THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Can restorative practices in schools make a difference?

Can Restorative Practices in Schools make a Difference?

Introduction

Restorative Practices (RP) developed in schools from growing international practice in restorative justice with offenders. Some schools in the UK looking for solutions to concerns about indiscipline and disaffection and violence have been enthused by its basic premise; the need to restore good relationships when there has been conflict or harm; and develop a school ethos that reduces the possibilities of such conflict arising. The approach seems compatible with the recognition of schooling as a complex task, with increasingly wider demands on schools in a diverse and changing world where teachers' work can often be challenging and stressful.

In 2004, the Scottish Executive funded a pilot project on RP in 3 Local Authorities and commissioned a team based at Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities to carry out a two- year evaluation of the pilot. We investigated the ways in which 18 pilot schools (10 primary, 7 secondary and one special school in urban, suburban and rural areas) were developing their Restorative Practices.

In this paper, we give a broad outline of some early findings, discuss what schools understood by Restorative Practices, identify the successes and issues for schools and outline the potential contribution of Restorative Practices for schools in challenging times. Finally we relate our findings to some key arguments about discipline and control in schooling.

Background to the pilot project

Interest in a Restorative approach in schools has developed rapidly across the UK in recent years. Caught between the twin demands of improving inclusive practice and the pressure to seek continuous improvements in achievement, headteachers often express concerns about the pressures for staff and pupils in their care (AHDS 2007; NAHT 2007; Mortimore & Whitty 2000; Munn 2000; Tomlinson 2000). They are aware of political concerns about pupil disengagement and disaffection (DfES 2004; Webb & Vulliamy 2004), and perceptions about increasing violence in schools and the 'ASBO generation' (Verkaik in The Independent, 2005), which often converge in over-heated debate and a search for simple solutions. They are often also aware of the complex pressures on children and young people: the numbers of young carers, of Looked After Children, of children coping with a range of family and personal difficulties, of increasing concern about wellbeing and mental health among the young; expectations about body image, self -presentation and success (Scottish Executive 2007; YoungMinds 2007; DfES 2006). Skevik (2007) summarises this for us when she talks about 'children as investments, children as threats and children as victims' (2003 p.426).

In common with its neighbours, Scotland has responded to these concerns and complexities with a range of recent legislation and policy initiatives aimed at, firstly, improvement in behaviour (The Motivated School, 2006; Solution Orientated Schools, 2005: Better Behaviour, Better Learning, 2001); secondly, an increase in inclusive practice (Standards in Scotland's Schools Act 2000: Additional Support for Learning Act, 2004), and, thirdly, an improvement in levels of achievement (Assessment is for Learning 2005; A Curriculum for Excellence, 2004; Guidance on

Flexibility in the Curriculum, 2001). Although having much in common with England, Wales and Northern Ireland and, for example, the agenda laid out by the Children Act (2004), it is also important to note the impact of Scotland's distinctive educational history and current priorities.

The RP pilot was developed in an educational context that holds strongly to the ideals of comprehensive schooling. Most children attend their local school in a system that has been much less affected by the development of the quasi-market in education than England. The framework offered by the Children's Hearing system over the last 35 years continues to shape a holistic view of children's needs and rejects attempts to view offending behaviour in isolation. It has perhaps led to a stronger emphasis on inter-professional working in Scotland and a reluctance to embrace the use of measures such as Anti-Social Behaviour Orders. Disciplinary exclusion and non-attendance rates have also remained proportionately lower over time in Scotland than in England.

Most recently, the Code of Practice on Additional Support for Learning (2005) has been especially significant; introducing a more functional definition of 'special needs', now conceptualised in terms of barriers to learning that may be pedagogical, institutional and social as well as those which may be individually focused. Prior to the introduction of the Additional Support for Learning (ASL) Act (2004), Scotland, in common with the rest of the UK, used the term 'special needs'. The new Act continues to make provision for what might in the past have been considered special needs and disabilities but also now includes, for example, recognition that pupils may have needs arising out of family bereavement, interrupted learning, family trauma or

illness, being a young carer, being gifted and talented. It emphasises a much more dynamic understanding of 'need' and one which also recognises the complexity and inter-connectedness of different needs which may exist within one young person.

