Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 67.2, Summer 2021, 159-177

Enacting Relational Leadership Through Restorative Practices

Owen D. Webb

Brock University

A restorative approach to education emphasizes that educators play a critical role in building relationships amongst school stakeholders. This case study examined the four-year journey of leading a school to implement and sustain a restorative culture. A theoretical framework for restorative practices was established around relational leadership theory and dialogue, providing the foundation for this research. The research addressed the need for studying the leading of restorative culture change from a relational perspective, while highlighting the need for leadership to establish spaces, processes, attitudes, language, and questions for establishing effective dialogue to initiate the building and sustaining of effective relations. Although the restorative culture was described by some as "diluted" by the end of the initiative, it was evident that restorative practices remained integral to the daily educational practices as a result of the four-year initiative by school leadership to integrate restorative approaches into daily practices.

Une approche réparatrice de l'éducation souligne que les éducateurs jouent un rôle essentiel dans l'établissement de relations entre les parties prenantes de l'école. Cette étude de cas examine le parcours de quatre ans de la direction d'une école pour mettre en œuvre et maintenir une culture réparatrice. Un cadre théorique pour les pratiques réparatrices a été établi autour de la théorie du leadership relationnel et du dialogue, ce qui constitue le fondement de cette recherche. La recherche a répondu au besoin d'étudier la gestion du changement de la culture réparatrice d'un point de vue relationnel, tout en soulignant la nécessité pour le leadership d'établir des espaces, des processus, des attitudes, un langage et des questions pour établir un dialogue efficace afin d'initier la construction et le maintien de relations efficaces. Bien que la culture réparatrice ait été décrite par certains comme "diluée" à la fin de l'initiative, il était évident que les pratiques réparatrices restaient partie intégrante des pratiques éducatives quotidiennes suite à l'initiative de quatre ans de la direction de l'école pour intégrer les approches réparatrices dans les pratiques quotidiennes.

A philosophy of *restorative practices* emphasizes that relationships are integral to fulfilling student needs (Vaandering, 2013, 2014a). Restorative practices is often referred to as *restorative justice*. Restorative justice is often considered a branch of restorative practices; restorative practices involve proactively building relationships and reactive responses to misbehaviour, whereas restorative justice is viewed by some as solely a reactive response to conflict (Wachtel, 2012). Hendry (in Reimer, 2015) named that restorative practices is a philosophy that focuses on the maintaining, building, and repairing of relationships. Vaandering (2010) noted that one can

speak to restorative as a philosophy when the focus is on developing caring, relationship-based cultures that focus on freedom in learning, rather than focusing solely on restorative practices as a strategy that simply seeks to reduce exclusions in schools. In acknowledging the importance of investing in relationships, a restorative approach emphasizes that educators not only play a critical role in learning, but also in proactively building relationships amongst all school stakeholders (Hendry, 2009). By endorsing change through investing in relationships rather than controlling student behaviour, restorative practices serves as a foundation for leading positive culture change in schools (Blood, 2005). At the same time, changing culture requires leadership to challenge deeply rooted cultural norms, values, and assumptions (Morrison, Blood, & Thorsborne, 2005). In speaking to the implementation of a restorative culture, Reimer (2011) argued that school leaders need to learn from culture change stories of other schools in order to understand how leaders in other jurisdictions have established restorative cultures. However, there is minimal research from which to draw resources, narratives, and insight, specifically in a Canadian context (see Reimer, 2011; Vaandering, 2009). To strengthen literature on leading relationally based, restorative culture change, there needs to be documented research of leading restorative culture shifts in schools through restorative practices (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012).

In February 2008, the Government of Ontario determined to create safe learning environments by releasing a *Progressive Discipline* policy for Ontario schools. Progressive discipline endorsed a whole-school approach for establishing a positive climate and employing an assortment of strategies to promote positive behaviour and to address conflict amongst students (Roher, 2008). As a means of upholding progressive discipline, some school districts and individual schools in Ontario implemented restorative justice programs. Restorative justice was to serve as a philosophical foundation for a relational approach to creating safe learning environments. Yet, Barrett (2013) indicated that the practice of modern restorative practices has preceded the development of the theoretical foundations of restorative practices: these theoretical underpinnings of restorative philosophy need to continue to be strengthened (Llewellyn, Archibald, Clairmont, & Crocker, 2013).

Research Questions

Blood and Thorsborne (2005) stated that "one of the critical issues for successful implementation and sustainability of a restorative philosophy is the realisation that this means organisational and cultural change" (pp. 2-3). This research examined the following questions, based on Blood and Thorsborne's vision for leading culture change through restorative practices:

1. What is the role of leadership in the process of developing a restorative culture?
2. How was the process of implementing restorative culture change experienced by the school community?
3. What evidence is there that restorative practices are reflected in the school community?

Conceptual Framework

Vaandering (2014a) asserted that a restorative philosophy "relies on a *relationship-based, dialogic framework* [emphasis added] that contrasts with the more common hierarchical, power-based structure" (p. 64). Likewise, Blood and Thorsborne (2005) posited that leadership must establish healthy dialogue and relations across the school in order for culture change to take place.

This conceptual restorative framework was developed around *relational leadership theory* (RLT; Uhl-Bien, 2006) and dialogue, in order to establish a theoretical foundation for researching the leading of restorative culture.

Relational Leadership Theory

Uhl-Bien (2006) posited that relational leadership is a "social influence process through which emergent coordination (i.e., evolving social order) and change (i.e., new values, attitudes, approaches, behaviors, ideologies, etc.) are constructed and produced" (p. 668). Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011) uphold relational leadership as acknowledging the social networks within which leaders lead. In shifting from an individual viewpoint to a relational one, leaders must recognize the importance of context, for the social reality of each individual is influenced by the context within which they relate (Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Uhl-Bien (2006) proposed a framework for leading relationally: relational leadership theory. "Relational Leadership Theory focuses on the *relational processes* by which leadership is produced and enabled" (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 667). She pushed for the need to envision relational perspectives from both a traditional perspective of leadership, whereby the focus is on a leader's attributes, and from a social constructionist approach, whereby relational processes are constantly shaping the realities within which members of the school community operate. Uhl-Bien stressed that questions change when leading in a relational context: How can leaders view circumstances from a relational perspective? How can leadership be intentional about engaging the school community relationally? A constructionist approach causes school leadership at all levels to analyze school practices through a relational perspective and how relationships enhance school practices including learning, leading, and responses to conflict.

Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011) endorsed a relational leadership ontology as being fulfilled in social experience; leaders must examine intersubjective spaces where they relate within the school community. In leading out of social constructionist perspective, leaders recognize that leadership is perpetually a process of social construction: to know is to relate (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Reitz (2015) argued that leading relationally shifts the traditional understanding of what it means to be a leader "towards something which allows more space for dynamic two-way influence" (p. 8). She viewed this influence as grounded in relational dialogue, whereby meaning is socially constructed.

Dialogue

Buber (1923/1970) posited that how people view each other when entering dialogue is critical to the effectiveness of the dialogue. Freire (2000) named that dialogue must be viewed as more than an educational method: "Dialogue characterizes an epistemological relationship. Thus, in this sense, dialogue is a way of knowing and should never be viewed as a mere tactic to involve students in a particular task" (p. 17). Buber believed that to dialogue in relation, one must view the other participant as *you* or as *thou* rather than as *it*. Buber used the word pair *I–Thou* to emphasize an all-embracing reciprocal relationship. This relationship upholds values including love, honesty, trust, care, and respect (Johannesen, 2000). Buber (as cited in Czubaroff, 2000) named inclusion as the critical element of dialogue. Relational dialogue is viewed by Uhl-Bien (2006) as the means by which relational leadership brings members of an organization together to exchange ideas and thereby further involve individuals in decision-making processes. Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011), "suggest that relational leadership means recognizing the intersubjective nature of life, the

inherently polyphonic and heteroglossic nature of relationships, and the need to engage in relational dialogue" (p. 1437). They identified the complexity that exists when seeking to lead others through relationships.

Buber (1923/1970) viewed relationships as central to human existence. To recognize another individual when in dialogue is to recognize the dignity and worth of the individual (Buber, 1923/1970); therefore, the space where individuals dialogue is where relationships are fulfilled. Vaandering (2013) posited that a restorative philosophy can be effective in working toward relational culture change, but it requires impartial and equitable dialogue. Reitz (2015) suggested that beyond her own writing, she has not seen literature or research that "specifically aims to explore how I–Thou dialogue might contribute to relational leadership theory, or vice versa" (p. 37). This study revealed how Buber's concept of I-Thou, dialogue, and RLT are integrated both in theory and in praxis through restorative practices, thereby strengthening the theoretical foundations of restorative philosophy.

Restorative Literature

As a study of restorative practices and culture, and an examination of these practices, examining literature around restorative culture is critical to establishing a foundation for the research.

Restorative Culture

Culture is a social phenomenon created by the collective experiences of members of the school community (Schein, 2004). Since culture is created through social interactions, culture is not something that can be imposed on a school community (Morgan, 1986). Furthermore, culture—though generated by social interactions—is ultimately a function of one's perspective. Although one individual may see her culture as positive, another person may perceive it as negative. Though culture is continually created through the multitude of organizational social interactions, leaders within schools have a strong cultural influence as they impose their values and beliefs upon their followers (Schein, 2004). Goldring (as cited in Roby, 2011) reasoned that relationships have greater power than formal leadership roles and titles and that these relationships have a dramatic impact on culture.

A restorative culture is defined as one where practices across the school are always grounded in dialogic and values-driven relational practice. It is a culture that supports and upholds school imperatives whereby learning, best practices, leadership, behaviour management, school policy, and general dialogue are grounded in a values-driven, dialogically based, relational foundation, supporting both individual and interpersonal needs of the school community (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005; Llewellyn et al., 2013). Vaandering (2009, 2014b) advocates for restorative approaches throughout the school: in the school office; for classroom learning and discipline; for hallway interactions; and in classroom and school design to establish spaces conducive to dialogue. These restorative practices uphold both the needs of individuals and the needs of the school community (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005; Llewellyn et al., 2013). Blood and Thorsborne (2005) identified language as a key indicator of a changed restorative culture. Mirsky (2007) described how culture change is evident when students seek to be allies in supporting the safety of others in the school community. Van Ness (2014) emphasized that a restorative culture is evident in school policy. Morrison et al. (2005) underscored the importance of relationships in creating a restorative culture: "if we understand that individuals are also motivated by the need

for affirming social relationships (or to simply find meaning for themselves as group members), institutions should acknowledge and carry the responsibility of nurturing positive relationships" (p. 337).

Culture Change

Schein (2004) posited that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin and that the real job of a leader is to create and manage culture. To change culture in a school is to change the assumptions of the members of the school community. Leaders must continually engage in challenging, inspiring, sharing vision, enabling, and encouraging, for people always need to be influenced through relationships in order to continually shape behaviours and beliefs (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005). An organization that engages in dynamic change is always undertaking new change in order to avoid status quo: The organization is always learning. This is true when schools undertake restorative change; leadership must lead the school community in the change or the implemented change will die (Reimer, 2011). The language and actions of leadership convey messages to the school community, for every interaction speaks to what is important and to what is not important in the school (Morrison et al., 2005). Although leadership can change culture, change happens within existing structures.

The Practices of Restorative Practices

Costello, Wachtel, and Wachtel (2010) and Umbreit, Coates, and Vos (2007) proposed that dialogue is the primary tool for upholding restorative practices. Some of the common tools of restorative practices include: impromptu conferences, circles, and formal group conferencing.

Impromptu conferences. Restorative leaders seek to restore relationships in their responses to conflict. Costello, Wachtel, and Wachtel (2009) stated that when leaders respond to conflict, they need to involve members of the community. They push leadership to provide opportunities for those causing harm to be accountable for repairing the harm. Costello et al. (2009) name five affective questions used to create dialogue for leading people through responding to conflict, often referred to as the *restorative questions*:

1. What happened?
2. What were you thinking at the time?
3. What have you thought about since?
4. Who has been affected and in what way?
5. What do you think you need to do to make things right?

