

Values and Restorative Justice in Schools

Valerie Braithwaite

Research School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University

Morris and Young conclude their essay in this collection recognizing that punishment processes and practices are a reflection of the sort of society we are and want to be. The connection between punishment institutions and a society's values extends from the macro level discussed by Morris and Young to the micro level where connections are mirrored in the belief systems of ordinary people. The belief systems of individuals allow experiences, observations and aspirations to be connected in personally meaningful ways. At the heart of these connections are basic beliefs and values about individuals, social relations, and institutions.

Morris and Young along with Daly provide some clues as to how restorative justice connects with the belief systems of individuals. Morris and Young refer to restorative justice in terms of a new set of values and priorities. Daly suggests that restorative justice is a package that brings retributive and rehabilitative notions of justice together with an extra quality that is relational and that extends beyond victim and offender to include community. These accounts have been defended in this volume through teasing out the features of restorative justice and traditional justice in action.

The present chapter shifts the frame of analysis in two respects. First, the focus changes from what happens, to what people think should happen when rules have been broken and others harmed. Perceptions and expectations that individuals have of justice practices is a topic that Daly touches upon in her argument for why retributive and restorative practices should not be conceptualized as oppositional forms of justice. Second, this chapter looks behind the practices that individuals favour in particular situations, and seeks to identify broad and widely held value systems that explain why certain justice practices resonate more strongly with some constituencies than with others. In the process, the age-old question of personal experiences versus social ideals as shapers of our policy preferences is addressed.

Context of the study

The social context in which justice practices are examined is school bullying, and the perceptions that are measured are those held by parents in relation to how a child who bullies another should be treated. This setting, while removed from the legal domain of courts and conferences, is interesting in a number of respects. First, bullying, its causes and its consequences, touches the lives of the majority of parents at one point or another to varying degrees. As such, views about how bullying should be handled are widespread and strongly held. School bullying therefore provides an interesting context in which to examine the tussle that one might expect at the individual level between responding in terms of principles and responding from personal experience.

The second attraction in searching for the value base to a restorative justice approach in the school context is that restorative justice was not recognized in this population as a “social movement” at the time the data were collected. The value base therefore is not one that has been imposed through organized public discussion about this type of justice. There is scope to understand the way in which individuals give meaning to restorative justice actions from the perspective of their own value systems.

Several practices recommended for dealing with bullying behaviour in schools capture one of the distinctive elements of restorative justice, its inclusiveness of community in the process of acknowledging and making amends for wrongdoing. This set of practices, that place importance on building and restoring positive relationships within the community are referred to in this chapter as dialogic. Dialogic relational practices are compared with traditional practices that have a punitive individualized orientation. The basis of comparison are the values that underly preferences for dialogic or punitive approaches to dealing with bullying. The purpose is to find out if the value base for dialogic practices is unique or if it represents a combination of more traditional values.

The values base

An argument to support the view that the values underlying restorative justice are not unique but rather combine a set of traditional values that are expressed more generally in socialization practices has been put forward by Ted Wachtel (1999). Wachtel draws upon the work of Glaser (1969) and Baumrind (1968) and proposes that effective social control can be understood in terms of two dimensions. One dimension, “control”, is defined in terms of discipline or limit setting. The second, “support”, is defined as encouragement or nurturing. Restorative justice practices employ high control (confronts and disapproves of wrongdoing) and high support (valuing the intrinsic worth of the wrongdoer).

Restorative justice, conceptualized in this way, has a counterpart in the effective parenting literature, Baumrind’s (1968) notion of authoritative parenting. Authoritative parenting involves a combination of affection and attentive responsiveness to individual needs along with clear requirements for responsible, pro-social behaviour. Baumrind’s prescription for good parenting has been widely recognized as requiring not only negotiation but also confrontation. Empirical work conducted since Baumrind’s initial formulation has resulted in parenting styles being conceptualized in terms of two basic approaches (Amato, 1987; Block, 1984; Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989). The authoritative style encompasses expressions of love, praise, independence, and responsibility, the setting of standards for behaviour and performance, and the enforcement of these standards. The authoritarian style is characterized by regulating through control, restrictiveness, and criticism, the use of punishment, and insistence on obedience to authority.

Should views that individuals hold about effective parenting be associated with the views they hold about systems of justice? Goodnow (1988) argues that the ideas that people have about parenting are driven by societal expectations and standards as well as individual experiences. Parenting norms are learnt, contested, and discussed at length in our society in public and private settings. Whether or not we are influenced by the

knowledge and opinions we hear depends on how we filter and process the information available to us. Framing schema play an important role in how we interpret the world around us (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). One schema for cueing us as to society's expectations is our socially transmitted, internalized value system (Rokeach, 1973). This value system comprises socially shared goals and modes of behaviour that have legitimacy across situations and across time (Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1994; Scott, 1965). Such value systems help us decide what is a desirable course of action to follow and what is not, for ourselves, groups or society. If we believe in freedom or in equal opportunity, certain practices become more acceptable than others, regardless of whether we are considering the justice system, the school system, or parenting.