An understanding of the distinctive features of Scottish education, alongside all that it has in common with other post-industrial countries, is essential to understanding the development of RP in this pilot; its successes and its challenges.

Restorative Practice

RP originally developed as Restorative Justice, an approach to crime that focussed on repairing harm and giving a voice to 'victims' (Bazemore & Umbreit 2001; Barton 2000; Marshall 1998; Fattah & Peters 1998; Barnett 1977). Restorative Practice in education differs from Restorative Justice in that the latter involves professionals working exclusively with young people who offend. In RP in education, the whole school community, all school staff, pupils and sometimes parents, can be involved (Hopkins 2004).

> Restorative justice in the school setting views misconduct not as school-rule-breaking, and therefore as a violation of the institution, but as a violation against people and relationships in the school and wider community.
> (Cameron and Thorsborne, 2001 p. 183)

In many countries, it has developed through the use of Restorative Conferencing; a structured approach to restoring relationships when there has been harm, that involves offenders, victims and key others in a process designed to resolve difficulties and

repair relationships (Morrison 2007).

The largest independent evaluation of Restorative Justice in schools in the UK to date, commissioned by the Youth Justice Board of England and Wales, reported on a pilot initiative in which youth offending teams worked with 26 schools in England and Wales (Bitel 2005). The aims of the initiative were to reduce offending, bullying and victimisation and to improve attendance, largely through Restorative Conferencing. Mirroring findings elsewhere (Blood 2005; Chmelynski 2005; Drewery 2004), there was found to be little impact on some outcome measures such as exclusion and no significant improvement in pupil attitudes except in the small number of schools where a whole school approach had been adopted. However, the researchers concluded that Restorative Justice in schools, while 'not a panacea… [could] if implemented correctly…improve the school environment, enhance learning and encourage young people to become more responsible and empathetic' (Bitel, 2005 p. 13).

The Scottish Restorative Practice project

In 2004, funding was provided by the Scottish Executive for a two- year pilot project on Restorative Practices (RP) in 3 Scottish Local Authorities (later extended for a further two years). The overall aim for the national pilot project in Restorative Practices was to learn more about RP in school settings and to look at whether there could be a distinctive Scottish approach, an approach that both complemented and offered something additional to current good practice.

In the pilot project in Scotland the underpinning principles were seen as:

- The importance of fostering social relationships in a school community of mutual engagement

- Responsibility and accountability for one's own actions and their impact on others

- Respect for other people, their views and feelings

- Empathy with the feelings of others affected by one's own actions

- Fairness

- Commitment to equitable process

- Active involvement of everyone in school with decisions about their own lives

- Issues of conflict and difficulty returned to participants, rather than behaviour pathologised

- A willingness to create opportunities for reflective change in pupils and staff (Kane *et al.* 2007a).

The Research

At the same time ach of the three Local Authorities (LAs) was asked by the Scottish Executive to identify 6 schools to be involved in the evaluation. Decisions about participation differed across these LAs. Some schools were keen to be involved in the initiative and saw RP fitting well with their own priorities. Others were selected because the LA was keen for them to take a revitalised approach to issues of pupil engagement with learning and behaviour management. The final 18 schools included 10 secondary schools, 7 primary schools and one special school for pupils with moderate learning difficulties. The ways in which they were selected mean that these schools cannot be said to be representative overall, although they were situated across urban, suburban and rural areas, some in areas of severe economic poverty and others

in areas of relative economic wealth. A sum of £45,000 was provided to each LA, some of which was devolved to schools and some used to fund local training.

The evaluation team worked with a national Steering Group throughout the two years, convened by the Scottish Executive and consisting of key managers from LAs, schools and educational psychologists' service. With this Steering Group, we negotiated a range of methods through which to evaluate the aims for RP and outcomes in these schools, resulting in a collaborative approach and a highly constructive 'feedback loop' with key staff.

We gathered some data that allowed comparisons to be made across schools and LAs but also recognised that schools had been encouraged by the Scottish Executive to identify their own aims and planned outcomes for the pilot project, responding to local needs and priorities. Evidence from the range of data was considered on a school-by-school basis, in order to build up a broad picture of progress in each school. Schools began from very different starting points, and had quite varied aims and strategies. Conclusions about each school therefore related to what they had achieved, in terms of their *own* context, concerns and priorities (Kane, Lloyd *et al.* 2007(a); McCluskey, Lloyd *et al.* 2008).