Circles. Costello et al. (2010) referred to circles as a "formal restorative process" (p. 13). They viewed circles as providing members of the school community opportunities to respond to questions, provide feedback, brainstorm, or participate in open dialogue. Costello et al. classified circles as both proactive and reactive, used for building community and for addressing conflict. Pranis (2005) emphasized that circles must uphold equality for all participants.

Formal conferencing. Formal conferences are the most structured restorative practice (Costello et al., 2010). Conferences are democratic, ensuring those most impacted are able to speak into the impact and the resolution. A facilitator ensures each person in the conference circle speaks into the incident. A script guides both questions, and who speaks when, with the goal of

addressing those impacted and how harms can be repaired (O'Connell, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 1999).

Methodology and Methods

The methodology for the research was developed around the research questions, focusing on the story of one school as leadership implemented and sustained a relational restorative culture.

Relational Research

When researching organizations from a relational perspective, Bradbury and Lichtenstein (2000) promoted a methodology that upholds a relationality orientation. Uhl-Bien (2006) suggested that studying leadership from a relational perspective requires the researcher to go beyond individual attributes, for if the researcher believes leadership is relational, it must be examined out of a relational context. Ospina (2012) supports the use of constructionist approaches whereby culture is emphasized, rather than focussing on the experiences of individuals. The social constructionist perspective views dialogue as "the vehicle in which self and world are in ongoing construction" (Bouwen & Hosking, 2000, p. 268), recognizing the importance of relational perspectives in research. From a social constructionist perspective, relational research in leadership seeks to understand the organizational context of a school at the macrolevel, which is developed through relational interactions at the microlevel (Fletcher, 2012). Uhl-Bien posited that research centred on RLT "would allow us to consider processes that are not just about the quality of the relationship or even the type of relationship, but rather about the social dynamics by which leadership relationships form and evolve in the workplace" (2006, p. 672).

Case Study

A case study was chosen as the methodology for answering the research questions. "Case studies are widely used in organizational studies and across the social sciences" (Klenke, 2008, p. 58). Case studies in the field of leadership focus on change, examining changes over time in relation to the organizational phenomenon being studied. The researcher is thereby able to establish a holistic view around characteristics and events related to leadership processes (Klenke, 2008).

Klenke (2008) spoke to researchers not being neutral bystanders. The researcher had worked with restorative practices for approximately seven years, trained by an international organization in the use of circles and in approaches for responding to conflict and misbehaviour. The goal in this research was to learn from leadership, staff members, and students in another organization, to discover how they established and experienced the restorative culture change process.

Merriam (2009) described a case study as a comprehensive description and examination of a bounded system. She added that the most defining attribute of a case study methodology is the delimitation of the case or the entity being studied. Merriam stressed that studying a bounded system through a case study is appropriate when one particular program or phenomenon is examined. In this study, the phenomenon being examined was that of the implementation and utilization of restorative practices in the school culture.

For the purpose of studying relational leadership, Eacott (2016) argued that "educational administration can only be understood in relation to contemporary social conditions" (p. 8). Examining relational space enables the researcher to look at a variety of perspectives; knowledge

is being created in the space between individuals, and therefore multiple meanings are created by those in the space (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000). Bradbury and Lichtenstein (2000) promoted qualitative methods for studying relational leadership that "uncover the invisible assumptions that generate social structures" (p. 557).

This research examined a public middle school in Ontario, Canada, studying the 4-year journey of the school in building a restorative culture. The research took place over a 12-week period, examining the participants' experience of the 4-year change endeavour. The site was pursued as a site for the research as the school had been endorsed by an international restorative group for their work with restorative practices, upholding their commitment to restorative approaches as a key element of the school's vision for supporting members of the school community and for learning. This provided a foundation for learning more about leading restorative culture change. The school is located in a suburban neighbourhood and has a diverse student population, both in terms of ethnicity and socioeconomic status. The student population includes Middle Eastern, North African, Chinese, Caribbean, and Caucasian students. The school caters to the learning needs of all students, including special education classes for students with learning disabilities and students who are gifted. The diversity of the school population is an effective setting for examining how investing in dialogue and building positive relationships are employed for establishing the restorative culture in the school.

Uhl-Bien (2006) named that different methodologies can be used for studying relational leadership, including qualitative approaches that support "interview-based methodologies" (p. 672). As a study of relationships and dialogue, the researcher ensured dialogic methodologies were used. The researcher collected data through thirteen semi-structured interviews with the principal, the vice-principal, support staff, and teachers. Interviews ranged from 60 to 90 minutes, taking place in secluded offices and workspaces in the school. A student focus group comprised of six students of varying grades and genders was interviewed twice, using the second session as a follow up to the first session. The focus group was conducted in a private conference room. Each session lasted 90 minutes. A four-session observation was conducted in a classroom dedicated to restorative practices, examining the relational and dialogic processes and pedagogy employed in the class. In addition, participant observations, documents, field notes, and journaling were used. Ethical approval for the research was given by both the researcher's affiliated university and by the school district. Pseudonyms were used when writing the results of this research.

Findings

The findings correspond with the research questions: examining the role of leadership in developing the restorative culture, the response of the school community to the restorative initiative, and evidence of restorative practices four years after implementation.

What is the Role of Leadership in the Process of Developing a Restorative Culture?

The change toward restorative practices started with a vision of the principal to create a restorative culture, seeking to lead the school community toward a culture of trust grounded in the restorative vision.

