

Running head: TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

UNDERSTANDING THE INTERSECTING CORE TENETS OF TRAUMA-INFORMED
CARE AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF APPLIED AND PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

OF

RUTGERS,

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

NEELA KARIKEHALLI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

AUGUST 2018

APPROVED:

Anne Gregory, Ph.D.

Monica Indart, Psy.D.

DEAN:

Francine Conway, Ph.D.

Copyright 2018 by Neela Karikhalli

Abstract

Schools are implementing both Restorative Justice (RJ) and Trauma-Informed Care (TI-C) initiatives to promote a positive school culture and to decrease gender and race disparities in discipline referrals. Typically, schools implement these types of initiatives with little understanding about the degree to which they are guided by similar or dissimilar approaches to addressing student behavior. In fact, there is little research to inform schools about the possibly shared central tenets of RJ and TI-C. Two studies in this dissertation addressed the need for research in this area. Study 1 used semi-structured interviews to examine if school staff members ($n = 14$) identified common elements of RJ and TI-C as honoring student voice, fostering a sense of community, and repairing harm. Results suggested that a handful of staff members were not knowledgeable or able to describe TI-C. However, the majority of staff members who were able to describe both initiatives identified the central tenets of RJ and TI-C as similar. These results suggest that there are overlapping approaches of each initiative, indicating that RJ and TI-C could be better integrated in future training, school policy and procedures. Study 2 furthered research on one of the overlapping tenets of RJ and TI-C, honoring student voice. Using self-report measures, Study 2 addressed whether staff with more or less authoritarian attitudes were open to honoring student voice compared to other staff ($n = 124$). The results of Study 2 indicated that overall authoritarian attitudes were not significantly correlated with honoring student voice. The majority of staff reported that they sometimes honored student voice. This held no matter their attitudes about authority and discipline in school. Future directions and implications for the overlaps of TI-C and RJ are discussed.

Acknowledgements

Graduate school has not just been an academic endeavor, it has also been a significant personal journey. There are many people who have supported and mentored me throughout my five years at Rutgers. First and foremost, I would like to thank my chair, Anne Gregory. Anne, you truly took a chance taking me on for dissertation (as if you didn't have enough to do!) and I am proud of the work that we created together. I will always treasure our car rides to Brooklyn, the many emails and phone calls, and all the laughter. You have been so encouraging and warm and I sincerely cannot thank you enough. Thank you to my committee member, Monica Indart. Monica, the work you do inspires me. I hope to make as much of an impact in the field of trauma as you have made. I also want to give a special acknowledgement to the late Karen Haboush, who was my original dissertation chair and encouraged my work in childhood trauma.

This would not have been possible without my incredible support system. A special thank you to my best friend, Sheri Balsam, who has been my partner in crime since day 1. I would like to thank Kahina Louis, Julia Brilliante, Ava Lorenzo, Clarissa Green, Aishah Manuel, Alina Khomenko, Evan Kalkus, Nina Franza and Brian Eichert. I could not have asked for a more intelligent and funny group of friends. You have all made New Jersey feel more like home. To my friends from college, home, internship and beyond (too many to list!) thank you for your encouragement and your understanding throughout this process.

And finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank my family. To Shweta, thank you for being the best little sister and half of my heart. You have taught me about patience and kindness from a young age, qualities I hope to emulate as a psychologist. To my parents, Shridevi and Dilip, thank you for everything. You have taught me the power of hard-work, perseverance, and the fierceness of love. I hope to use this degree to continue to make you proud. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Trauma and Psychopathology	2
Trauma and Schooling	3
School Response	4
Restorative Justice	6
Trauma-Informed Care	7
Case Study of Trauma-Informed Care	9
Challenges to Implementation	10
Central Tenets of RJ and TI-C	11
Variable Staff Openness to Student Voice	13
Summary	16
STUDY 1	17
Methods	18
Results	23
STUDY 2	30
Methods	31
Results	34
DISCUSSION	39
Similar and Dissimilar Components of RJ and TI-C	40
Lack of Knowledge	43
Study Limitations	45
Implications and Future Directions	46
APPENDICES	48
REFERENCES	64

Introduction

Exposure to trauma within childhood is a salient and pervasive issue that can have devastating effects on its victims. Trauma is broadly defined as exposure to a traumatic event that involves an actual or perceived threat to the physical integrity of an individual or others (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2000). These traumatic events can take many forms including child sexual or physical abuse, neglect, domestic violence, life-threatening illness, school or community violence, unexpected death of a family member or close friend, natural disaster, motor vehicle accident, or other serious accident. Exposure to trauma is pervasive among children in the United States. In a 2015 nationally representative sample of over 4,000 children and adolescents, 57.6% of children reported exposure to community violence within their lifetime. Furthermore, 15.2% of the sample reported incidents of child maltreatment, which includes abuse, neglect and custodial interference within the past year. In total, 40.9% of children had more than one direct experience of violence, crime, or abuse and 60.8% of the children were exposed to more than one form of trauma within the past year (Finkelhor, 2015). Amongst children and adolescents living in poor urban areas, research consistently shows that these youth experience greater incidences of trauma, whether as witnesses or victims (Buka et. al. 2001; Okundaye 2004; Paxton 2004; Self-Brown 2004). In particular, African American and Latino youth in urban, low-income communities have been shown to be more at risk for being exposed to community violence than any other population in the United States (Stein et al. 2003; Cooley-Quille et al. 2001). Amongst a nationally representative sample of adolescents, 57% of African American children had witnessed violence compared to 34% of Caucasian youth. Fifty-six percent of urban elementary school students reported witnessing violence and fights within schools and 87% of all students reported community violence in the past year. Nearly half (44

%) of middle-school youth were threatened at school (Flannery, Wester & Singer, 2004). This high rate of exposure to trauma can have long lasting effects within a population of marginalized youth.