A conceptualization of broad widely-held value systems that appears relevant to discussions of restorative versus traditional justice practices is the value balance model (Braithwaite, 1998a). The value balance model emerged from an empirical study of the values expressed by a random sample of the Australian population in 1974. The first study involved semi-structured interviews in which participants were invited to express their views on what values were important to them personally and to Australians generally. The 125 values generated by this study have been the basis for measuring values of Australian students and citizens over a 25 year period (Braithwaite, 1982; Braithwaite & Law, 1985; Braithwaite, 1994; Blamey & Braithwaite, 1997; Braithwaite & Blamey, 1998). The patterns of interrelationships among these values have been relatively stable over time and across populations, with a series of factor analytic studies producing remarkably consistent conclusions. Most of the variation among individuals in human valuing can be explained by the pursuit of two major value orientations or value systems, one representing harmony, the other security (Braithwaite, 1998b).

The security value system brings together guiding principles that ensure that one is well positioned to protect one's interests and further them within the existing social order. Security values guide us in deciding how we divide up limited resources, what kinds of competition between groups and individuals is legitimate, and how we define

winners and losers. The principles apply at a personal or societal level. At the societal level, values such as the rule of law, national economic development, and national greatness are socially sanctioned goals for ensuring the safety of one's group and individuals within it. At a personal level, security values include having authority, social recognition, economic prosperity, authority, and being competitive (see Appendix I for sample items).

In contrast, the harmony value system brings together societal and personal values that aim to further peaceful coexistence through a social order that shares resources, communicates mutual respect, and cooperates to allow individuals to develop their potential to the full. Harmony values orient us toward establishing connections to others, transcending our individual grievances and dissatisfactions, and finding peace within ourselves and with our world. Harmony values for society include a good life for others, rule by the people, international cooperation, a world at peace, human dignity, greater economic equality, and preserving the natural environment. Harmony values for the individual include self-insight, inner harmony, the pursuit of knowledge, self-respect, and wisdom, as well as being tolerant, generous, forgiving, helpful, and loving (see Appendix I for sample items).

The security and harmony systems are stable, enduring, and valued at some level by the vast majority of the population (Braithwaite & Blamey, 1998). In spite of very high levels of acceptance of these values in the community, individuals differ in how they prioritize them (Braithwaite, 1994, 1997, 1998a). Values are useful, therefore, for explaining how different individuals see their obligations to the collectivity (Blamey & Braithwaite, 1997; Dryzek & Braithwaite, 1999).

The value balance model identifies four different value constituencies within the population. The security oriented prioritize security over harmony values. For this group, winning resources in an orderly fashion takes precedence over harmonious relationships and spiritual well-being. The priorities are reversed for the harmony oriented: They prioritize harmony over security values. Value relativists differ from both groups: They downplay the importance of either security or harmony values as a

framework for decision making, preferring to be responsive to context. In contrast, dualists profess to wanting it all, committing to both security and harmony values as guiding principles in their lives. A series of studies have shown these groups to differ in their responses to policy issues (Braithwaite, 1994, 1998a). In the context of this chapter, it is of interest that the security oriented are most likely to be in favour of tougher law enforcement and harsher penalties. The harmony oriented oppose increasing police powers and stiffer sentencing (Braithwaite, 1998a).

Just as individuals differ in their value priorities, institutions differ in the values that frame their social interactions (Braithwaite, 1998c; Rokeach, 1979). Charitable institutions, for instance, speak to the harmony values of the community, the stock exchange speaks to security values. Within different institutional settings, different values frame the ways in which business is conducted, and such institutions, in turn, appeal to different sections of the population for support and affirmation. Elsewhere it has been suggested that institutional resilience and adaptability may be derived through harnessing practices that speak to both security and harmony values (Braithwaite, 1998c). Nowhere is this more apparent than in the school system, where competition and cooperation are institutionalized side by side.

Harmony values are hypothesized as the frame for developing strategies that encourage collective responsibility and shared decision making. School actions within a harmony framework are likely to include dialogue among all parts of the school, and the building of a strong community around the prevention of bullying practices. The actions are likely to have a strong relational focus. These actions are hypothesized as being most strongly supported by those who place high importance on harmony values as guiding principles in life.

While harmony values set standards that allow for the identification of wrongdoing, they do not, in themselves, give guidance for the allocation of blame or fault toward an individual. Decisions about who wins and who loses, who is to be punished and who is to be rewarded are made within a security value framework. Security values involve rules and the enforcement of rules that set limits on legitimate

competitive struggle. School actions within a security framework therefore take the form of having rules against bullying, formally confronting bullies with their wrongdoing, and sanctioning bullies in public ways through suspensions and expulsions. These actions are hypothesized as being most strongly endorsed by those who place high importance on security values as guiding principles in life.

The relevance of parenting styles

If harmony values predict parental support for dialogic relational strategies to prevent school bullying, and security values predict support for punitive individualized strategies, do parental styles of child rearing have a role to play in this study? Parental styles of being authoritative and authoritarian may overlap too much with harmony and security values, if they are regarded as merely a contextualized representation of the more abstract principles. Not everyone, however, relies on broad abstract principles to guide their policy preferences in a specific context, particularly if they have not been engaged in public debate that might draw such linkages to their attention. Furthermore, the information that shapes the child rearing practices adopted by parents comes from many sources, including experience, family traditions, norms, fashions and the ideas of significant others (Goodnow, 1988). A strong case can be made, therefore, for expecting child rearing practices to have an influence on school disciplinary practices that is independent of their value base.