Creating a restorative culture. The principal, Ms. Amherst, initiated restorative culture change with a focus on upholding relationships, building community, and supporting

accountability. In order for the change to take hold, the principal was very intentional in establishing a culture that would take hold in the community. When hiring, she sought staff who could work with restorative practices, always communicating the culture that staff were being hired into. She provided restorative training, recognizing that a critical mass of trained staff was required for normalizing restorative culture within the school: "And now it is normalized: It is the way we do business" (Interview, April 26, 2016). She remained persistent throughout the implementation process, specifically in the early days when some staff opposed the change. She articulated the need to continually make expectations clear, and then those in conflict regulated themselves as the expectations became the culture. An assistant administrator, Mr. Devine, described his view of the persistence:

> She didn't give up. She just kept persisting and she kept providing using the school resources that were available to her to make sure we had training in this area … there were some rough spots I think along the way, but overall as we progressed and progressed, and we kept getting more and more training and more and more exposure in restorative practices, that caused a cultural shift in the way people saw things. (Interview, April 14, 2016)

The principal was driven by the belief that community building is critical with adolescents, maintaining that when adolescents have a voice and are heard, then relationships are strengthened. "Everything, from the way that I structure the timetable, to the training I give my staff, is involved in that building of the community" (Interview, April 26, 2016). She believed that community building at the classroom level was "the basis for everything in the school", for the focus on relational communities changed the culture. Teachers were encouraged by the principal to "own their kids", or to be accountable to them (Interview, April 26, 2016). She added, "We know with adolescents that a deep relationship with a caring adult is key in their development and their emotional well-being and mental health" (Interview, April 26, 2016). Likewise, students were encouraged to be accountable to each other, to create a safe place for learning and for being.

Staff perception of the vision. Staff at the school placed significant onus on school leadership for selling the restorative vision to staff, for modelling restorative practices, for leading teachers to use restorative approaches, and for ultimately executing the vision. Mr. Devine spoke to his internal battle against the principal articulating the restorative vision and his role as a staff member in implementing it. He recalled this conflict:

> For me, it wasn't the idea of restorative practice: it was who it was coming from. But again, as I developed a relationship with this person, I quickly began to realize that that was not the case. I was wrong … With a kid, I would always give a kid the benefit of the doubt … I guess the credit I have to give to the principal was that she worked at developing a relationship with me. (Interview, April 14, 2016)

Different staff members articulated different benefits that they saw arising out of the principal's restorative vision. Mr. Carter, a support staff member, appreciated the focus on collaboration when resolving conflict. Mr. Devine noted both students and staff appeared to be more open to communicating honestly. The vice-principal, Mr. Baccus, noted that although staff had different articulations of the vision, they were generally moving in the same direction.

A culture of trust. Ms. Amherst named, "That is the basis of all of the change at this school. Just trusting people" (Interview, April 26, 2016). She desired that staff would experience a culture of "yes," when they expressed that they wanted to try new things. A teacher, Mr. Jackson,

articulated how he experienced this through his principal, naming that when he presented his idea, her response would be "tell me about it", rather than "why?" (Interview, May 26, 2016). In his opinion, this mindset trickled down from administration, to staff, and ultimately to students.

Staff expressed the need for trust from their perspective. Ms. Knight named the importance of how leaders lead: "I think for specific leaders, teachers would do anything" (Interview, May 31, 2016). Ms. Lewis, a teacher, emphasized that staff have to trust their leaders to believe in their vision, otherwise they won't follow. She added that teachers need to not only hear about a vision, but to see it in action. Trust comes from seeing restorative practices put into practice and experiencing the effectiveness of the vision in action: with this trust comes change that moves the culture. Support staff member, Ms. Ennie also articulated, that "Everyone is on board here with the same policies. I love that about it. I think that is amazing" (Interview, May 4, 2016). Nonetheless, not all staff members viewed uniformity amongst the staff in relation to restorative practices. Ms. Lewis, stated that there was a vision, but that it is not followed through, at least not on a school wide-level.

How was Culture Change Experienced by the School Community?

Restorative culture change was predominantly experienced by staff at the school: administration, teachers, and support staff. The largest shift for the school community was in the methods of communicating, including the types of questions used to initiate dialogue, circles, and conversations for responding to conflict.

Changing the questions, changing the dialogue. Mr. Devine, an assistant administrator, stated the need for a school community to talk, to dialogue honestly. He named that a culture needed to be established where students and staff could speak openly about issues and concerns. Mr. Carter, a support staff member, discussed the importance of restoratively leading offenders to be responsible for co-creating their own consequence because this ensures short-term and long-term accountability. He viewed the use of punishment without accountability as a means of creating recidivism rather than positive change, for he viewed punishments that were simply given to students as actually allowing students to get away with their actions; punishment does not require responsibility or accountability.

Staff upheld the use of the restorative questions as critical for leading people into conversations. Mr. Carter stated:

> The [restorative] questions are generally applicable to everyone. Instead of, "What's the answer to number 8?" Shoot. If you don't know it, that's a terrible situation. If you do know it … it's still all on you. Whereas a circle is like, "how was your weekend?" "How are we feeling about this?" "What are some ways we can come to this answer?" It's open … I think it creates that sense of … that sense of community, and that we are all in it together. (Interview, March 30, 2016)

The principal, Ms. Amherst, saw a change in the staff response to student conflict. She recalled that when a student said the f-word prior to the restorative shift, the teacher would have asked for an immediate student suspension, whereas now the staff were more likely to seek out a conversation with the student about the incident. She observed responses to conflict shifting from being punitive toward being focused on learning.

Circles. Ms. Frieze, a teacher, believed that restorative training provided her with skills for using circles to empower the students in her classroom: "I totally understand the philosophy

behind being a coach and working with students and all of that, but I never understood the power …. Sitting in a circle with you sitting with them" (Interview, May 30, 2016). Mr. Baccus named that circles create a positive social dynamic as students are face-to-face and thereby providing a more equitable perspective. Staff articulated that circles were an effective tool for supporting classroom learning. Ms. Knight explained how her English Language Learners (ELL) sometimes faced conflict situations because they were unaware of cultural expectations, social etiquette, or school policies. She employed restorative circles to support student dialogue: "There are definitely times where we will sit and talk about 'what is something that happened?' and 'what they think about,' and 'what they think needs to be done differently,' and 'what would they do next time?'" These open questions led to powerful dialogue with the students. Teacher, Ms. Morgan, stressed the need for students to voluntarily participate in circles. From her point of view, when students are forced to speak, then students don't take ownership for their contributions.

