will focus’ (Restorative Practices Development Team, 2003, p. 28). This decision should not be made structurally in terms of the family or the school: ‘There needs to be some contextual relationship to the person that defines them as part of the community of care’ (2003, p. 28). Key questions to ask include (p. 28):

- Is there a victim?
- Who has a stake in addressing this issue?
- To whom does resolving this issue matter?

The restorative process will not succeed as well as it might without the willing participation of the victim, or aggrieved person. However, no attempts should be made to persuade an unwilling victim to attend. A prime consideration is safety for all involved.

Understandings of restorative justice, of the causes of problematic behaviours and of what behaviours are important for maintaining the well-being of individuals and the community vary widely across different cultures and across different groups within apparently the same culture. There is a danger that the school will try to exert control over the location and timing of the process, the protocol to be followed and over what restorative actions need to be taken, and by whom. Where the behaviour or decisions of powerful members of school staff may be part of the problem to be addressed (as in decisions to stand down, suspend or exclude students), students, parents and community members of those students may have little power to suggest and initiate solutions. A more balanced and equitable protocol for restorative justice procedures may involve locating the process outside the school, but within a community context, by following protocols and procedures that are understandable by members of those cultural communities.

In New Zealand schools, for example, one important aspect of the restorative justice process within the context of Māori students is that the *hui whakatika* (restorative justice meeting) is particularly effective when conducted according to Māori protocol. This meeting will be conducted by Māori elders, or, as in the example above, by a Māori professional, with elders present, and will focus on reaching a consensus position on what should be done to 'put things right'. By following Māori protocol (rather than the protocol of the school), this process can help address issues of power imbalances between school authorities and the individual student and their community.

School personnel, including any senior management involved, as well as professionals and *whānau* members must listen respectfully, not interrupt others, speak only when 'given the floor' and follow the advice and guidance of the elders. In this way, solutions can be reached that do not automatically lead to stand downs, suspensions or expulsions of students, but nevertheless acknowledge that harm or hurt has been caused which must be repaired. The school, however, does not own, and so cannot completely control or manage, the process. It has to learn to be responsive to community preferred ways of dealing with challenging behaviour. On their part, the elders responsible ensure the process is respectful of all individuals and is positively affirming of their positions.

Introducing restorative practices in schools

Introducing restorative practices in schools requires considerable forethought and prior planning, negotiation and deliberation. The Team at the University of Waikato suggest that (see Restorative Practices Development Team, 2003, p. 46):

1. The support of the management, staff and community of the school is an essential ingredient for the success of restorative conferencing. We therefore recommend that all schools undertake a detailed consultation process prior to initiating any project.
2. Schools that wish to consider establishing Restorative Conferencing need to analyse carefully whether the process fits within the culture of the school.

The restorative ideals, as opposed to a punishment focus, have to be deeply embedded in the school's culture for the project to be successful.

3. The relationship between the disciplinary role of the Boards of Trustees (Boards of Governors) and the conferencing processes should be clarified from the outset. At times the demarcation lines between these linked roles can create problems. Clear policies need to be established between these two disciplinary processes. This is particularly important in determining responsibility for reporting to disciplinary committees or the board and the extent to which completion of agreed outcomes will remove the risk of suspension.
4. We recommend the use of a community support person to complete the community liaison and administrative work that is vital to the conducting of conferences. The use of the support worker appears to enhance the participation of all groups in the process.
5. In high schools the deans (heads of year) should be trained as convenors to assist in the referrals of students to conferences. As the staff members who hold an overview of the issues in their area of responsibility, they have greater potential to ensure proactive steps are taken to address disciplinary issues as they arise. Deans should therefore be among those staff members primarily responsible for recommending conferences.¹
6. The conferencing process can be used for a range of different types of problems, including: continual disobedience, assault, vandalism, alcohol and drugs misuse.
7. The process has the potential to be extended into other contexts within the schools as a model of handling contentious issues. This could include developing processes to address classroom conflicts, bullying, peer mediation, staff conflicts and issues within Boards of Trustees.