Data collection involved:

- Interviews with a range of Local Authority and school staff
- Individual and group interviews with pupils and parents/carers
- School staff survey (N= 627)
- Pupil survey (N= 1163)

- Observation of a range of meetings, activities and lessons

- Documentary analysis of school and Local Authority policies

- Participation in a range of Scottish Executive, Local Authority and school based meetings

- Analysis of national and school statistical data

- Focus group meetings with school and Local Authority staff.

The range of data collection methods, and the unique opportunities to engage directly and repeatedly with so many staff and pupils, has resulted in an immensely rich set of data. The staff and pupil surveys were analysed using SPSS and results from the quantitative analysis will be written up separately. This article draws on early findings from the surveys but focuses primarily on data drawn from interviews to offer insight into some key questions regarding a Restorative approach and its relationship to ethos, the challenges of school change and meanings of discipline and control in schools.

Across the 18 schools, we interviewed a range of staff and pupils, as can be seen from the table below. We met directly with 138 primary pupils and 93 secondary pupils, either in groups or in individual interview. Key staff members in each school were interviewed on a number of occasions over the period of the pilot. More than 400 education staff interviews were conducted overall. Most of the interviews were transcribed. The analysis sought to identify 'indigenous themes –themes that characterise the experience of the informants' (Ryan & Bernard 2003, p.4). The research team paid particular attention to the needs of children as research participants in individual and group interviews (Lewis & Lindsay 2000). The interviews were

coded individually, and the iterative process within the research team allowed local and community social and cultural themes to be identified. The quotations from interviews below represent these main themes; reflections on context and ways of thinking about people, events, relationships and change processes (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000).

(Insert Table I here)

Findings

Restorative Practice, as it developed in the pilot schools, ranged on a continuum ranging from whole school to highly individualised approaches; each school developing its own aims and set of strategies. The continuum included:

- restorative ethos building;

- curriculum focus on relationship/conflict prevention;

- restorative language and scripts;

- restorative enquiry;

- restorative conversations;

- mediation, shuttle mediation and peer mediation;

- circles - checking in and problem-solving circles;

- restorative meetings, informal conferences, classroom conferences and mini-conferences; and

- formal conferences.

Implementation of RPs in Scotland is in its early stages – too early for claims to be made about long-term impact or sustainability. As can be seen in the Table below,

schools were at very different stages of development at the end of the 2-year evaluation. However, it is clear that significant success had been achieved in some schools.

(Insert Table ii here)

The primary schools and the special school shared many salient features and were characterised by:

- a strong focus on ethos and relationships in and out of classrooms and a generally broad view of RP underpinning specific practices

- strong leadership and positive modelling by head teachers and key staff

- a major contribution to the developments by class teachers and support staff

- a focus on a promoting restorative language in school interactions, using posters and cards with scripts

- playground projects involving promoting positive relationships through games and activities supported by trained problem solvers and peer mediators

- restorative conversations and classroom conferences

- social skills and cognitive reasoning programmes aimed at developing skills to prevent and resolve conflict.

RP was often seen to be building on developments already started and to be compatible with other initiatives such as social skills courses, peer mediation training and cognitive reasoning programmes. Indeed, successful primary schools developed a blended approach to their initiatives and the values and ideas associated with Restorative Practices provided a 'glue' which was helpful in integrating these into an

overall approach. There was strong evidence of cultural change, such as use of restorative language by staff and pupils, within the primary and special schools - while there still existed a minority of resistant staff. The atmosphere in most of the schools became identifiably calmer and pupils generally more positive about their whole school experience; they described staff as fair and listening to 'both sides of the story'. Most staff were comfortable with the language of RP and identified improvements in staff morale. A small number of schools had raised attainment and in several there was a decrease in exclusions, in-school discipline referrals and out of school referrals, although of course not all of these can be attributed solely to the introduction of RPs. There was clear evidence of children developing conflict resolution skills.

The special school was one of the schools felt to have made significant progress across the school. According to staff, key to success were the particularly strong modelling by senior management and a strong commitment to training and to training 'recall' time.