Trauma and Psychopathology

Exposure to trauma within youth can develop into serious disorders and psychopathology. Although children's reactions to traumatic events may differ based on nature, chronicity, and age of onset of the trauma, there is a large body of research showing that trauma exposure can result in a variety of psychopathology including externalizing and internalizing disorders (e.g., Ford, Stockton, Kaltman, & Green, 2006). Youth who have been exposed to violence within multiple settings such as home and school are at increased risk of developing post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and conduct disorders (Perkins & Graham-Bermann, 2012). One study found that up to 40% of trauma-exposed children and adolescents met diagnostic criteria for PTSD (Hunt et al., 2011). Experience and exposure to multiple adversities have also been shown to increase the risk of behavioral problems, increased anxiety and depressive symptoms (Burke et al., 2011).

Exposure at a young age to violence and trauma can impact children later in life. One study that examined toddlers and domestic violence, found that toddlers who were exposed to domestic violence in the home were more likely to exhibit externalizing and internalizing symptoms into middle childhood (Schnurr & Lohman, 2013). Furthermore, these symptoms were not shown to remit over time. This indicates that psychopathology if untreated can persist into adulthood. Several studies support that youth trauma exposure increases the likelihood of adult PTSD diagnosis (Grassi-Oliveira & Stein, 2008). In addition to disorders such as PTSD and conduct disorders, children exposed to trauma can also exhibit attentional difficulties. Children

with histories of both trauma and neglect have been found to have lower levels of attention and executive function (De Bellis, Hooper, Spratt, & Woolley, 2009). The high rate of exposure to trauma within urban populations raises concerns about how symptomology can negatively affect these children within school settings.

Trauma and Schooling

Evidence of poor school outcomes among children affected by trauma is mounting (Delaney-Black et al., 2002). Delaney-Black and colleagues (2002) concluded in their review of the literature that school outcomes are profoundly affected by youth who had violence exposure. Based on their review, they concluded that violence exposure is associated with a decrease in school attendance in middle and high school aged students (Delaney-Black et al., 2002). In another review, scholars concluded that there is substantial evidence that maltreated children have significantly higher rates of grade retention and drop-out, as much as three times the drop-out rate for maltreated children, compared with the general school population (Boden, Horwood, & Fergusson, 2007). Trauma-exposed children were more likely to have failed a school grade and exhibit lower IQ and reading achievement scores (Delaney-Black et al., 2002). This suggests that exposure to trauma may actually inhibit intellectual and academic functioning. In fact, research supports that children who have a trauma history were found to have higher rates of referrals to special education and related services, had more special education individual education plans (IEP), reported lower school engagement and had higher rates of dropout in high school as compared with children who have not experienced trauma (Proche, 2016; Shonk & Cicchetti, 2001).

While numerous studies have shown that children exposed to traumatic stress are more likely to have poorer school performance, lower reading achievement, decreased verbal IQ, and

more days of school absence, less is known about the effect of trauma on brain development (Carrion & Wong, 2012). Researchers have found that trauma actually changes the brain structure within youth (Walkley & Cox, 2013). Trauma may activate a neurobiological stress response due to the threat of an individual's well-being. Triggers (e.g., traumatic memories, real or perceived threats), may cause the brain to release chemicals into the body (Souers & Hall, 2016). As stress hormones accumulate, students may exhibit behaviors that may be perceived by educators as misbehaviors (e.g., withdraw or disruptive behaviors) (Oehlberg, 2008). Chronic and frequent physiological stress responses can alter brain development, leading to dysregulation of neural circuitry (Carrion & Wong, 2012). In a large study evaluating brain changes with youth who have PTSD symptoms compared with control subjects, found that youth with PTSD symptoms have higher levels of cortisol and decreased hippocampal volume. This indicates that children who have posttraumatic stress may have decreased memory and executive function (Carrion & Wong, 2012).

School Response

Schools are an ideal setting to enact interventions for students due to practitioner's ease of access to students and parents. However, the vast majority of schools within the United States are not addressing students' experiences with trauma due to allocation of resources, limited time and lack of trained professionals (Kaotaoka et al., 2011). Thus, traditionally the way schools are addressing students' experiences with trauma is by focusing on the symptoms they exhibit. In fact, students who have experienced and exposed to trauma are more likely to be referred for discipline referrals and suspensions (Shonk & Cicchetti, 2001). Schools commonly use methods such as codes of conduct, suspension, corporal punishment, and zero tolerance policies (Cameron & Sheppard, 2006). These conventional school disciplinary practices may have a