Conclusion

Recent special educational developments across the world have seen a shift to working within an inclusive approach. Teachers and other educators are therefore now required to deal with greater cultural, physical and intellectual diversity. This is a challenge in terms of programme development, classroom pedagogy and structures, time management and service delivery. Teachers are pivotal members of the team, for they are the link between the specialist expertise of parents and community on the one hand, and the specialist professional support team on the other hand. With these additional responsibilities, the task of the teacher can be considerably challenging, but also increasingly satisfying and rewarding.

'Inclusion' is a term which as yet lacks adequate theorizing or consensus about what it may mean in practice: commonly, it is described as a process, a set of practices or an issue of human rights. However, one factor that is often missing from much of the debate around inclusion is the situated nature of difficulties in learning and behaviour in schools. Curricular experiences offer students ways of knowing the world. Within an institution, educators' and students' relationships and values are defined by that institution's social practices. This can be problematic when students are defined also in terms of their membership and participation in

other communities of social practice that may be quite different from the school community.

In England, as in many other countries, education in mainstream schools for all is the government's stated intention and moves in this direction have existed for some 30 years. Inherent in the argument for inclusion is a social, ecological or environmental model for understanding and responding to behavioural difficulties. Such a model emphasizes the importance of factors in the environment, for example the home, the school and the community, including other people's stereotypes, values and preconceptions; that is, factors outside the student.

Inclusion, *per se*, tends to be perceived in terms of increasing educational opportunity and removing barriers to progress. However, inclusion of itself does not ensure equity. For example, social and economic disadvantage, linguistic and cultural diversity, and so on, are factors known to limit the success of access, and the benefits which might flow from it.

Current moves towards inclusive approaches for all students of statutory school age require a reconceptualization of both learning and behaviour as situated, dynamic and interactive between students and the learning environment. If this is to occur, teachers need to be able to reflect critically on notions of 'behaviour difficulties', inclusion and the values associated with them. Learning occurs through engagement in society. Schools play a critical part in shaping students' beliefs in their sense of self-efficacy, that is in their ability, responsibility and skill in initiating and completing actions and tasks. The way schools mediate success and failure is crucial to the development of a sense of personal agency (Bruner, 1996). School processes and practices impact upon young people's development of a sense of agency and ability. The sense of belonging to, or marginalization from, the school community affects every aspect of participation, and therefore learning within it, and necessarily affects a student's behaviour and self-perception. Failing to support the development of students' understanding and ability to act in a social context risks marginalizing and alienating young people and rendering them incompetent. It is not an easy task to engage with students whose behaviour in schools is experienced as challenging or otherwise worrying. Nevertheless, these students have the same basic need to belong and to be affirmed as any others.

Families and local voluntary community groups are, potentially, important sources of additional support for schools in developing initiatives to address problematic student behaviour. Embedded within different home-school partnership arrangements are presuppositions about the rights of families and/or local community groups from a diversity of backgrounds and cultures to support their children at school, in ways that are safe and supportive for all involved. These presuppositions can serve to include or alienate both parents and their children. A restorative justice approach implies an 'empowerment model' (Dale, 1996) of parental partnership with schools.

In some schools, an empowerment model of parent-school partnership might be experienced as uncomfortable for a number of reasons. Parents might be felt to usurp some of the power and control more usually owned by professionals inside educational institutions. Also, there is an inherent inequality that flows from a market-type education system which advantages children whose parents are the most

literate, persistent and articulate (Audit Commission, 1992; Gross, 1996). There may therefore be a very real concern about the way in which, as Gewirtz *et al.* (1995) comment, education is viewed in the UK as a commodity with increasing choice open to those who are advantaged, a position that is becoming increasingly common in New Zealand also.