In secondary schools progress was found to be more patchy and it is likely that the different structures of secondary schools led to a slower pace of change. However findings indicated that:

- in several schools staff identified and valued the commitment and modelling of RP by key members of staff, especially managers and those within pupil support teams
- some staff and some departments were using restorative language and conversations

- some staff identified significant changes in classroom climate and some subject departments were developing restorative strategies

- interest in RP was generated by trained staff working with colleagues, especially with subject departments

- in most secondary schools there was development and use of restorative meetings to address conflict between pupils and between staff and pupils

- several schools were increasing the involvement of pupils as restorative practitioners through buddying and anti-bullying initiatives

- some schools also developed restorative conferencing processes, where key staff met with a pupil and their family to explore a problem or harm, using a script and formal structure, to allow all concerned to express their views and feelings and to generate a restorative solution.

The research indicated that secondary schools had more diverse approaches to the development of Restorative Practices. Schools where significant numbers of staff might need further convincing tended to opt for small-scale 'local' innovation perhaps involving pastoral care/behaviour support or particular subject departments. They also tended to offer RP to staff as 'another tool in the tool box' and to emphasise that it was not simply another initiative but a development of their own skills. However, in some secondary schools, where ethos was regarded as already very positive, aims for RP were broader, tended to complement existing practices and engaged more explicitly with discussion of underpinning values.

The key features associated with successful implementation, in both primary and secondary schools, included readiness for change, and also balance of clarity and

flexibility about identification of aims. This was very often associated with good quality training and leadership. The findings outlined above indicate that greatest success was achieved where schools saw a need for change and were already committed to improving school ethos by creating and sustaining positive relationships throughout the school community. However, there was also evidence of significant progress in schools where more limited aims were achieved. A crucial part of readiness was not just recognition that situations could be better but a sense of agency among those involved; they had the <u>capacity</u> to make them better.

In interview, key staff in most schools often discussed the importance of a restorative ethos. Staff in primary schools often felt that they *were half-way there already* (Primary Class teacher). One headteacher said,

> *you know, behaviour was always a problem and it will always be a problem in the next twenty years, but you should be able to come to your work thinking right OK, it's a challenge but ...we'll work through it. We want [teachers] who are explorers, talking about getting a team together... open.*

In one secondary school, a Restorative approach was understood in the following way by the headteacher:

> *you always negotiate...in decisions about children...with pupils....with parents...I kept referring to SMT [Senior Management Team]and guidance [pastoral support team] but the other point is to make it a whole school issue...even in their teaching being more restorative and listening and receptive to two sides. And possibly prevent issues escalating and making children more responsible young adults.having the ability to take part in every*

aspect in the school life. And that's one of the issues we want to build on so that they have a voice and can be seen to be heard.

There were some indications that RP could inspire established senior staff with a new energy. In one secondary school, for example, the Depute Headteacher was initially sceptical, but then attended a training course and, *'came away convinced, fully convinced, absolutely fully convinced that this was a very powerful tool'*.

For their part, pupils felt that RP had led to teachers *'not shouting'* ,*'listening to both sides'* and *'[making] everyone feel equal'*. Pupils were generally very clear about the effectiveness of restorative meetings, where these had taken place. One pupil commented,

> *That's what happens when you are in a fight. She [the headteacher] doesn't just call you in and shout at you. She brings the two of you in and try to solve what happened.*

Another pupil explained,

> *I like what Mr [Name] does. He just takes what you say and gets the other one to say what happened and then he would bring us both together and we would speak about it then. It did work when he done it'.*

When this pupil said the teacher *'takes what you say'*, she highlighted an important point made by many pupils keen to point out how much they value a fair hearing, one of the central tenets of a Restorative approach.

The early findings of the evaluation are very positive overall. There was strong evidence of real and sustained engagement with the project overall and substantial gains made in many of the schools. However, if we are to understand whether RP is likely to be seen in the long term as anything more than 'just another initiative', then it is important to give equal weight both to its undoubted successes but also to the challenges and questions which it raises. One fundamental challenge lies in the relationship between RP and other approaches to discipline and control in schools.

RP and school discipline

> *'Teachers are afraid we are stealing their strength'*
>
> (Primary Headteacher).

Many have voiced concerns about issues associated with disaffection, disruption and non-attendance and the effectiveness of current approaches to these issues (Cremin 2007, Hayden 2007, McCluskey 2007 & 2005, Reid 2006, 2005 & 1999, Parsons 2005, Munn, Lloyd & Cullen 2000).