destructive effect on students' academic and psychosocial functioning (Cameron & Sheppard, 2006). The American Psychological Association (APA) Task Force (2008), the first to accumulate research on traditional school discipline practices concluded that practices such as zero tolerance policies and suspensions appear to predict higher future rates of misbehaviors and suspensions. Moreover, these practices appear to further exacerbate negative mental health outcomes for youth (APA Task Force, 2008). Traditional discipline practices disproportionately refer ethnic and racial minorities and children receiving special education services (Cameron & Sheppard, 2006). In a comprehensive review of school discipline trends, researchers found that ethnic and racial minorities are disproportionately referred for school discipline sanctions (Gregory, Skiba & Noguera, 2010). For example, compared to 5% for White boys and 2% for White girls of all K-12 students that received one or more out-of-school suspensions, the percentage is much higher for Black boys (18%) and Black girls (10%; US Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2013). Black boys represent 8% of students across the nation, but 19% of students expelled without educational services. Black girls are 8% of enrolled students, but 13% of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions. Girls of other races did not disproportionately receive one or more out-of-school suspensions, while American Indian or Alaska Native, Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and multiracial boys were also disproportionately suspended from school. They represent 15% of K-12 students but 19% of K-12 students with more than one out of school suspension. Alarming, students are less likely to graduate high school and less likely to enroll in post-secondary education with each additional suspension received in the 9th grade (Balfanz, Byrnes, & Fox, 2013). These sobering statistics paint a picture of the extent of the disparities and inequity of discipline within schools across the United States.

Restorative Justice

Across the nation, schools are enacting various reforms to decrease disparities and increase equity (Gregory et al., 2017). One such program is Restorative Justice (RJ). With roots within collectivist cultures and Native American traditions, RJ is a way for victims and offenders to heal conflicts and adequately serve justice. RJ's central tenets are founded on community building, relationships, support, honoring voice, and a commitment to social justice (SaferSanerSchools <http://www.iirp.edu/education-programs/continuing-education/projects/safer-saner-schools>). Drawing from indigenous cultures, RJ began as an attempt to address property crimes and since the 1970's, programs have used RJ practices as an alternative to the current justice system (Zehr, 2002). RJ has developed to encompass a variety of practices and is implemented within schools, workplaces, and religious institutions (Zehr, 2002). In schools, RJ seeks to resolve and repair relationships, promote accountability for one's actions, instill empathy, encourage an equitable process, and create opportunities for reflection and change (McCluskey et al., 2008). RJ offers schools an alternative to the current use of punitive disciplinary practices, such as out-of-school suspensions. As an alternative to school suspensions, RJ may hold great potential for schools to provide a voice for students and to promote a positive school culture (Zehr, 2002).

RJ practices within schools include: community building circles, restorative conferences and techniques such as affective statements (Guckenburg et al., 2016). A community-building circle is an arrangement in which students and their teacher sit together and discuss important topics within their lives. Participants in circles speak one at a time using a "talking piece" in order to give each person the opportunity to express themselves (Guckenburg, et al., 2016.) Teachers participate along with the students as a way to build community. The goal of the

community-building circle is to allow participants to express themselves and to create an open environment that enables positive relationships (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2010). In support of this goal, one recent study found that the implementation of restorative circles was linked to respectful teacher-student relationships (Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2014).

A restorative conference is conducted when a harm has occurred between students. The victim and the aggressor are both given a chance to explain their side of the story and to have a chance to apologize. These conferences are enacted to give fairness and voice to all students when any incident has occurred. The whole classroom may discuss the incident. Students discuss feelings, identify who has been affected, and develop a plan to repair the harm and prevent future conflict. This process aims to hold students accountable for their actions while also reintegrating the student who did the wrongdoing back into the community (Gregory et al., 2014). In RJ, affective statements are used for both teachers and students to express their emotions in reaction to events (Wachtel, Costello, & Wachtel, 2009). This further allows students and teachers to learn about one another and promotes transparency and an inclusive community.

Trauma Informed Care

Another initiative that schools are enacting to increase equity and positive school climate is “trauma informed care” (TI-C). To be trauma-informed, in any context, is to understand the ways in which traumatic experiences may impact individuals and then apply that understanding to the design of systems and services to accommodate needs and promote healing (Carello & Butler, 2015). In theory, when TI-C is well integrated into a school, students feel safe, supported and trauma’s impact on learning is the center of the educational mission (Cole et al., 2005). Currently, there is no consensus on the principles of TI-C within schools. For example, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)’s developed four key

assumptions which are: (a) a realization of the widespread prevalence and impact of trauma, (b) a recognition of the signs of traumatic exposure (c) a response grounded in evidence-based practices that (d) resists re-traumatization of individuals (SAMHSA, 2014). However, Fallot and Harris (2009) took a more general approach and identified five fundamental principles. These principles include: ensuring safety, establishing trustworthiness, maximizing choice, maximizing collaboration, and prioritizing empowerment. The lack of consensus on TI-C principles may make implementation varied.