At this point, the question that needs to be asked is why child-rearing styles should influence parents' views in a different domain, that is, school disciplinary policy? In general, individuals strive for consistency among different parts of their belief system (Abelson, 1983). If these parts are closely related, the pressure for consistency is greater. When children go to primary school, parents are trusting others with their care. It is reasonable to expect parents to approve of care practices in the school that reflect their values and their child rearing practices at home. Indeed, the degree to which parents favour parental styles of being authoritative or authoritarian in dealing with their

children may be a stronger predictor of favoured strategies for dealing with bullying than abstract and generalized values. Therefore, the model tested in this chapter includes both the abstract harmony and security value orientations and the child rearing styles of being authoritative and authoritarian. Child rearing styles are conceptualized as action-based composites of values, experience, knowledge, habits, and mores.

Contextual personal experiences

Values and general styles do not always guide our decision making (Ajzen, 1991). In a specific context, feelings, beliefs and attitudes can come into play to exert influences on how we respond to certain issues. When wrongdoing harms others, being the victim or the offender, or a member of either's intimate network, is bound to shape one's views about how matters should be dealt with. Personal experience is likely to impact on notions of fairness and legitimacy, which in turn will shape sympathy or antipathy for certain regulatory strategies. In this study, intermediate variables of fairness and legitimacy were not measured, but experience as a parent of a victim or bully was measured.

From a self-interest perspective (Downs, 1957), parents of children who have been accused of being a bully or who have experienced victimization, are likely to respond in a way that advantages them. Parents of victims are most likely to want the threat to their child removed immediately, that is, to favour suspension or expulsion, and in more extreme cases, desire compensation or revenge. Parents of bullies are most likely to want to protect their child and themselves from further stigmatization and punishment, and to shift the blame elsewhere. The parents of victims and bullies are, therefore, most likely to favour punitive individualized strategies and dialogic relational strategies respectively.

For parents whose children are not in the bullying and victimization category, but who are struggling to cope with the demands of parenting, self-interest may loom large in their expectations of the school and its disciplining policies. Parents who are

struggling may see the school system as a place for support and assistance in disciplining children. Whether they would favour a punitive or dialogic approach to bullying is difficult to say. But to the extent that the dialogic relational strategies include and assist parents with parenting, one might expect parents who are experiencing considerable parenting burden to favour the dialogic approach.

First hand experience with bullying or parenting difficulties is not the only factor that results in our supporting a policy initiative that may be inconsistent with our values. Psychological theory alerts us to the importance of having achievable goals as well as the capacity to achieve them (Feather, 1982). If the goal is to stop a child from being a bully, one has to believe that children who bully can change. If one believes a child can change, some strategies for preventing bullying make more sense than others. Alternatively, if one believes a child cannot change, options are more limited.

Values represent hopes and aspirations. The capacity to achieve them at a societal level often rests on others. If we do not have confidence that our hopes and aspirations can be realized through the commitments and actions of others, values may not predict our policy preferences very well. A concept which captures our belief that others can deliver the goals we want is trust. In policy matters, trust in those with decision making power to realize our aspirations is critically important. If parents do not feel that they can trust teachers, students, other parents, school boards, and education departments to implement strategies to control bullying, disillusionment with the strategies may be expressed, even if such strategies are consonant with their personal values.

Thus, the model used to explain support for restorative justice and subsequently, retributive justice, can be summarized as follows. Public support for dialogic collective strategies (restorative justice) and punitive individualized strategies (retributive justice) are hypothesized as a function of (a) abstract values (security and harmony), (b) parenting styles (authoritative and authoritarian), (c) belief that a child who bullies can change, (d) experience as a parent of a bully, (e) experience as a parent of a victim of bullying, (f) parenting burden, and (g) trust in members of the school community. The

major focus of this study are the values that underlie a restorative or retributive approach: Are these values different or are they the same, and do values retain their importance when personal experiences of bullying, schools, and parenting are taken into account?

The data base

The “Life at School Survey” (Ahmed, 1999) involved the participation of 1402 students, and 978 of their parents or guardians. Of the 96 schools contacted in the Australian Capital Territory, 32 public and private schools agreed to take part. The sample comprised those families who had volunteered after receiving a letter outlining the purpose of the study and a permission slip for participation. The overall rate of participation was 47%. The sample was restricted to grades 4 to 6 in the primary schools, except in a few schools which were unusual in having a grade 7 class for inclusion. The ages of the children ranged from 9 to 13 years (mean = 10.86 years). The sample comprised 54% girls, 46% boys.

The questionnaires were self-completion designed for a child and the parent or guardian with whom the child was most involved on a daily basis. Children filled out their “Life at School Survey” in class. Questionnaires were sent home with the children for parents to complete and return to the school.

Parent or guardian data were available for 70% of the children who participated and took home a questionnaire. Of this sample of 978 respondents, 845 (86%) were mothers, 132 (14%) fathers and 1 was a guardian. Self-identified non-Australians comprised 25% of the sample.