Many staff, particularly but not always in secondary schools, talked about difficulties reconciling their current behaviour management or discipline policy and practice with RP. They were very keen to see how RP could support their day-to-day work with pupils, but were often unsure about its use in more serious situations. The staff survey, administered relatively early in the project, indicated that most staff felt that punishment was sometimes necessary. In the pupil survey, most pupils indicated that punishment was sometimes necessary. The central challenge of RP, we would suggest, lies here; in its contrast with the habitus of schools; with the 'taken for granted' structures and systems of discipline and control in schools. Morrison,

discussing the international trend towards more zero tolerance discipline in schools argues that,

> Violence within this system, is most often addressed in moral and legal terms; asking how evil is this action and how much punishment does it deserve?
>
> (Morrison, 2007 p. 71).

When the pilot started, most schools had a 'Positive Discipline' approach, often based on Assertive Discipline (Canter & Canter 1992), widely used in Scottish schools and also across the UK and USA. Proponents talk about pupils making good choices about behaving well or poor choices about not engaging. Rule infringement leads to a set list of increasingly serious consequences, including exclusion, and the clarity and consistency of such an approach is seen as invaluable to hard-pressed staff. Headteachers are often keenly aware that society demands that schools teach responsibilities as well as rights, and see this as offering safety and protection for staff as well as pupils (Garland 2005).

However, the context of Scottish schooling is also shaped by an enduring political commitment to the principles of welfare through, for example, the Children's Hearing system and the inclusive ideals of comprehensive education, as noted earlier. Assertive discipline has been criticized for its inflexibility, for its assumption that the teacher always exercises power fairly and for an over-simplified understanding of the term 'choice' in the complex lives of pupils today (Kohn 2006). Restorative Practice has been a significant innovation, not only in terms of the change in processes, but, more fundamentally, because the underpinning principles outlined earlier have challenged assumptions about the legitimacy of everyday statements such as 'schools

must maintain the right to exclude'. These principles have led to an unease about discipline and disciplinary exclusion which goes beyond a discussion about effectiveness; an unease much more concerned with, as Levitas says, 'exclusion…[as] a closing off of the self- generally through fear –and thus a diminishing of one's own humanity' (2005, p. 106).

A number of headteachers in the pilot primary and secondary schools emphasised that they were still prepared to exclude pupils and certain kinds of behaviour, for example, violence, as meriting an immediate exclusion. Interestingly, though, two of the secondary school headteachers advocated abandoning punishment altogether, although the staff survey suggested that not all staff in these schools agreed with them. One headteacher expressed concern that some staff were *'...very proud of their control. I haven't heard a pin drop all day!'* Scottish schools abandoned the use of physical punishment, the 'belt', in the mid 1980s. However the notion of visible, public punishment as a viable deterrent still has widespread support in society (Parsons 2005). For many, authority depends on fear, and 'meaningful consequences' for misbehaviour are necessarily unpleasant and aversive (Kohn 2006).

> *There's always the risk that when the going gets tough, restorative is an easy target in any school…you've got a kind of default setting among teachers saying 'well that's all very well but we're not punitive enough, we're not scary enough. The kids aren't frightened of us'*
>
> (Staff member).

Kohn (2006) argues that discipline can often be just about compliance and that the language of behaviour can be seen to be part of a wider discourse of obedience. He

quotes Glasser's observation (1969, p. 22) that 'we teach thoughtless conformity to school rules and call the conforming child 'responsible''. Restorative Practice, when conceptualised as it was in some schools as '*just another tool in the tool-box*' (and when the toolbox also contains disciplinary practices that emphasise compliance and punishment), seemed to offer limited scope to transform school ethos. In some secondary schools this was recognised but key staff still felt the need to demonstrate to some subject heads ('*resistant feudal barons*') that RP 'worked' with the most difficult pupils, before attempting a wider, whole school approach.

The research has raised a number of issues about whether Restorative Practice might be still just about compliance, another surveillance technique to add to the Foucaultian panopticon (Thomas & Loxley 2007). With Morrison, however, we argue that Restorative approaches can,

> enable us to move beyond the predominant paradigm of regulatory formalism, where institutional representatives make a moral judgment about the "evilness" of the action and a legal judgement about the appropriate punishment and allow us to be more responsive because it entails giving back the harm, or wrongdoing, to the community most affected and creates a process for the community to address the harm
> (Morrison, 2007 p. 71).