Districts and schools are beginning to implement TI-C. Examples of trauma-informed initiatives within schools include: Compassionate Schools Initiative in Washington State (<http://www.k12.wa.us/CompassionateSchools>), Massachusetts Advocates for Children and the Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative (<https://traumasensitiveschools.org>) and Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (<https://dpi.wi.gov/sspw/mental-health/trauma/modules>) (Phifer & Hull, 2016). The goals of these trauma-informed schools are to help close the achievement gap, support social–emotional health, and promote a positive school climate (Phifer & Hull, 2016). TI-C schools may be initiated differently depending on the enacting state. For example, in Massachusetts, TI-C schools are enacted through “The Safe and Supportive Schools” law. This law assists schools to create safe and supportive learning environments, called “trauma-sensitive” schools. “Trauma-sensitive” schools have a shared understanding among all staff that adverse experiences in the lives of children are common and that trauma can impact learning and behavior (Phifer & Hull, 2016). Another example of a TI-C school is the Compassionate Schools Initiative (CSI) in Washington. The Compassionate Schools Initiative’s goal is to create compassionate classrooms and foster compassionate attitudes of their school staff. The unique components of CSI are to focus on culture and climate in the school and community, train and

support all staff regarding trauma and learning, ensure discipline policies are both compassionate and effective and provide access, voice, and ownership for staff, students and community.

Research is emerging that TI-C within schools may lead to positive outcomes. One study used a single group pre and post design in a school in Washington (Walkley & Cox, 2013). They found that after using TI-C approach as compared to discipline rates from previous years, suspensions dropped 85%, expulsions dropped 40% and written referrals were cut in half by a 47% reduction (Walkley & Cox, 2013). More rigorous research with comparison schools is sorely needed. Yet, this single study offers some promise that TI-C in schools may have positive correlates related to student outcomes.

Case Study of Trauma-Informed Care

As there is no clear consensus on the broad principles of TI-C, it may be useful to examine an individual example of successful implementation. One example is the New Haven public school system, which implemented TI-C using varied systematic levels to reach different students affected by trauma (Perry & Daniels, 2016). At the primary level, staff were given professional development on trauma, PTSD symptomology, and how this can impact learning. In classrooms, direct instruction was given to all students about trauma's effects on learning, the impact of stress on behavior and how to advocate for their needs. These skills were taught over a three-day intensive session, and not incorporated within the schools' curriculum. At the secondary and tertiary level, a team consisting of school staff and mental health clinicians was developed. This team identified students in need and provided further supports and services. This included an empirically validated intervention, Cognitive Behavior Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS), which was implemented for a small group of students who had more pervasive trauma exposure. Preliminary quantitative and qualitative results indicate that the initiative was

successfully able to identify and give services for students who need additional support and provided knowledge of how trauma can impact learning to all staff and students (Perry & Daniels, 2016).

Challenges to Implementation

There are several challenges to successful implementation of initiatives such as RJ and TI-C in schools. There is a large body of research on the “implementation gap,” which describes the phenomenon that schools have difficulty replicating successful programs that were developed and evaluated under more tightly controlled research conditions (Goldberg, 2003). There are several factors that may explain the implementation gap.

One such factor may be the lack of adequate staff training and administrator support. Research indicates that staff often report feeling unprepared and having low confidence in their abilities to implement new initiatives (Stormont, Thomas, & Van Garderen, 2012). Furthermore, staff often do not get continued support following introductory training (Forman, 2013). This lack of support and adequate training may explain the implementation gap. Research also supports that staff members often fail in implementing new interventions do so because of a lack of ongoing support and training (Noell et al., 2005).

Administrator support, particularly by the principal of the school, has been cited within research as a crucial factor to successful implementation (Forman, 2009). However, administrators may have inadequate time and other competing responsibilities such as academic and state demands to fully devote to school-wide change (Oberle, Domitrovich, Meyers, Weissberg, 2016). This can lead to an ongoing challenge within schools. Too often, programs are introduced within schools as “fragmented fads” and isolated from other initiatives implemented within the school (Shriver & Weissberg, 1996). Consequently, schools become

overwhelmed with several different programs, which have little sustainability, direction, coordination or impact (Durlak, Domitrovich, Weissberg, Gullotta, 2016). It is therefore crucial to make sure that programs implemented align effectively with each other, and furthermore are sustainable within the infrastructure of the school.

Another factor explaining the implementation gap is the acceptability of the intervention to the implementers. Acceptability is defined as a perception that an intervention is satisfactory (Forman, 2015). Within schools, teachers are tasked with carrying out the daily responsibilities of interventions (Forman, 2009). Their own values and attitudes on student behavior and classroom management, as well as their favorable attitudes towards the program, profoundly affects the acceptability of the intervention (Han & Weiss, 2005). Research has supported that teachers' philosophical alignment with the central tenets of the program is key to successful implementation within schools (Forman, 2015).

Central Tenets of RJ and Trauma-Informed Care

Schools are implementing RJ and TI-C, along with numerous other programs. Thus, it is essential to ascertain the degree to which they overlap in central tenets. Doing so may help increase the synergy with which programming is adopted. As of yet, however, researchers have yet to identify the common tenets of RJ and TI-C. An examination of their underlying philosophy and practices through the literature suggest that common tenets may include: repairing harm, fostering a sense of community and honoring student voice.