Measures

Values and parenting styles

The Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventories comprise 14 subscales, 4 of which measure a security value orientation and 3 a harmony value orientation (Braithwaite & Law, 1985, Braithwaite & Scott, 1991, Braithwaite, 1997, 1998b). The security value orientation scale comprises the subscales “national strength and order”, “social standing”, “getting ahead” and “propriety in dress and manners”. The harmony value orientation scale comprises “international harmony and equality”, “a positive orientation to others” and “inner harmony and equality”. Sample value items for both orientations are given in Appendix I. Respondents are asked to rate each value item in terms of its importance as a guiding principle in life from 1 meaning “I reject this” to 7 meaning “I accept this as of the greatest importance”.

Parenting styles were measured through a modified version of the Child-Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965). The CRPR is a self-report inventory that requires parents to sort a set of statements about child-rearing values, attitudes and behaviours into categories that provide a personal profile of how each respondent thinks and behaves in relation to their child. A subset of the items was selected and the methodology was altered from a sorting task to one in which respondents rated each item on a 6-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree¹. The modified format and item set were piloted in the same population from which the sample was drawn and scales to measure authoritarian and authoritative parenting were developed (Huntley, 1995).

In the present larger scale study, further modifications to the scales were made on the basis of a psychometric analysis of the items. The scales used to measure parenting styles in this paper are more limited than implied by the labels of authoritarian and authoritative parenting. Consequently, the parenting scales used in the present

¹ In this way, the measurement of parenting styles departed from the Q-methodology employed by Block (1965) and followed the R-methodology tradition.

analyses are called the “command and control” style and the “supportive and self-regulatory” style.

Command and control represents a parenting style that is protective and restrictive, induces guilt to regulate behaviour, and insists on achievement, self-discipline and obedience in the child. The command and control scale does not include items referring to physical punishment and the expression of negative emotions toward the child, as might have been expected in an authoritarian parenting scale.

The supportive self-regulatory scale represents the expression of positive affect and openness in the parent-child relationship, fostering autonomy and exploration, and guiding children’s behaviour through positive feedback and affirmation. The supportive self-regulatory scale does not include insistence on the child undertaking duties and family responsibilities, one facet of Baumrind’s (1968) initial formulation of authoritative parenting. The items used in the parenting scales are included in Appendix II.

Contextual personal experience

The experience of having a child who has been accused of bullying was assessed through a single question, “How often has your child been accused of being a bully?” The response categories were “more than once” (scored 3 for this analysis), “it has happened” (2), and “never” or “don’t know” (1).

Parents were also asked if they were aware of their child having a problem with bullying: “How often has your child been bullied by another student or a group of students in the last year (1995-96)?” Response categories ranged from “most days” (scored 6 for this analysis) to “never” (1).

Both of the above personal experience measures reflect the parent’s world view. In other words, children could be bullies or victims, unbeknown to their parents. The measures chosen are consistent with the argument of this paper, that support for justice practices can be understood in terms of the values and interpretations of reality made by

individuals, in this case parents, regardless of whether or not these understandings are externally validated.

In order to measure the degree to which parents believed change was possible among individual bullies, parents were asked “What do you think are the chances of changing children who bully others into good citizens in the school?” The response categories ranged from 1 to 5 and were labelled 10%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 90% chance.

Trust was measured through asking respondents: “How much can you trust the following groups to control the problem of school bullying?” Groups such as students, parents of bullies, parents of victims, school teachers, and school disciplinary boards were rated on a four point scale from “not at all” (1) to “a great deal” (4). A principal components analysis followed by a varimax rotation resulted in 9 items being collapsed into three trust scales. Trust in authorities involved summing responses to the amount of trust placed in the following groups: (a) Parents and Citizens Associations, (b) School Disciplinary Boards, and (c) the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Department of Education and Training. Trust in professionals involved summing responses to the amount of trust placed in (a) school teachers and (b) school principals. Trust in the community involved summing responses to the amount of trust placed in the following groups: (a) students, (b) parents of bullies, and (c) parents of victims.

Parenting burden was measured with a multi-item scale adapted from the Threat to Basic Needs Scale and the Time Constraints Scale in caregiving (Braithwaite, 1990). Respondents were asked how often their parenting responsibilities produced the following experiences: (a) having too little time to myself, (b) giving up interests, leisure activities or hobbies that I enjoy, (c) being unable to get my household chores done, (d) losing patience with the family, (e) being unable to rest when ill myself, (f) feeling that I cannot get on top of all the things I have to do, (g) being unable to get enough sleep, (h) feeling that I have lost control over my life, (i) feeling guilty about what I have or have not done for my child(ren), and (j) feeling that I am not doing anything as well as I should. Responses to these 10 items were given on a 5 point scale

from 1 meaning “never” to 5 meaning “a lot of the time”. Responses were added to produce a total parenting burden scale score for each respondent.

Outcome measures

The outcome measures used in this study were dialogic relational strategies and punitive individualized strategies. Parents were asked “How important would you consider each of the following school actions to be in dealing with bullying?”. Response categories ranged from 1 meaning “undesirable, would make things worse” to 5 meaning “essential, the highest priority”.

The dialogic relational strategies were: (a) Role-playing and story telling which explains why bullying is bad; (b) Meetings that make bullies commit to changing their behaviour and playing a constructive role in the school rather than a destructive one; (c) Organizing discussion groups for parents of students who bully or are bullied; (d) Consulting with parents and children to develop guidelines for how bullying should be handled; (e) Training courses for parents to improve parenting skills; (f) A school contract signed by each student and their parents not to be involved in bullying in any form; and (g) Encouragement of ‘neutral’ students to help break up fights in the playground.