Empathy for others. Mr. Gardiner, a teacher, appreciated how restorative approaches brought people together to address conflict. He saw tremendous value in using circles to allow everyone to see the perspective of others, which provided a foundation for participants being respectful of each other. He witnessed empathy when students viewed other students from a new perspective, moving beyond the peer they see on the playground. He noted that when students hear from their peers that "Johnny's mom is sick" (Interview, May 24, 2016), their perspective shifts and empathy is created.

Restorative practices with staff. When administration led staff using restorative practices it impacted staff dynamics, the strength of the staff community, and ultimately the learning culture. Mr. Baccus, the vice-principal, observed how providing a space to have honest dialogue allowed staff to express underlying negativity in the school. When concerns were expressed in a safe place, then stakeholders could work on how to meet the needs of those affected, and ultimately move forward: "They all had a chance to say what they felt, and it may be just for show, but since then we have not had those pet problems again."

Early on in the implementation process, administration implemented circles for staff meetings. Staff experienced circle meetings as positive, but the practice was not sustained over time. It did not take long for staff to realize several staff members were not comfortable in the circle as they conversed with colleagues, shared stories, and articulated feelings. Ms. Knight pondered whether this was a result of personality, or perhaps they did not like being the center of attention. "This is what always is fascinating to me: they are in front of kids all day long, but the minute they are in front of adults they are not comfortable" (Interview, May 31, 2016). Ms. Lewis recalled how staff expressed nervousness during the first staff circle. Yet, as an advocate of restorative practices, she thought it was incredible that staff shared with each other. She recalled how staff had to learn to support and encourage each other. "So, they sit there and then you just watch them, and they say something nice for other people and you just start melting. And they become like, 'It's actually OK'" (Interview, June 7, 2016). Ms. Frieze viewed this circle dialogue as carrying over to conversations in the staff room, creating relations that ultimately influenced the overall relational culture. Nonetheless, the use of circles decreased over time due to the time required and due to the other educational demands on the agenda.

Evidence that Restorative Practices are Reflected in the School

Evidence of restorative practices after the four years of implementation was revealed in student voice, both in what staff heard from students and through stories from students.

Student voice: what staff see in students. Ms. Lewis named her passion for using circles with students: "You deny them so much if you don't communicate" (Interview, June 7, 2016). She described how dialogue provided students the opportunity to get to know their peers. Furthermore, open dialogue empowered students to ask difficult questions. Mr. Carter believed that when students had a voice their credibility increased, for their classmates changed their stereotyped identity of the student speaking. He reflected, "Sometimes even for myself, when kids speak, [I think] 'I was not expecting that to come out of your mouth, because you've never shown me that: You've never shown that, but you've never had the opportunity.'"

Mr. Carter was adamant that staff members need to interfere by initiating conversations with students, even when students might resist. He added that educators need to teach students how to dialogue because society is moving away from direct interactions, and toward more indirect interactions via social media: students don't know how to speak face-to-face. He yearned for students to have opportunities to share their voices on issues important to them. Yet, there also needed to be a meta-dialogue with students, leading them on how to speak and respond when dialoguing with others. Ms. Lewis told a story of interfering, and how a restorative circle was used to meet the needs of a boy with autism. He frequently shouted out in class and would swear at her. When he did this, other students would ask, "Why do you let him swear at you?" She realized that her standards were inconsistent, for if another student swore at her, she would remove him immediately. She addressed this inconsistency:

> They did not understand how I could let somebody swear at me. Like they were just like, flabbergasted, right? And then I had to be like … "maybe they don't get it." So, I had to address it. We had a circle, and we talked about … honestly, since then the kids have been awesome with him, and he has been amazing. He has a few little outbursts, but he has been amazing … So, the kids started treating him differently because they realized he was different. (Interview, June 7, 2016)

Mr. Carter told a story about how a circle process changed student's perceptions of one another when they were not seeing eye-to-eye. Although he wanted to support the students in resolving the conflict, he desired this to be done in the context of students understanding they had a role to play too: students needed to know that their peer pressure could support the process, or it could be used to shame their peers:

> We did the fishbowl [a circle with people in an inner circle, and people in an outer circle] … put them back to back. These kids are in grade six … age 12…. to see their peers give feedback, to really step up and be mature. And to see these guys … they did not like each other at say, 10 o'clock. By 10:15 they are like, "You know what, … I shouldn't have done this," and they apologized and forgave each other …. The fact that these students who aren't restorative trained, they were able to adopt a restorative mindset: practice it, give feedback, watch it work … and at the end they clapped! I was like … "this is amazing." (Interview, March 30, 2016)

Interfering and leading the students through a dialogue allowed the students to move from conflict toward a more positive relation.

Mr. Gardiner wondered if the relational approach allowed students to work the system: "For some kids, they will say what they need to say." He believes students, "play us a little bit" (Interview, May 24, 2016). Mr. Baccus addressed these concerns, naming that this was a common refrain: "Some may look at it as, 'I can get away with things, they don't punish here.' That's not true, but I think some may look at it that way and try to push things" (Interview, April 6, 2016).

He did not believe students were getting away with things, but rather viewed that the relational approach had resulted in greater accountability and greater learning.

A student perspective. The single practice students most commonly associated with restorative practices was circles (Field Notes, April 27, 2016), recognizing that these students came to the school two years after the initial restorative implementation. Students named how circles benefitted their school culture. Nasir valued circles because as a student they allowed him to experience the feelings of other students.

> [A circle] changes how you interact with other students and teachers … I personally think circles are a very good tool for introspection … because I think that people really get to know themselves when they get to do circles, and they get to know others, especially regarding emotions, thoughts, and behaviours. (Focus Group, April 27, 2016)

Hanna expressed how, for students, the circle enables the class to open up to each other and share feelings and ideas. She added that often students don't know everyone in their class and yet the circle creates a safe place for one to share. She believed that when students were not in a circle formation, that they were more fearful of sharing. She added the circle created a close community whereby students transition from being insecure to secure.