Conclusion

The research suggested that RP had most impact when school staff were willing to reflect on their daily interactions in school and review their values - when they saw the pilot project as a chance to think about what kind of school they wanted and how

they wanted to 'be' with their pupils. RP seemed most effective when 'behaviour' was seen as an issue to be addressed through Restorative strategies that involved active learning for all children and for staff across the school. This was most likely to happen when there was visible commitment, enthusiasm and modelling by the school management team and where the school had invested in significant staff development. In many schools there was a clear positive impact on relationships, seen in the views and actions of staff and pupils and in a reduction of playground incidents, discipline referrals, exclusion and need for external support.

In recognition of the benefits of RP revealed by this research, the Scottish Executive has now extended the period of the pilot project by a further two years, 2006-2008. The possibilities offered by RP depend on the extent to which schools can sustain deep engagement with its principles and with the questions raised, and which, to date, have marked it out as significantly different from other initiatives. Can they manage the tensions between current policy and practice in behaviour management and explore the differences between an essentially punitive paradigm and this '…restorative, indeed transformative, approach'? (Cameron & Thorsborne 2001 p. 184).

References

ASSOCIATION OF HEADTEACHERS AND DEPUTES IN SCOTLAND (2005) **Policy Position on Inclusion**, www.ahds.org.uk/policy_positions accessed 24 August 2007.

BARNETT, R. (1977) Restitution: A new paradigm of criminal justice, **Ethics: An International Journal of Social, Political and Legal Philosophy**. 87(4), pp.279-301.

BARTON, C. (2000) Empowerment and criminal justice, in: H. STRANG & J. BRAITHWAITE (Eds) **Restorative Justice: Philosophy to Practice** (Ashgate, Dartmouth).

BAZEMORE, G & UMBREIT, M. (2001) A comparison of four restorative conferencing models, in: **Juvenile Justice Bulletin** (Washington, D.C., Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention).

BITEL, M. (2005) **National Evaluation of the Restorative Justice in Schools** (London, Youth Justice Board for England and Wales).

BLOOD, P. (2005) The Australian context − restorative practices as a platform for cultural change in schools, paper to **XIV World Congress of Criminology**, Philadelphia, August 7-11, 2005.

CAMERON, L. & THORSBORNE, M. (2001) Restorative justice and school discipline; mutually exclusive? In: H. STRANG and J. BRAITHWAITE (Eds) **Restorative Justice and Civil Society** (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

CANTER, L & CANTER, M. (1992) **Assertive Discipline** (Santa Monica, Lee Canter & Associates).

CHILDREN ACT (2004)

CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) ACT (1995)

CHMELYNSKI, C. (2005) Schools find 'restorative justice' more effective than expulsion, **School Board News** (Virginia, National School Boards Association).

COHEN, L. MANION, L & MORRISON, K. (2000) **Research Methods in Education** (London, Routledge/Falmer).

CREMIN, H. (2007) **Peer Mediation: Citizenship and social inclusion revisited** (Maidenhead, Open University Press).

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2006) **Children Looked After in England (Including Adoptions and Care Leavers)**, 2005-2006 (London, DfES).

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2004) **Five Year Strategy for Children and Young People** (London, HMSO).

EDUCATION (ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR LEARNING) ACT (2004)

DREWERY, W. (2004) Conferencing in schools: punishment, restorative justice and the productive importance of the process of conversation, **Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology**, 14, pp. 332-334.

FATTAH, E. & PETERS, T. (1998) Support for crime victims in a comparative perspective, in: **A Collection of Essays dedicated to the memory of Professor Frederic McClintock** (Leuven, Leuven University Press).

GARLAND, D. (2005) **The Culture of Control** (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

GLASSER, W. (1969) **Schools Without Failure** (New York, Harper and Row).

HAYDEN, C. (2007) **Children in Trouble: The Role of Families, Schools and Communities** (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).

HM GOVERNMENT (2004) **Every Child Matters: Change for Children** (London).

HOPKINS, B. (2004) **Just Schools: A Whole School Approach to Restorative Justice** (London, Jessica Kingsley).