The punitive individualized strategies were (a) Class rules against bullying, e.g., taking away privileges from children who bully others; (b) Formal confrontation of students who bully others by the principal in her/his office; (c) Expulsion of children who have repeatedly been reported as bullies of other children; and (d) Suspension for a week or two of children who have bullied other children.

Responses to each set of items were summed to create the outcome measures. The basis for the construction of these scales was a principal components analysis and varimax rotation of 16 possible intervention strategies. This analysis produced a three factor solution. The third factor has not been included in this analysis because it related to avoidance, rather than dealing with a bullying problem once it had occurred.

Results

The central hypotheses of this study are that:

A: Dialogic relational strategies for dealing with bullying (a) belong to the domain of the harmony value orientation, (b) are linked with supportive self-regulatory parenting and (c) are shaped by personal experiences with bullying, parenting and schools.

B: Punitive individualized strategies for dealing with bullying (a) belong to the domain of the security value orientation, (b) are linked with command and control parenting and (c) are shaped by personal experiences with bullying, parenting and schools.

These hypotheses were tested using a hierarchical regression analysis in which values and parenting styles were entered first as a block, followed by personal experiences. This approach gives us insight into how the more stable and enduring values fare as predictors of policy preferences, and how their influence is modified when personal experiences are added to the equation. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 1.

The strongest predictor of support for dialogic relational strategies is commitment to the harmony value system. This is the value system that guides us in the cooperative side of social life, setting markers for sharing resources, resolving differences, and preserving our interdependency. Interestingly, this variable remains the dominant predictor even when personal experiences are added to the equation. In Table 1, the change in the beta weights for harmony values from Model 1 to 2 in the prediction of dialogic relational strategies is minor.

By the same token, personal experiences also predict our preferences for models of social control as self-interest theorists claim and as Goodnow (1988) argues in her paper on how parenting practices come into being. The change in R^2 of 7 % shows that personal experience is an additional influence in shaping preferences on how schools should handle problems of bullying. Parents who have a child who has been victimized

and parents who report high parenting burden favour the use of a dialogic relational approach, possibly in the hope that others can assist in bringing about changes that they alone are unable to effect.

Trust in others and expectations of behaviour change in bullies were also elements in supporting a dialogic relational approach. Although not significant in the final regression equation, parents who believed children who bully others could change were more likely to favour dialogue. Trust in all groups was positively related to favouring a dialogic approach at the bivariate level, although the variables behaved a little differently in the regression model. Trust in both authorities and in the community increased support for a dialogic approach, trust in teachers reduced it. Possibly this reflects an individualized view of behaviour management: In the absence of other kinds of trust, trust in teachers to solve bullying may accompany the expectation that teachers are responsible for and capable of controlling the behaviour of difficult children. In such circumstances, a dialogic approach oriented to all children is unnecessary.

Interestingly, both supportive self-regulatory and command and control parenting styles were positively associated with a dialogic approach. This outcome was unexpected. The hypothesis was that supportive self-regulatory parenting would be correlated with the harmony value system, and both would constitute foundational beliefs for a dialogic approach to dealing with bullying in the school. Command and control parenting was expected to be associated with the security value system and both were expected to underlie a punitive approach.

Original expectations were confirmed in so far as supportive and self-regulatory parenting was positively correlated with commitment to a harmony value system ($r = .40, p < .01$), but not the security value system ($r = .00, ns$). Command and control parenting was positively correlated with commitment to a security value system ($r = .41, p < .01$), but not the harmony value system ($r = .02, ns$). What then is the explanation for why parents who subscribe to command and control parenting also support dialogue?

Possibly, the common element is desire for intervention in the school setting. Parents who use supportive self-regulation and parents who use command and control regulation both want to see the school take action to contain bullying. In contrast, parents who subscribe to neither command and control nor supportive self-regulatory styles prefer a permissive approach to bullying in schools, and favour non-intervention. In school policy terms, a permissive response is likely to be expressed as “kids will be kids” and “let them sort it out”. Those who adopt this view are likely to be low scorers on both command and control parenting and supportive and self-regulatory parenting, and are the most likely to say that proposed school interventions that involve meetings, rules and lessons in responsibility and accountability will make things worse.

Support for punitive individualized strategies followed the same general pattern to that described above. Values were the most important predictor of policy preference, in this case, commitment to the security value system. Those who place great store in principles for regulating competition and establishing order were the most supportive of a retributive approach to dealing with bullying, an approach that targets the perpetrator, isolates him/her from the community, and punishes him/her for wrongdoing. Personal experience extended understanding of the sources of support for the retributive system. Parents of children accused of bullying were less enthusiastic about a punitive individualized approach, whereas parents of victims expressed positive reactions, as did those who had little confidence that bullies could change their ways.

Trust did not predict support for punitive individualized strategies in the regression model, although at the bivariate level, trust in authorities and trust in professionals were positively associated with support for a retributive approach to dealing with bullying. It is of note that trust in the community was not relevant to the question of support for a punitive individualized approach.