Students shared that they valued dialogue. Safia named that circles focus discussion, and that a discussion focused around everyone's voices ultimately helped each of the students. Rania believed that the circle created an environment where it is okay to speak and to help others. Finally, Nasir named that there was value in conversing in a setting where, when you speak, your teacher and other students can talk back. This ultimately helped him to trust others. On the other hand, students felt helpless when a teacher would not speak back to students and failed to take student needs seriously. Hanna named that a student without a bond with a teacher may be taught, but when the student-teacher relationship is strong, it is much easier to learn. When staff led students using a two-way dialogue, it ultimately enhanced the learning experience.

Discussion

The research revealed that to lead towards restorative culture, relational space must be created. It is in this space that face-to-face dialogue can occur, establishing the foundation for members of the school community to build relationships, and thereby develop empathy for others in the community. Although staff named that the momentum for implementing restorative practices had waned, the research demonstrated that restorative approaches remained integral to daily learning practices.

Relational Leadership Theory in Action: Building a Restorative Culture

Drewery (2016), speaking out of a social constructionist perspective, upheld that our social reality must be viewed as codependent or interdependent constructions that exist in relation. Implementing a restorative culture is in itself a visionary change executed by leadership, fulfilled not because of a leader's formal role, but rather by leadership supporting members of the organization in engaging relationally. Uhl-Bien (2006), in speaking to RLT, named that relational processes become relational leadership when school leaders inspire a change in social context combined with renewed organizational values and goals that uphold a relational approach to

learning. Relationships were an integral construct for participants as they defined restorative practices. This supported the work of Morrison et al. (2005), who stated that restorative organizations must uphold the value of relationships through nurturing relations across the organization.

I will refer to the process of consistently shaping structures and decisions around relationship building as *micro-relating*: every meeting, pedagogy, decision, and interaction in the community must be considered in a relational context. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2013) argued that leadership is relational and therefore leaders must invest daily in relating with each member of the school community. School leadership must help members of the community consider regularly how daily practices support a restorative framework. Uhl-Bien (2006), in upholding RLT, named that leadership involves processes of social construction to bring forth meaning because meaning is revealed through relation. Researching a restorative context out of a RLT lens, drives research to assess leadership on relational processes rather than solely on the effectiveness of leadership (Hosking, 2000; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Likewise, to be consistent across the culture, micro-relating or intentional relational processes must be central to conflict resolution processes. The stories articulated by students and educators demonstrated how dialogue is essential for resolving conflicts and restoring relations. Vaandering (2016) posited that people are both broken and healed in relation and therefore leadership must bring stakeholders together when there is conflict, placing the process in the hands of the community rather than limiting discretionary decision-making to a single administrator. A learning environment that supports strong social cohesion creates a community that experiences fairness and trust (Cloete, 2014; van der Gaag & Snijders, 2004). Fairness and trust must be evident both in pro-active relationship building and in reactively responding to conflict.

Restorative Practices: A Dialogic Philosophy

The research revealed restorative practices as a philosophy of dialogue. Both staff and students experienced restorative practices being fulfilled through dialogue. Barrett (2013) named that because dialogue is critical for relationship building, dialogue is thereby critical for establishing a restorative culture. Hosking (2007) made an almost paradoxical statement in stating that a relational orientation requires one to focus on processes before persons. Yet, effective processes must be established by leadership because relational foundations and perspectives are strengthened through effective processes. Placing people in the same room is not enough for relationships to be created. A social constructionist perspective posits that both personal and collective understanding are established in interactions (Drewery, 2016), yet not all interactions are positive interactions. The physical structures, the established context, the questions used, and the atmosphere created all influence the effectiveness of the dialogue. Restorative practices established an intentionally safe space for speaking in a community that was diverse both in ethnic background and in socioeconomic status. Reitz (2015) believes that safe space ultimately stimulates dialogue rather than negating it. In a flourishing restorative culture, educators and students know that they are valued by each other, enabling a relational and dialogical context that establishes a foundation for effective learning.

Empathy: A (Critical) Bi-product of the Relational Process

Dialoguing provided staff and students with voice; the opportunity to tell their stories.

Participants stories revealed emotions, needs, feelings, and conflict. The response to these personal stories was empathy or, as cited by several participants, stepping into the shoes of another. One teacher, Ms. Frieze, experienced that empathy had traditionally been taught through talking to students about empathy, rather than allowing students to develop it through firsthand accounts:

> We used to take years at this school teaching character, trying to teach children to have empathy. And I don't think you can teach through skits to have empathy, but I think you can here through these experiences, because kids can always hear from different perspectives, and as they hear that they can start to feel it. (Interview, May 30, 2016)

Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) named that: "Interpersonal acceptance is about empathy: being able to cognitively adopt the psychological perspective of other people and experience feelings of warmth and compassion" (p. 252). Empathy is a core bi-product of dialogue, as empathy is constructed when people come to know each other. This empathy dictates how individuals enter future dialogues with individuals they have encountered.

Staff and students appreciated the place where they taught and learned each day, upholding the positive and safe culture of their school. Yet, in terms of being a fully restorative school, staff expressed concern. Ms. Knight explained that staff members were constantly turning over, but restorative training with new staff was not keeping up with this turnover. In trying to describe the current restorative culture, she stated, "I feel like it is getting *diluted*" (Interview, May 31, 2016). Staff members cited time and the energy required for relational investment as limiting factors for fully implementing restorative practices. And yet, although the use of restorative practices has waned and formal training had not been present for the previous two years, it was evident that culture had shifted over the four-year window. Leadership initiatives around restorative practices were evident through language used by both students and staff. Restorative questions, restorative circles, a focus on dialogue, restorative responses to conflict, and relational language were revealed through interviews and focus groups in the research process. McCluskey (2014) stated that when people desire a more restorative culture, it is evidence that strong restorative culture exists. Although many staff expressed that the restorative culture had become diluted and that the culture could be more restorative, it was evident the culture had shifted and students were positively impacted each day by the culture that had been created. Jabri (2015) likened culture change to a river. The river, through its own power, changes its course over time. We soon forget what the river used to look like for we become accustomed to the new path of the river. Likewise, many forget the major changes that have taken place over time to create the new course. This was evident in the case of restorative culture change in this school.