KANE, J., LLOYD, G. McCLUSKEY, G., RIDDELL, S. STEAD, J. & WEEDON, E. (2007a) **Restorative Practices in Scottish Schools** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

KANE, J., LLOYD, G. McCLUSKEY, G., RIDDELL, S. STEAD, J. & WEEDON, E. (2007b) Collaborative evaluation: balancing rigour and relevance in a research study of restorative approaches in schools in Scotland, paper to **European Education Research Conference**, 18- 21 September, Ghent.

KANE, J., LLOYD, G. McCLUSKEY, G., RIDDELL, S. STEAD, J. & WEEDON, E. (2007c) Generating an inclusive ethos? Exploring the impact of restorative practices in Scottish schools, **International Journal of Inclusive Education,** 8, No.6.

KOHN, A. (2006) **Beyond Discipline** (Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

LEVITAS, R. (2005) **The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour** (2nd edition) (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).

LEWIS, A & LINDSAY. (Eds) (2000) **Researching Children's Perspectives** (Buckingham, Open University Press)

MARSHALL, T. (1998) **Restorative Justice: An Overview** (The Home Office, Restorative Justice Consortium).

MCCLUSKEY, G. (2007) Exclusion from School: what can 'included' pupils tell us? **British Educational Research Journal**, 33 No. 6.

MCCLUSKEY, G. (2005) What does discipline mean in secondary schools now? **Scottish Educational Review** 38.

McCLUSKEY, G., LLOYD, G., KANE, J., RIDDELL, S., STEAD, J. & WEEDON, E. (2008) 'I was dead restorative today' From restorative justice to restorative approaches in school, **Cambridge Journal of Education,** 38, No.2.

McLEAN, A. (2006) **The Motivated School** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

MORRISON, B. (2007) **Restoring Safer School Communities** (Sydney, Federation Press).

MORTIMORE, P & WHITTY, G. (2000) Can school improvement overcome the effects of disadvantage? In: T.COX (Ed) **Combating Educational Disadvantage** (London, Falmer Press).

MUNN, P. (2000) Social capital, schools and exclusion, in: S. BARON, J.FIELD & T. SCHULLER (Eds) **Social Capital: Critical Perspectives** (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HEAD TEACHERS **Commission of Inquiry into Testing & League Tables**, accessed 24 August 2007 www.naht.org.uk/themes.

PARSONS, C. (2005) School exclusion: the will to punish, **British Journal of Educational Studies**, 53, No.2, pp.187-211.

REID, K (2006) Raising school attendance: A case study of good practice in monitoring and raising standards, **Quality Assurance in Education**, 14, 3, pp.199-216.

REID, K (2005) The Causes, Views and Traits of School Absenteeism and Truancy: An Analytical Review, **Research in Education**, 74, pp.59-82

REID, K. (1999) **Truancy in Schools** (London, Routledge).

RYAN, G. & BERNARD, H. (2003) Techniques to identify themes in qualitative data, in **Field Methods**, 1, pp.85-109.

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2007**) Looked After Children and Young People - We Can and Must Do Better** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2005) **Assessment is for Learning** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2005) **Solution Orientated Schools Programme** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2005) **Supporting Children's Learning: Code of Practice, Statutory Guidance relating to the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004.**

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2004) **A Curriculum for Excellence** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2001) **Better Behaviour – Better Learning** (Edinburgh, TSO).

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2001) **Guidance on Flexibility in the Curriculum** (Edinburgh, Scottish Executive).

SKEVIK, A. (2003) Children of the welfare state: individuals with entitlements, or hidden in the family, **Journal of Social Policy**, 32, pp.423-40.

STANDARDS IN SCOTLAND'S SCHOOLS ACT (2000) (Edinburgh, HMSO).

THOMAS, G. & LOXLEY, A. (2007)(2nd edition) **Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion** (Maidenhead, Open University Press).

TOMLINSON, S. (2000) Ethnic minorities and education: New disadvantages, in: T.COX (Ed) **Combating Educational Disadvantage** (London, Falmer Press).

VERKAIK, R. (2005) The Asbo Generation in: **The Independent**, 20 June 2005.

WEBB, R. & VULLIAMY, G. (2004) **A Multi-agency Approach to Reducing Disaffection and Exclusions** (London, DfES).

YOUNGMINDS (2007) **Annual Report 2006** (London,YoungMinds).