Just as command and control and supportive and self-regulatory parenting both predicted a dialogic approach in the previous set of analyses, both parenting styles predicted support for a punitive individualized approach to bullying. Parents who believe in actively guiding the development of children, regardless of their preferred

orientation, concur in giving support to punitive individualized strategies in the school's disciplinary portfolio.

Where to from here?

These findings explain the diversity of views among parents in how to deal with bullying. Security values direct some parents in one direction, harmony values in the other. Personal experiences in dealing with bullies, victims and the school also have an effect. Most interestingly, and most unexpectedly, parents who actively socialize children, regardless of whether their strategy is command and control or supportive and self-regulatory favour strategies for dealing with bullying that span the restorative and retributive divide.

The notion of a portfolio of strategies raises the interesting question of how this range of options should be organized so as to be mutually reinforcing. It is not unusual for educationalists to advocate a system that prioritizes strategies that fall under the restorative/rehabilitative umbrella and to discourage escalation up the punishment ladder until cooperative efforts to regulate behaviour have been fully explored (Johnson & Johnson, 1995). This approach is formalized in the arena of business regulation through the concept of an enforcement pyramid. Cooperative problem solving and strategies of education and persuasion should be tried first against a backdrop of penalties that can be used sequentially and that escalate in severity until there is no option other than incapacitation (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992).

Both these literatures suggest a model for institutionalizing strategies for dealing with bullying behaviour, a model that gives precedence to a dialogic relational approach (restorative justice) with a punitive individualized approach (retributive justice) being used as the last resort. This model is consistent with the way in which Braithwaite (1999) envisages restorative justice processes operating within a traditional legal framework.

With this in mind, additional data were collected in the “Life at School Survey” to explore parents’ reactions to an enforcement pyramid that combines key elements of the restorative and retributive approaches. Parents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following three models for bringing bullying under control:

- (a) Through discussions involving teachers, students and parents to sort out problems between children who bully and the children who are bullied
- (b) Through enforcing strict rules that forbid bullying and through disciplining guilty parties
- (c) Through discussions first and then through stricter enforcement of rules if the problem is not resolved.

Parents responded to each on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The breakdown across categories is given in Table 2. More than three quarters of the parents agreed or strongly agreed with each option, but the most strongly endorsed was option 3. Strong agreement was expressed by 53% of the sample, and agreement by a further 40% for trying a restorative approach prior to a punitive approach.

Conclusion

This study examined the value base underlying restorative and retributive approaches to dealing with bullying in schools. Values were examined at the abstract level as principles that guide behaviour across contexts and situations. These same values were hypothesized as underlying child-rearing styles, and these styles were expected to shape parents’ preferences for how disciplinary problems should be handled in the school setting.

The hypotheses were largely confirmed, but with some surprises. Values were conceptualized in terms of a security value system and a harmony value system. Both value systems are familiar and deeply embedded in society’s institutions. As suggested by previous work, favouring punitive individualized strategies for dealing with bullying was an expression of the security value system. The dialogic relational strategies, in

contrast, were an expression of the harmony value system. This finding suggests that restorative justice is not so much founded on new values, as being a new form of expression for some rather old and familiar values in the community.

The harmony value system was linked with supportive self-regulatory parenting, while the security value system was linked with command and control parenting as expected. Particular parenting styles, however, did not predict the kind of disciplinary strategy preferred at school. Parents who practised command and control regulation and parents who practised supportive self-regulation concurred in recommending that schools have both punitive individualized strategies and dialogic relational strategies at their disposal. This result, together with the other findings of the study, point to directions for school policy on bullying that should meet with tolerance, if not approval, from the vast majority of the school community.

The model that meets with most approval from parents is that which uses a restorative justice approach, while giving schools the capacity to move to retributive measures in the event that restorative strategies fail. It appears that parents are willing to prioritize harmony values, as long as measures are in place to give expression to security values should that be necessary. This is not to deny that there are parents who would prefer to go straight to punitive individualized measures and opt for a security approach before anything else. Similarly, there are harmony oriented parents who resist contemplating failure of a dialogic relational approach, and who are horrified at the prospect of escalation to punitive individualized strategies. But both these ideological groups (the security oriented and the harmony oriented) need to accommodate the world views of the other, and these data suggest that such accommodation is not only desirable, but achievable.

The security oriented and the harmony oriented are likely to represent politically active and vocal groups in society. They may engage in adversarial wrangles over policy, but these data suggest that such conflicts should have a constructive rather than destructive end point. First, it is significant that while the security oriented favour a retributive approach and the harmony oriented a restorative approach, they are not

strong opponents of each other's preferred strategies. Their understanding of the world and their views on how to make it a better place are not in opposition to each other, just different. Second, most individuals in society are neither security oriented nor harmony oriented, but are dualists (Braithwaite, 1994,1998a). As such, they want their institutions to deliver harmony, while providing security against those who threaten harm or disruption. Ultimately, the anti-bullying policies adopted by schools will need to meet these expectations. Often we think of a school favouring a particular philosophy in designing its anti-bullying policy, and we think of schools with different philosophies and policies catering for different constituencies. Rigby's (1996) distinction between moralistic, legalistic and humanistic approaches can be readily used to classify schools in terms of how they address bullying.

What is being advocated in this paper, however, is a break from "pure" types that rest on a particular educational or regulatory philosophy. Different strategies make sense to different people, and the diversity among individuals, both students and parents, demands a mix-and-match approach whereby each school has a basket of tools that span the dialogic relational and punitive individualized divide.