Repairing Harm. There appears to be overlap between RJ and TI-C in their central tenets and principles of change. The first is a focus on repairing harm. RJ repairs harm after an infraction has occurred by asking the victim and disputant to sit together and discuss their subjective experience of the incident. By providing both of these individuals' opportunities to

speak, RJ acknowledges the emotions and those impacted by the wrongdoing (Gregory et al., 2014). However, RJ is not punitive towards the wrongdoer, by emphasizing their reintegration into the community (Gregory et al., 2014). RJ views this process as integral for students to move forward following the harmful incident. The assumption underlying a restorative response is that "justice" is more than simply punishing, or treating, rule breakers, but rather is about repairing the harm caused to victims, offenders and community. By empowering students to be responsible for their own actions, restorative justice offers students a means to rebuild their dignity through reparation of harm (Schiff, 2013).

In TI-C, the focus is also on repairing the harm or wrongdoing that occurred to the student. TI-C schools do this by prioritizing empowerment and providing students with skills in order to cope with the trauma. This may eventually involve the referral for trauma-specific services such as individual and group therapy (Fallot & Harris, 2009). TI-C schools posit that after a trauma has occurred, that the student hurt by the incident needs to be empowered and encouraged to process these instances as a way of moving forward and to prevent further symptoms and psychopathology (Fallot & Harris, 2009).

While there are specific differences in both RJ and TI-C, both programs seek to repair a harmful incident in order for individuals to move forward. Both programs see this as a commitment to justice and an opportunity to make right a wrong. In RJ, the focus is systemic. It is not just about the individual who caused the harm. Rather, it is about all who were involved in the incident – the person(s) who were harmed as well as the person(s) causing the harm (Sprague & Tobin, 2017). It is important to acknowledge that those harmed include not just other students, but the whole community including teachers/staff members, parents and administrators. In TI-C, the repairing harm is more individually focused. As students may be dealing with traumas that

are out of their control, the repairing harm aspect of TI-C, involves empowering and developing skills for the person who experienced the harm.

Sense of Community. Both programs seek to build a positive school climate and community for their students (Fallot & Harris, 2009). Within RJ, circles are used in classrooms to build community (Sprague & Tobin, 2017). Teachers use structured group discussion and meaningful conversations while sitting in a circle (Costello, Wachtel, & Wachtel, 2010). The topic of the circle may differ including academic, emotional and classroom-specific topics. The goal of this is to provide an opportunity for students and teachers to learn about one another (Sprague & Tobin, 2017). By doing so, RJ posits that children will feel more part of the school wide community.

Within TI-C, the approach is similar. A trauma informed school aims to provide a sense of safety to all students. This safety is not merely physical, but also encompasses social, emotional, and academic safety (Walkley & Cox, 2013). A child who has experienced trauma is in need of this sense of safety not only to participate in the classroom, but also to obtain a sense of well-being (Walkley & Cox, 2013). To help a child feel safe in the educational setting, a school must provide structure and limits, routine, and consistency (Steinke, 2016). Although the programs are different from each other, they share a common goal of providing students with a sense of community and safety within the school so that students can thrive and flourish.

Student Voice

Besides fostering a sense of community and repairing harm, another central tenet to RJ and TI-C is honoring student voice. Research has demonstrated that students are more likely to cooperate when they feel fairly treated by teachers (Gregory & Ripski, 2008). Therefore, integrating student voice is crucial for both programs. RJ defines honoring student voice as: "the

ability to make a difference through what one says, and to have a say in key decisions. When parties have a voice, their viewpoints, thoughts, and feelings receive a 'fair hearing'" (Sprague & Tobin, 2017, p. 11). Within RJ, schools can integrate student voice and family perspectives in different ways depending on the school. For example, they might hold restorative circles with their classmates to address a problem in the classroom (Wachtel et al., 2009). They could additionally include students' opinions implementing a new RJ initiative (Gregory et al., 2014).

Honoring student voice is similar within TI-C. TI-C schools are concerned with students' perspectives not just the staff perspectives. A well-implemented TI-C school tries to understand the situation from the student's point of view as a way of addressing trauma and empowerment (Hodas, 2006). Students who attended TI-C schools indicated that, "choice" or "collaboration," as the component that they liked the most (Carello & Butler, 2015). TI-C schools state that students with complex trauma histories often feel belittled, ashamed, or powerless, and unsafe. By providing these students with opportunities to express their opinions and perspective, are large parts of the overall healing that these schools can provide (Carello & Butler, 2015). Both programs seek to hear and understand students' subjective experiences on items related to their personal lives. In TI-C, this may include hearing from the student's experience in relation to a trauma while in RJ this may include their perceptions of fairness and equality in discipline referrals in their schools.

There are numerous indications there is overlap in central tenets of the two programs, but further research is needed to ascertain if this is the case. The proposed Study 1 addresses this need by asking staff to describe the central tenets of RJ and TI-C, if they believe that these tenets are aligned and to what degree are they aligned. If Study 1 finds that one of the common tenets relates to engaging student voice, then it will be informative to identify the degree to which

school staff are open to engaging student “voice.” This is key given that research and theory on implementation science indicates that philosophical alignment is key to the successful adoption of new programming in schools (Forman, 2015).

