Restorative Practice & Emotional Literacy

The thin edge of the wedge?

Presenter

Richard Hendry

Additional Support Needs Officer (West) Highland Council

richard.hendry@highland.gov.uk

Aim of this workshop

To pose and reflect on some conceptual challenges and their practical implications.

Some key questions:

- 1. Are Emotional Literacy and Restorative Practice conceptually compatible?
- 2. What, if any, are the inherent tensions between these concepts?
- 3. What are the practical implications for implementation in schools re:
 - Motivation for change
 - Starting points and 'ways in'?

What do we already know?

Do we hold shared definitions?

Can we agree on these (for today)?

EL: Definitions (1)

I know what I feel. I can say what I feel. I am learning how to handle my feelings.

I know how they feel. I can say how they feel. I am learning to handle their feelings.

HT Sheila Lang & Forthview PS, Edinburgh 2005

EL: Definitions (2)

Emotional Literacy is the practice of:

- Using emotional information from ourselves and other people;
- Integrating this with our thinking;
- Using both of these to inform our decision-making and behaviour to help us get what we want from that situation and from life.

SEL 2000

Characteristics of Restorative Practice

- A way of working with people that creates opportunities to:
- ✓ Work with the whole person behaviours, thoughts and feelings;
- ✓ Reflect on our behaviours and their impact on others by developing empathy;
- ✓ Resolve conflicts by mutual agreement;
- ✓ Address harm and support people who feel harmed;
- ✓ Help manage feelings of shame and remorse;
- ✓ Put things right (through genuine apology / reparation);
- \checkmark Build and repair relationships.

A whole-school approach to developing EL and implementing RP

Building Relationships Solving Problems Resolving Conflict Addressing Harm

A Whole-school Approach to Relationships



*Restorative Interventions include Restorative Conversations, Meetings, Circles, Conferences (including Classroom and Family Group), Shuttle Dialogue, Empathy programmes.

What they might have in common

They are both 'eclectic conceptualisations': I.e. the borrow from and synthesise a range of theoretical psychological perspectives, research evidence and practice-based perspectives.

The both challenge aspects of belief and attitude that pervade, to varying degrees, educational and wider societal cultures.

What they might have in common (cont.)

They both rely on humanistic perspectives and necessitate a 'doing with' rather than 'doing to' or doing for' approach.

Both aim to develop key human capacities:

- Empathy
- Shame management
- Moral Compass

Are Emotional Literacy and Restorative Practice conceptually compatible?

E.g.

To **what degree** does each rely on the notion that a community (school?) can hold one shared understanding of what constitutes morally acceptable behaviour?

"I'm OK. You're OK."

"We are each of us doing the best we can at any given moment with the resources available to us." But...

Who determines their 'appropriate' moral compass?

What, if any, are the inherent tensions between these concepts?

E.g.

"Preparing children life" vs. developing genuine autonomy.

Is RP just a way of developing some aspects of EL?

Is 'reintegrative shaming' (Braithwaite) compatible with EL in schools?

Do EL and RP have the same, 'grander' intended outcomes?

What are the practical implications for implementation in schools?

- 1. Possible motivations for change
- 2. Starting Points / 'Ways in'

Possible motivations for change

What's in it for me?

What's in it for the child?

Others' expectations: SMT, LA, SG, GTCS

Possible 'ways in'

Because:

"You have to!"

"The children's learning will improve."

The school's ethos/sense of community will improve."

"The children will be better equipped to cope with life's challenges."

"Society will become safer and fairer."

"Your job will be less stressful / more rewarding."

What has been your experience? Where and what are the pitfall?

How do we think and respond?

Retributive DO TO Punish / Deter	C O N T	Restorative DO WITH Repair / Rebuild	
•	R	SUPPOR	t)
Neglectful NOT DO Inaction / Ignore	O L	Permissive DO FOR Act on behalf of	

Adapted from McCold, P. and Wachtel, T.'s 'Social Discipline Window', 2003

School / Classroom Culture

HIGH Control	 Power Struggles Confrontation Authoritarian Win-Lose Retribution Stigmatising TO 	 Consistent Responsive Flexible Accountable Responsible WITH Cooperation Negotiation 	
	•Uncaring •Tired •Lazy •Burnt Out •Given Up	T FOR •Chaotic •Inconsistent •Excusing •Giving In •Blurred Boundaries •Rescuing	(Thorsborne)
LOW —	Supp	ort	HIGH

Terminology

Restorative Practice The application of Restorative principles in schools **Restorative** Approaches The range of practical ways of working 'restoratively' **Proactive Approaches** Responsive Interventions (curriculum-based) Mediation, Restorative Emotional Literacy, conversations, meetings, Conflict Resolution skills, circles and conferences. Resilience

The Basis for Restorative Practice



Three aspects that influence learning and behaviour



Modelling

'If we aren't modelling what we want to teach then we are teaching something else."

Helen Flannigan

Curriculum: The impact of 'Emotional Literacy' Programmes

207 research programmes involving 288,000+ children.

Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programmes produce significant improvements in:

- Social and emotional skills
- Attitudes about themselves, others, and school
- Social and classroom behaviour
- Disruption and aggression
- Emotional distress, such as stress and depression
- Achievement test scores and grades (mean +11%)

The Effects of Social and Emotional Learning on the Behavior and Academic Performance of School Children, Durlak, J.A. et al. (2008).

The Range of Restorative Interventions

These derive from three distinctive, practice-led approaches:

- Mediation
- Restorative Justice
- Circle work

The Range of Interventions

Adult Mediation

- **Peer Mediation**
- Problem-solving Circles, 'Classroom Conferences'
- Restorative Conversations (enquiry/dialogue/chat)
- Restorative (face-to-face) Meetings
- **Restorative Circles**
- **Restorative Conferences**
- **Shuttle Dialogue**
- 'Victim Awareness' (Empathy development programmes)

What is your (school's) approach?

	Non-restorative	Restorative	
Building relationships	Assumed, omitted or ignored:	Explicit opportunities created to develop positive relationships,	
	Neglectful		
Solving problems	Adults provide the solutions:Those affected by the problem generate the		
	Permissive	solution.	
Resolving conflict	Authority-figure arbitrates: Authoritarian	Those involved in the conflict work to reach	
	Referring on: Permissive	agreement.	
Addressing harm	Focus on sanctions & deterrence: Retributive	Focus on apology and reparation.	
	Referring on: Permissive	All affected are involved.	
Outcomes	Obedient, disengaged	Respectful relationships.	
	or high conflict/harm.	Thoughtful learners.	
	Low resilience.	High resilience.	

Shame and shaming

Shame is a normal human response to experiences that leave us feeling socially rejected or isolated, including breaking our own moral code and being harmed.

Rows and sanctions are often shaming experiences. They do not help us to manage our shame.

In a retributive climate we can become very skilled at hiding or even denying our own shame.

Shame Reactions



Adapted from D.L. Nathanson, Shame and Pride (W. W. Norton & Co., 1992): 312ff.



What a Restorative Intervention Offers

- 1. A cognitive framework to support the taking of personal responsibility.
- 2. A non-threatening, respectful climate in which to experience shame and express remorse.
- 3. The assumption and belief that we can change our behaviours.

Diffusion model of innovation



Blood and Thorsborne (2005)