Proper consideration of the location of power and its significance is therefore highly important in conceptualizing ways in which families might support their children. Families have the potential to make a major impact on children's learning and, as a number of researchers have indicated, support the learning of those who experience difficulties (Glynn *et al.*, 1979; Ostler, 1991; Heaton, 1996; Riddick, 1996). The corollary of recognizing this potential impact is a need to accord respect both to the role of families and to the families themselves by sharing information about children's progress and acknowledging that families also have expertise that should be harnessed to support children's learning.

Potentially therefore parents and carers are an important resource in supporting the learning of all children, and may be the only additional resource for those who experience difficulties (Wearmouth, 2004). Educators need to acknowledge and respect cultural differences and values, and to incorporate the advice of community members in developing strategies for responding to challenging behaviour. This might involve developing relationships with their community members in order to allow them to determine who should have access to their homes and families and how this should be done. Professional training needs also to include strategies to ensure educators develop an ability to work within a team approach, and alongside people from other cultures, to learn from them and to ensure issues are handled with safety and respect.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their appreciation to Mere Berryman for her assistance in the production of this article.

Note

1. We feel it is important to note that, in a New Zealand context, where conferences involve Māori students and their *whanau*, deans may not be able to assume that they have the automatic authority to call together a *hui* on behalf of the Māori community. Rather, they may need to seek advice and guidance of senior Māori people in the locality or of Māori colleagues in the school.

References

- Anderson, C., Gendler, G., Riestenberg, N., Anfang, C. C., Ellison, M. & Yates, B. (1996) *Restorative measures: respecting everyone's ability to resolve problems* (St Paul, MN, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, Office of Community Services).
- Audit Commission (1992) *Getting in on the Act: provision for pupils with special educational needs* (London, HMSO).
- Belenky, M. F., Bond, L. A. & Weinstock, J. S. (1997) *A tradition that has no name: nurturing the development of people, families and communities* (New York, Basic Books).

- Braithwaite, J. (1997) *Restorative justice: assessing an immodest theory and a pessimistic theory* (Canberra, Australian National University, Australian Institute of Criminology).
- Bruner, J. (1996) *The culture of education* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- Carey, M. (1996) Restorative justice in community corrections, *Corrections Today*, 58(5), 152–155.
- Cavanagh, T. (n.d.) *Creating safe schools using restorative practices in a culture of care*. Unpublished report, Fulbright Foundation.
- Council of Europe (1966) *European Convention on Human Rights (Rome, 1950) and its five Protocols* (Strasbourg, Council of Europe).
- Dale, N. (1996) *Working with families of children with special needs: partnership and practice* (London, Routledge).
- Gewirtz, S., Ball, S. J. & Bowe, R. (1995) *Markets, choice and equity in education* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Glynn, T., McNaughton, S., Robinson, V. & Quinn, M. (1979) *Remedial reading at home: helping you to help your child* (Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research).
- Gross, J. (1996) The weight of the evidence: parental advocacy and resource allocation to children with statements of special educational need, *Support for Learning*, 11(1), 3–8.
- Heaton, P. (1996) *Parents in need* (London, Whurr).
- Hopkins, B. (2004) *Just schools: a whole-school approach to restorative justice* (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Ostler, C. (1991) *Dyslexia: a parent's survival guide* (Godalming, Ammonite Books).
- Restorative Practices Development Team (2003) *Restorative practices for schools* (Hamilton, NZ, University of Waikato).
- Riddick, B. (1996) *Living with dyslexia* (London and New York, Routledge).
- Schweigert, F. J. (1999) Moral behaviour in victim–offender conferencing, *Criminal Justice Ethics*, Summer–Fall, 29–40.
- Umbreit, M. S. & Coates, R. B. (1992) *Victim–offender mediation: an analysis of programs in four states of the US. Learning the Common Good* (Minneapolis, MN, Minnesota Citizens' Council on Crime and Justice).
- Wearmouth, J. (2004) Issues in addressing children's difficulties in literacy development through family–school partnerships, *Curriculum Journal*, 15(1), 5–18.