Variable Staff Openness to Student Voice

Staff may be more or less open to student voice. Teaching style may be a factor in openness to student voice. Research on teachers’ style developed from the parenting literature. Diana Baumrind (1978) identified three primary parental disciplinary styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Baumrind (1978) suggested that *authoritative* parents are high in warmth and responsiveness while simultaneously demanding of expectations, rules and behavior. These parents provide their children with a rationale for their actions and priorities as well as honoring their child’s opinions (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Conversely, *authoritarian* parents are identified as neither warm nor responsive to their children. These parents have strict demands, and rigidly enforce the rules. Baumrind suggested that authoritarian parents do not communicate to their children the rationale behind these rules nor consider their child’s perspective (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). While *permissive* parents are high in warmth and responsiveness towards their children, they also do not have expectations for rules and may be excessively tolerant of their children’s misbehavior.

At the school level, research has shown that teachers and administrators exhibit a variety of discipline styles. After surveying student’s perceptions about teachers’ expectations, fairness, rule setting, negative feedback and teacher interest in subject matter, researchers found that students reported clear distinctions among teachers. Therefore, as with parents, teachers can exhibit different disciplinary styles with their students (Wentzel, 2002). Researchers have used a parenting-style framework to explain variability amongst teachers and confirmed that variability

among teachers that can fit into parenting frameworks (Walker, 2008). Results indicated that teacher style alters the effectiveness of their teaching practices, and that style alters children's openness to such teacher practices. A small-scale study shows that though all teachers used similar demands, teachers differed on degree of warmth and amount of demands and expectations (Walker, 2008). These teachers were warm and responsive to students' needs while simultaneously offering high structure and support. These authoritative teachers also supported autonomy and student voice had the highest amount of academic grade performance within their students. Interestingly, Wentzel (2002) found that student perceptions that their teachers maintained high expectations (structure) yet gave infrequent negative feedback (support) was associated with less irresponsible student behavior.

Teachers who were identified as authoritarian style often espoused strict behavior management strategies such as zero tolerance policies (Walker, 2008). Zero tolerance policies, which are very common and popular are characterized by little flexibility in response to rule breaking. Zero tolerance policies often do not consider student's intentions or circumstances to their behavior. When categorized using the Baumrind's parenting styles, this is labeled as an authoritarian since it emphasizes high structure and rules without flexibility and understanding (Gregory & Cornell, 2009). Wentzel (2002) found that teachers who give more negative feedback had students who exhibited more irresponsible and less pro-social behaviors. Similarly, Walker (2008) found that authoritarian classrooms showed higher levels of disengagement and poor academic beliefs among students.

Summary

Trauma exposure in youth is widespread and pervasive throughout the United States. Almost 41% of students had more than one direct experience of violence, crime, or abuse and

60.8% of the students were exposed to more than one form of trauma within the past year (Finkelhor, 2015). Students exposed to or experienced trauma are more likely to have poorer school performance, lower reading achievement, decreased verbal IQ, and more days of school absence (Carrion & Wong, 2012). Schools are implementing numerous programs such as RJ to address disparities and promote equality and positive school climate (Gregory, Skiba & Mediratta, 2017). Schools are also implementing TI-C practices to address students' subjective experience or exposure to trauma (Carello & Butler, 2015). There are indications that these programs have overlapping tenets including repairing harm, fostering a sense of community and honoring student voice. However, as of yet, no studies have examined this. The current dissertation included Study 1, which examined whether school staff describe similar tenets when discussing RJ responses and TI-C and whether they perceived the tenets as being aligned using interviews from staff. Study 2 of the dissertation addressed another understudied area related to the conditions under which new initiatives are implemented in schools. It is well established that new initiatives can falter in schools (Warren, 2011). Scholars of implementation science argue that school staff need to be open to the key components of programs (e.g., Forman, 2016). Study 2 examined the degree to which if teachers with authoritarian attitudes engage in practices that honor student voice. The methods and findings are presented separately for Study 1 and Study 2, and then results are considered together in the discussion section.

Study 1: Exploratory Qualitative Analysis of Alignment of RJ and TI-C

Study 1 addressed the following question, "According to school staff, to what degree do the central tenets of RJ align with TI-C (e.g., honoring student voice, sense of community, repairing harm)?" It was hypothesized that a majority of school staff would describe overlapping central tenets of RJ and TI-C as being very aligned. Specifically, it was anticipated a majority of school

staff would describe both RJ and TI-C in a manner reflecting the central tenets of honoring student voice, fostering a sense of community, and repairing harm as healing and empowering to children who have undergone trauma.

Methods

Participants

The current study drew its participants from a larger study examining RJ implementation in four schools in an urban city in the Northeastern United States. Participants were recruited by the Rutgers research team to discuss their experience of RJ within their school. The team compensated the staff who agreed to be interviewed by donating \$40 to their schools. The final participants were 14 identified staff from four participating schools that have implemented RJ within the past year. Participants were in diverse positions within the school including teachers, administrators, support staff and RJ coordinators. The inclusion criterion required to participate within the study was some knowledge of implementing RJ within the school however some participants were not actively involved in implementing RJ. The majority of the participants identified as female (78.6%, $n = 11$), and 28.6% reported identifying as male ($n = 4$). The participants came from different racial and ethnic backgrounds with seven participants identifying as “White,” three participants identifying as “Black,” and four participants who declined to state their race or ethnicity within the interview.

Measures

Interview Protocol. The interview protocol for this study was developed in conjunction with Dr. Gregory. Appendix A contains the interview protocol. At the beginning of the interview, school staff were asked the following questions: “Imagine a scenario with a student in a community-building circle who is disruptive and talks back to teachers, irritable and easily

distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?”