How the strategies in the basket are put together to be mutually reinforcing needs to be considered within particular contexts, and requires considerably more research. Other contributions in this volume outline some of the principles that need to be considered in designing mixed regulatory approaches. What the current findings can contribute to this debate is an assurance that involving ordinary citizens in the process need not necessarily polarize the debate between retributivists and restorative justice advocates. The findings of this chapter show that in school communities, most parents endorse a dual system. Second, while security and harmony value systems may point parents in different directions, neither group systematically opposes the others' preferred approach. Third, while values may result in different perspectives, these differences are reduced by the experience of parenting. Those who engage with parenting styles in a bid to regulate their child at home are sympathetic to the need for a range of skills at school that answer security and harmony needs. It seems that being a parent can de-politicize

problem solving considerably and help us understand the need for compromise and balance in the rules and policies that operate in schools.

Being a parent does not just cover general parenting styles, but specific experiences of feeling over-burdened, dealing with a child accused of bullying, or protecting a child who has been victimized. These experiences shape preferences, but again, in most cases, they do not systematically give rise to opposition to retributive or restorative processes. Victims prefer punitive individualized strategies, but do not oppose dialogic relational ones. Indeed, they support dialogue, along with parents who are stressed by parenting. The only instance where we see systematic opposition to a disciplinary approach is in the case of parents of children accused of bullying. These parents are more likely to regard punitive individualized strategies as counterproductive, and are therefore likely to take an adversarial position in relation to parents of children who are victims. This conflict is less likely to occur, however, when dialogic relational processes are used.

This last finding lends some support to the argument that restorative processes should precede punitive ones. Parents of those accused of bullying and parents of victims are more likely to be antagonistic to each other in retributive contexts by virtue of the process being adopted. The institutional setting is likely to fuel pre-determined beliefs about unfairness amongst the relatives of those accused, and such beliefs will more than likely act as a shield against acceptance of wrongdoing and its consequences. Once non-permeable psychological boundaries of this kind are set in place between the offender's family and the victim's family, the chances of reducing interpersonal threat and accepting responsibility for harm are likely to be small. To the extent that retributive justice contexts yield evidence to support this scenario, there may be wisdom in following these data to the point of least trying a more mutually acceptable process for dealing with wrongdoing before anything else.

References

- Abelson, R.P. (1983). "Whatever Became of Consistency Theory?", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 37-54.
- Ahmed, E (1999) *Shame Management and Bullying*. PhD Thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). "The Theory of Planned Behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Amato, P (1987) *Children in Australian Families: The Growth and Competence*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Ayres, I and Braithwaite, J (1992) *Responsive Regulation: Transcending the De-regulation Debate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baumrind, D (1968) "Authoritarian Vs. Authoritative Parental Control", *Adolescence*, 3, 255-272.
- Blamey, R and Braithwaite, V (1997). "The validity of the security-harmony social values model in the general population," *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 71-7.
- Block, J H (1984) *Sex Role Identity and Ego Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Braithwaite, J (1999) "Restorative Justice: Assessing Optimistic and Pessimistic Accounts", *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 25.
- Braithwaite, V A (1982). "The Structure of Social Values: Validation of Rokeach's Two Value Model," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 203-11.
- Braithwaite, V (1990) *Bound to Care*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Braithwaite, V A (1994) "Beyond Rokeach's Equality – Freedom Model: Two-dimensional Values in a One-dimensional World", *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 67-94.
- Braithwaite, V.A. (1997). "Harmony and Security Value Orientations in Political Evaluation", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 401-414.
- Braithwaite, V (1998a). "The Value Balance Model of Political Evaluations," *British Journal of Psychology*, 89, 223-247.
- Braithwaite, V A (1998b) "The Value Orientations Underlying Liberalism-Conservatism", *Personality- Individual Differences*, 25, 575-589.
- Braithwaite, VA (1998c) "Communal and Exchange Trust Norms, their Value Base and Relevance to Institutional Trust." In V Braithwaite and M Levi (eds.) *Trust and governance*. New York: Russell Sage, pp 46-74.

Braithwaite, V A and Blamey, R (1998) "Consensus, Stability and Meaning in Abstract Social Values", *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 33, 363-380.

Braithwaite, V A and Law, H G (1985) "Structure of Human Values: Testing the Adequacy of the Rokeach Value Survey," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 250-63.

Braithwaite, V A and Scott, W A (1991) "Values". In J P Robinson, P R Shaver and L S Wrightsman (eds,) *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*. San Deigo: Academic Press, pp 661-753.

Daly, K. (see this volume)

Downs, A (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Dryzek, J and Braithwaite, V (1999) "On the Prospects for Democratic Deliberation: Values Analysis Applied to Australian Politics", *Political Psychology*, 20, forthcoming.

Feather, N T (1982) *Expectations and actions: Expectancy-value models in psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Glaser, D. (1969) *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goodnow, J (1988) "Parents' Ideas, Actions, and Feelings: Models and Methods from Developmental and Social Psychology", *Child Development*, 59, 286-320.

Huntley, S. (1995) *The Socialisation of Pride, Shame and Guilt*. Honours Thesis. Division of Psychology, The Australian National University.