Implications and Conclusions

Hersted and Gergen (2013) proposed "that dialogue is not simply an after-the-fact process for sharing information; it is a process on which the very life of the organization depends" (p. 18). This research establishes a strong link between relational leadership theory (Uhl-Bien, 2006) and restorative practices, linking the theory of leading relationally with the relational philosophy of restorative approaches. The constructionist approach of RLT establishes the value of creating dialogic spaces in supporting the development of a relational culture. Dialogue serves as a mediating process among members of the school community, establishing a context for meaning-

making with others. Traditional classrooms are often still set up in rows where a "perfect" classroom allows students to only see the eyes of the teacher: They have little contact with each other. Educators need to reimagine physical structures and pedagogy to encourage more face-to-face dialogue. In the Canadian context of the current pandemic of 2020-21, educators must also evaluate how face-to-face interactions and dialogue can be integrated into online learning platforms, especially if online learning becomes a stronger reality for future education.

Empathy is where safe schools are created. If members of a school community desire to stop bullying, and if they want to establish a culture where respect, trust, and care saturate the school culture, then leaders must create space where empathy is established. Empathy is established in face-to-face interactions. When individuals respond out of empathy, they seek to uphold the best interests of others rather than negating the others' needs. Leaders must ensure students and staff are known, and dialogue is the medium in which knowing takes place. Through this knowing, relationships are established, empathy is created, and an effective community of learning is created and strengthened daily through restorative dialogic processes. Every interaction one has in a school in some capacity impacts future decisions by that student regarding interacting with others and how they trust, care, learn, and lead with others. Hosking (2000) deemed that a constructionist perspective is satisfied through ongoing achievements, fulfilled in events and acts of interaction. School leadership needs to reflect on how all aspects of school—specifically in-class learning—create a medium for encounters and dialogue, establishing the potential for creating greater empathy in the school community.

The study revealed that school leaders must have a model to assess a restorative vision. Leadership, teachers, and support staff cited that measuring the effectiveness of the culture change was difficult without baselines, constant assessment, and tools for assessing. Llewellyn (2012) posited that a relational culture might be assessed through alternative means including "collaborative processes, improvement in skills, understanding, social relations, and the creation of a stronger, positive sense of community" (p. 308). Likewise, measuring the use of dialogue and assessing the use of voice in classroom pedagogy could serve in assessing the effectiveness of restorative practices at the classroom level. Leadership needs to be able to assess the effectiveness of the restorative change endeavours, and to respond when necessary, both to significant change, and to lack of change. The reliance on anecdotal data prevented the school leadership from tracking change, negating the ability to fully comprehend the impact on the culture. Likewise, this lack of data prevented staff from recognizing the culture shift that had taken place and their involvement in this change.

This research demonstrates the need for further research on restorative practices from a relational perspective. The study contributes to the growing research in the field of relational leadership. Eacott (2016) stressed that "understanding is achieved through describing the unfolding actions of the social world in temporal and spatial conditions" (p. 8). He challenges traditional research approaches that favour the methodological individualism often seen in studies of relational leadership. Eacott pushed for a relational paradigm that will overcome "enduring issues in the scholarship of the field" (p. 11). The study contributes to constructionist views of leadership: how a restorative philosophy may in fact serve as a foundation for establishing how one enters research, and for employing dialogic processes for further studies in relational leadership.

Conclusion

When speaking about dialogue in staff meetings, classroom discussions, or conflict resolution processes, it can be easy for people involved to state "all we did was talk". Yet dialogue, when intentionally led, can be powerful for creating relational cultures, which leads to learning and knowledge creation. When school leaders invest in all school relationships through a restorative philosophy—adult-adult, adult-student, and student-student—through dialogue, they continue to reframe the culture and change it towards one where students and educators are flourishing. Culture must continually be shaped; the current culture is also an indication of the culture to come. One can never think they have "arrived" when it comes to culture, for when leadership fails to shape culture, other factors and forces will take over. Leading for restorative culture change requires continual investment in all relationships, first by school leadership, and ultimately by every member of the organization, such that through positive relations, a culture is created whereby each member takes ownership for constructing the culture.

Acknowledgements

This paper benefitted from dialogue with Julian Kitchen. I am thankful for the editorial investment of Anna Kirova, Leah Spencer, and the peer reviewers. I wish to acknowledge that this paper was written and edited while living and working on the land of the Between the Lakes Treaty (#3) of 1792.

References

Barrett, A. L. (2013). The structure of dialogue: Exploring Habermas' discourse theory to explain the "magic" and potential of restorative justice processes. *Dalhousie Law Journal, 36*(2), 336–358.

Blood, P. (2005, August). *The Australian context—Restorative practices as a platform for cultural change in schools.* Paper presented at the XIV World Congress of Criminology: "Preventing Crime & Promoting Justice: Voices for Change." Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from http://circlespeak.com.au/doc/BloodCriminologyConference05.pdf

Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2005, March). *The challenge of culture change: Embedding restorative practice in schools*. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices: Building a Global Alliance for Restorative Practices and Family Empowerment, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.thorsborne.com.au/conference_papers/ Challenge_of_Culture_Change.pdf

Bouwen, R., & Hosking, D. M. (2000). Reflections on relational readings of organizational learning. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 9*(2), 267–274. doi:10.1080/135943200397987

Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B. M. B. (2000). Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organization Science, 11*(5), 551–564. doi:10.1287/orsc.11.5.551.15203

Buber, M, (1970). *I and thou* (W.A. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Scribner. (originally published in 1923).

Cloete, A. (2014). Social cohesion and social capital: Possible implications for the common good. *Verbum et Ecclesia: Social Cohesion, 35*(3), 1–6. doi:10.4102/ve.v35i3.1331

Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians, and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.

Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2010). *Restorative circles in schools: Building community and enhancing learning*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.