Toward the end of the interview, the staff were asked the following questions: “In your perspective, what is trauma-informed care?”, “What background do you have in trauma informed care prior to joining RJ?”, “In general, are staff knowledgeable about trauma within the school” and “Should professional development about the effects of trauma be a priority?” They were asked questions about the overlaps between RJ and TI-C: “To what extent has your professional development in RJ addressed trauma?”, “Have students’ exposure to trauma come up during RJ processes and practices?” and “In what ways might RJ processes and practices help students who have been exposed to trauma?” Finally, they were asked to reimagine the scenario presented at the start of the interview: “Now, please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. This is unlike the students’ typical behavior. If the staff member was educated about trauma, how would it affect their mindset and their actions? What would the staff member do next?”

Coding Manual. The coding manual was developed in conjunction with Dr. Gregory. All codes within the manual were dichotomous (e.g., 0 for absence, 1 for presence) for the specific constructs. Codes were also global, indicating that specific codes were assigned to the entire interview record. The constructs measured within the TI-C and RJ Coding Manual are explained below. Generally speaking, coders made inferences about staff perceptions about the presence or absence of central tenets of TI-C and RJ based on their descriptions of how teachers using a trauma-informed mindset, or an RJ mindset might hypothetically respond to a student who was being disruptive during a community-building circle.

Restorative Justice. The RJ codes within this section include: RJ-Elements, RJ-Student

Voice, RJ-Sense of Community/Relationship Building, and RJ-Repairing Harm. Within the RJ-Elements code, the coders were asked whether the staff were familiar with the common values or central tenets of RJ. Staff who were familiar and had exposure to RJ were given a rating of 1 and staff who were unfamiliar or had no exposure to RJ were given a rating of 0. For RJ-Student Voice, coders rated whether staff identified honoring student voice as a RJ tenet. Staff who did not identify honoring student voice when describing the process of RJ were given a rating of 0, while staff who did identify honoring student voice were given a rating of 1. Coders were also asked to rate staff members whether repairing harm was identified as an RJ tenet. If the staff member did not identify repairing harm, including conflict resolution, they were given a rating of 0. An example of a staff member who identified repairing harm as a central tenet stated:

I think of it in terms of an approach of building community and adjusting harm that occurs in that community. So, in schools I think about the way we create connections among students and teachers and other members of the whole community and establish ways to address harms.

Finally, coders were asked to rate the extent to which relationship building and community building were identified by the staff member as a central tenet to RJ (0 for absence, 1 for presence). An example of a rating of 1 rating included:

We had that weeklong like activities where there are different workshops for students. There was yoga here. And how to do a resume. And different topics up for discussion. I thought it was really positive and the students really enjoyed it.

Trauma-Informed Care. During the semi-structured interview, staff were asked about TI-C. Although TI-C had not been implemented within the schools, the staff were asked about any previous experiences, their understanding of the components of TI-C and the need to address

trauma within the school. The codes within this section include: TI-C Elements, TI-C Repairing Harm, TI-C Sense of Community/Relationship Building, TI-C Student Voice, TI-C Need, and Overlap.

In the TI-C Elements code, coders were asked to rate the staff member on the extent to which they knew what TI-C was or if they were able to define or describe it any way. Staff members who were familiar with or able to define trauma-informed care were given a rating of 1 and staff members who were unfamiliar with TI-C were given a rating of 0. In the TI-C Repairing Harm code, coders were asked to rate the staff members whether they described repairing harm as central to trauma-informed care (0 for absence, 1 for presence). Staff members who were given a rating of 1 identified that they would help the student access further services to address their socioemotional difficulties (e.g., repairing harm within themselves).

In the TI-C Honoring Student Voice, coders were asked to rate whether staff identified honoring student voice as a central tenet of trauma-informed care. Staff members who identified this as being central to trauma-informed care were given ratings of 1 and staff members who did not identify honoring student voice were given ratings of 0. In the TI-C Sense of Community/Relationship Building Code, coders were asked to rate the staff whether they identified sense of community within the school as central to trauma informed care (0 for absence, 1 for presence). Finally, in the TI-C Need code, the coders were asked to rate the staff on whether they identified a need for further trauma services, knowledge and intervention within the school. Staff who did state that it would be necessary were given a rating of 1, and staff who did not were given a rating of 0. An example of a rating of 1 included:

Yes, I feel like staff do need to know more about that. I feel staff need to be trained more about trauma and the mental issues of students and I feel like staff need to take the time to read or get to know their students.

Finally, coders were asked whether staff identified an overlap of common components between the two programs. Staff who identified explicitly the linkage or overlap between the two programs were given ratings of 1, whereas staff who did not were given ratings of 0.

Procedures

Consented staff participated in an audio-recorded interview conducted by the Rutgers Research Team. Each interview took one hour to complete. Each audio recorded interview were transcribed for ease of further analyses. In order to use the Coding Manual and establish reliability of the constructs being measured, two undergraduate research assistants at Rutgers University attended a two-hour workshop on the manual. In the workshop, coders were given background information, each construct was explained thoroughly as were the corresponding ratings for the specific staff's transcribed interview. The research assistants were given sample interviews to code together as to gain familiarity with the qualitative coding. After this workshop, coders completed the 14 interviews and filled out the rating form indicating their final scoring and submitted it electronically.