Johnson, D W and Johnson, R T (1995) *Reducing School Violence through Conflict Resolution*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kluckhohn, C KM (1951) "Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action." In T Parsons and E Shils (eds) *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp 388-433.

Kocanska, G, Kuczynski, L, and Radke-Yarrow, M (1989). "Correspondence between Mothers Self-reported and Observed Child-Rearing Practices", *Child Development*. 60, 56-63.

Morris, A and Young, W (see this volume)

Rigby, K (1996) *Bullying in Schools: and what to do about it*. Melbourne: ACER.

Rokeach, M (1973) *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M (1979) *Understanding Human Values: Human and Societal*. New York: Free Press

Schwartz, S H (1994) "Are there Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values?", *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45.

Scott, W A (1965) *Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Tversky, A and Kahneman, D (1986) "The Framing of Decisions. The Psychology of Choice", *Science*, 211, 453-458.

Wachtel, T (1999) "Restorative Justice in Everyday Life: Beyond the Formal Ritual". Paper presented at the Reshaping Australian Institutions Conference, Restorative Justice and Civil Society, The Australian National University, Canberra, February 16-18.

Table 1

Table 1: Results of the hierarchical regression analyses predicting support for dialogic relational strategies and punitive individualized strategies among parents of primary school children (minimum N = 919)

Predictors	Mean ^a (SD)	Dialogic relational strategies			Punitive individualized strategies		
		<i>r</i>	β		<i>r</i>	β	
			Model 1	Model 2		Model 1	Model 2
harmony	5.77 (.61)	.37**	.32**	.27**	.11**	-.07	-.07
security	4.93 (.76)	.21**	.04	.01	.38**	.36**	.35**
supportive self-regulatory	5.02 (.49)	.19**	.07*	.09**	.03	.07*	.07*
command & control	3.54 (.55)	.09**	.08*	.07*	.27**	.13**	.11**
trust in authority	2.24 (.70)	.25**		.17**	.15**		.04
trust in professionals	3.23 (.65)	.10**		-.07*	.09**		.05
trust in community	2.47 (.56)	.24**		.16**	-.01		-.04
parent of perpetrator	1.18 (.47)	-.04		-.05	-.09**		-.09**
parent of victim	1.97 (1.28)	.13**		.10**	.08*		.07*
parental burden	2.84 (.58)	.05		.07*	-.02		.02
likelihood of change	3.39 (1.00)	.10**		.01	-.10**		-.09**
Adj. R^2			.14**	.21**		.16**	.18**
Change in R^2				.07**			.02**

^a Total scale scores for each individual were divided by the number of items in the scale so that means could be interpreted in terms of the original metric

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 2: Breakdown of responses and means (standard deviations) for three approaches to controlling bullying

Approach	Response categories					Mean (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	
Discussions involving teachers, students and parents to sort out problems between children who bully and the children who are bullied	1%	4%	10%	51%	34%	4.12 (.83)
Enforcing strict rules that forbid bullying and through disciplining guilty parties	2%	7%	13%	44%	34%	4.01 (.96)
Discussions first and then through stricter enforcement of rules if the problem is not resolved	1%	3%	3%	40%	53%	4.42 (.76)

Appendix I

Sample items for the security value system:

National strength and order

national greatness (being a united, strong, independent, and powerful nation)

national economic development (greater economic progress and prosperity for the nation)

the rule of law (punishing the guilty and protecting the innocent)

national security (protection of your nation from enemies)

Social standing

economic prosperity (being financially well off)

authority (having power to influence others and control decisions)

Getting ahead

ambitious (being eager to do well)

competitive (always trying to do better than others)

Propriety in dress and manners

polite (being well-mannered)

neat (being tidy)

reliable (being dependable)

Sample items for the harmony value system:

International harmony and equality

a good life for others (improving the welfare of all people in need)

rule by the people (involvement by all citizens in decisions that affect their community)

international cooperation (having all nations working together to help each other)

greater economic equality (lessening the gap between the rich and the poor)

Personal growth and inner harmony

the pursuit of knowledge (always trying to find out new things about the world we live in)

inner harmony (feeling free of conflict within yourself)

A positive orientation to others

tolerant (accepting others even though they differ from you)

helpful (always ready to assist others)

trusting (having faith in others)

Appendix II

Parenting styles

Supportive self-regulatory parenting (Authoritative)

1. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what she/he tries to accomplish.
2. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.
3. My child and I have warm intimate times together.
4. I let my child make many decisions for him/herself.
5. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.
6. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.
7. I joke and play with my child.
8. I believe in praising a child when he/she is good and think it gets better results than punishing him/her when he/she is bad.
9. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.
10. I am easy-going and relaxed with my child.

Command and control parenting (Authoritarian)

1. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where he/she might get hurt.
2. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.
3. I do not allow my child to say bad things about his/her teachers.
4. I teach my child to keep control of his/her feelings at all times.
5. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when he/she misbehaves.
6. I try to keep my child away from children of families who have different ideas or values from my own.
7. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.
8. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages he/she has.
9. I believe children should not have secrets from their parents.
10. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.
11. I want my child to make a good impression on others.
12. I believe it is unwise to let children play a lot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.
13. I expect a great deal from my child.
14. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.
15. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.