Cunliffe, A. L., & Eriksen, M. (2011). Relational leadership. *Human Relations, 64*(11), 1425–1449. doi:10.1177/0018726711418388

Czubaroff, J. (2000). Dialogical rhetoric: An application of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 86*(2), 168–189. doi:10.1080/00335630009384288

Drewery, W. (2016). A social constructionist approach to restorative conferencing. In B. Hopkins (Ed.), *Restorative theory in practice: Insights into what works and why* (pp.152–165). Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley.

Eacott, S. (2016). Methodological notes on the study of educational leadership relationally. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 25*(2), 3–14.

Fletcher, J. K. (2012). The relational practice of leadership. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. M. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research* (pp. 83–106). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: With an introduction by Donaldo Macedo*. New York: Continuum.

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools: A guide to using restorative practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hersted, L. & Gergen, K. J. (2013). *Relational leading: Practices for dialogically based collaboration*. Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.

Hosking, D. M. (2000). Ecology in mind, mindful practices. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 9*(2), 147–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/135943200397914

Hosking, D. M. (2007). Not leaders, not followers: A post-modern discourse of leadership processes. *Follower-centred perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl*. (pp. 243–263). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Jabri, M. (2015). *Rethinking organizational change: The role of dialogue, dialectic & polyphony in the organization*. London, UK: Routledge.

Johannesen, R. L. (2000). Nel Noddings's uses of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue. *Southern Journal of Communication, 65*(2–3), 151–160. doi:10.1080/10417940009373164

Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative research in the study of leadership*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Llewellyn, J., (2012). Restorative Justice: Thinking relationally about justice. In J. Downie & J. J. Llewellyn (Eds.), *Being relational: Reflections of relational theory and health law* (pp. 89–108). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Llewellyn, J., Archibald, B. P., Clairmont, D., & Crocker, D. (2013). Imagining success for a restorative approach to justice: Implications for measurement and evaluation. *Dalhousie Law Journal, 36*(2), 281–316.

McCluskey, G. (2014). Challenges to education: Restorative practice as a radical demand on conservative structures of schooling. In E. Sellman, H. Cremin, & G. McCluskey (Eds.), *Restorative approaches to conflict in schools: Interdisciplinary perspectives on whole school approaches to managing relationships* (pp. 132–141). New York, NY: Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mirsky, L. (2007). SaferSanerSchools: Transforming school cultures with restorative practices. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 16*(2), 5–12. Retrieved from https://www.iirp.edu/news/safersanerschools-transforming-school-culture-with-restorative-practices

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morrison, B., Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2005). Practicing restorative justice in school communities: The challenge of culture change. *Public Organization Review, 5*, 335–357. doi:10.1007/s11115-005-5095-6

Morrison, B., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and discipline. *Journal of School Violence, 11*(2), 138–155. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.653322

O'Connell, T., Wachtel, T., & Wachtel, B. (1999). *Conferencing handbook: The new real justice training manual*. Pipersville, PA: Piper's Press.

Ospina, S. M. (2012). Foreword. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. M. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational readership research* (pp. 1–40). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes*. Intercourse, PA: Goodbooks.

Reimer, K. (2011). An exploration of the implementation of restorative justice in an Ontario public school. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 119*, 1–42. Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/pdf_files/reimer.pdf

Reimer, K. (2015). *Restorative justice as a window into relationships: Student experiences of social control and social engagement in Scotland and Canada* (Doctoral dissertation) University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON. http://dx.doi.org/10.20381/ruor-4131

Reitz, M. (2015). *Dialogue in organizations: Developing relational leadership*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Roby, D. E. (2011). Teacher leaders impacting school culture. *Education, 131*(4), 782–790. Retrieved from https://docplayer.net/5682257-Teacher-leaders-impacting-school-culture.html

Roher, E. M. (2008). Progressive discipline: Totally rethinking safe schools. *Principal Connections, 11*(3), 18–19.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 654–676. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2007). Restorative justice dialogue: A multi- dimensional, evidence-based practice theory. *Contemporary Justice Review, 10*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580601157521

Vaandering, D. (2009). *Towards effective implementation and sustainability of restorative justice in Ontario public schools: A critical case study*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Vaandering, D. (2010). The significance of critical theory for restorative justice in education. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 32*(2), 145–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714411003799165

Vaandering, D. (2013). Student, teacher, and administrator perspectives on harm: Implications for implementing safe and caring school initiatives. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 35*(4), 298–318. doi:10.1080/10714413.2013.825514

Vaandering, D. (2014a). Implementing restorative justice practice in schools: What pedagogy reveals. *Journal of Peace Education, 11*(1), 64–80. doi: 10.1080/17400201.2013.794335

Vaandering, D. (2014b). Relational restorative justice pedagogy in educator professional development. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*(4), 508–530. doi: 10.1111/curi.12057

Vaandering, D. (2016). Critical relational theory. In B. Hopkins (Ed.), *Restorative theory in practice: Insights into what works and why* (pp. 63–76). Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

van der Gaag, M. P., & Snijders, T. A. (2004). Proposals for the measurement of individual social capital. In H. Flap & B. Völker (Eds.), *Creation and returns of social capital* (pp. 199–218). New York, NY: Routledge.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1

Van Ness, D. W. (2014). Restorative justice as worldview. In E. Sellman, H. Cremin, & G. McCluskey (Eds.), *Restorative approaches to conflict in schools: Interdisciplinary perspectives on whole school approaches to managing relationships* (pp. 32–39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wachtel, T. (2012, October). Defining restorative. Paper published in the handbook of the 17th World Conference of the International Institute of Restorative Practices, *Restorative works: What works, what doesn't, how and why* (pp. 85–109). Bethlehem, PA: International Institute of Restorative Practices.

Note

This paper is a product of my doctoral dissertation at Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada.

Owen Webb completed his doctorate at Brock University in 2018. He seeks to advocate for students and educators through writing about restorative practices, school leadership, and the importance of the student-student relationship in building positive cultures. He currently serves as the Dean of Students at an independent school in Hamilton, ON, employing restorative practices to develop positive school culture, to support wellness in the school community, and to resolve conflict.