Data Analytic Plan

The final data included two of the undergraduate research assistants' codes as well as the author's own coding ratings. Intraclass correlations and percent agreement was calculated between the codes to offer evidence of the credibility and trustworthiness of the coding, which determine reliability for qualitative analysis with small samples (Patton, 2002). Overall, the majority of the ICC's were excellent amongst raters, although RJ Repairing Harm, TI-C Student

Voice and TI-C Repairing Harm had fair and poor standards respectively. The ICC's are described within Table 1 below.

Table 1

Intraclass Correlations (ICCs) of the Interview Coding

Variable	Intraclass Correlations (ICCs)	Standards for ICCs
Restorative Justice (RJ) Elements	.81	Excellent
RJ Student Voice	.82	Excellent
RJ Community Building/ Relationship Building	.79	Excellent
RJ Repairing Harm	.48	Fair
Trauma Informed Care (TI-C) Elements	.85	Excellent
TI-C Student Voice	.57	Fair
TI-C Community Building/Relationship Building	.83	Excellent
TI-C Repairing Harm	.12	Poor
TI-C Need	.79	Excellent
Overlap	.70	Good

Note: ICCs less than .40 = Poor; .40-.59 = Fair; .60-.74 = Good; .75 and higher = Excellent

The percent agreement between the two independent coders as well as the author was calculated across codes, including RJ Elements (85.7%), RJ Student Voice (78.6%), RJ Community Building/Relationship Building (57.1%), RJ Repairing Harm (42.8%), TI-C Elements, (64.3%), TI-C Student Voice (64.3%), TI-C Community Building/Relationship Building (71.4%), TI-C Repairing Harm (64.3%), TI-C Need (85.6), and Overlap (42.8%). In cases of significant disagreement between the raters, the final master codes used in analyses were the codes designated by the author.

Results

The qualitative coding found that while 13 of the 14 staff members were able to describe and were familiar with RJ, only nine of these staff members were familiar TI-C. Some of the staff members were readily able to describe TI-C, whereas other staff members were more

hesitant and had not heard of the concept. The following excerpt describes one staff member's perception of TI-C:

The idea is that you are able to identify the signs of trauma and be able to address it appropriately or find the appropriate person to help address the issue. I mean to me, even my most difficult student, they're difficult because they've been traumatized. All behavior as a result, is rooted in some kind of trauma that they've experienced in their lives, so to me it's very much connected. It's being able to identify it appropriately and then being able to get them the right resources.

Another staff member elucidated further with the following quote:

To me, trauma-informed care is the understanding that students are coming to us with a key strap of chronic stress and experiences of trauma in their lives, that don't just stop when they get to the school door, so that often times behaviors are symptoms of something deeper.

Overall, five staff members had not heard of trauma-informed care and could not describe its components. Due to this, these staff members were excluded from further analyses regarding the central tenets of RJ and TI-C. The remaining staff were analyzed according to their descriptions of the central tenets of both initiatives. These results are summarized in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Staff Who Endorsed Central Tenets

Central Tenets	RJ (<i>n</i> = 13, 92.9%)	TI-C (<i>n</i> = 9, 64.3%)
Honoring Student Voice	11 staff (84.6%)	8 staff (88.9%)
Sense of Community/ Relationship Building	11 staff (84.6%)	5 staff (55.6%)
Repairing Harm	11 staff (84.6%)	9 staff (100.0%)

Table 3

<i>Number and Percentage of Staff Who Endorsed Both RJ and TI-C Central Tenets</i>	
Central Tenets	Both RJ and TI-C (<i>n</i> = 9, 64.3%)
Honoring Student Voice	6 staff (66.7%)
Sense of Community/ Relationship Building	4 staff (44.4%)
Repairing Harm	8 staff (88.9%)

Out of the nine staff who could define TI-C, six staff described both RJ and TI-C in a manner reflecting the central tenet of student voice. Out of the nine staff, four described both RJ and TI-C in a manner reflecting the central tenet of sense of community and relationship building. Finally, out of the nine staff, eight of them described both RJ and TI-C in a manner reflecting the central tenet of repairing harm. Thus, a majority of the staff appeared to conceptualize RJ and TI-C in similar ways in honoring student voice and repairing harm. A minority of the staff (*n* = 4) described both in a manner that suggested overlap in the tenet of community and relationship building.

More specifically, fostering a sense of community and building relationships was the central tenet that was *least* described by staff for both RJ and trauma-informed care. However, more staff were likely to describe a sense of community within RJ, due to different activities implemented within the school. One staff member stated:

There's a lot of events, we have more events each year, then we did in prior years. I've definitely seen more things happening, like a kick boxing class, a poetry slam. I think it's really good for the school community that they are happening.

Additionally, within RJ, staff members discussed the relationships within the school as being integral to fostering a sense of community. One staff member stated:

Now you have the students now feeling comfortable coming to other teachers now, and definitely the RJ coordinator. Before it was a point where they held everything to themselves and I think, that's where the anger was coming from because they did not have anybody to vent to.

Within TI-C, staff members discussed how the school could be a “safe space” for the students:

We're creating space for students to be whole people and share their stories, and it doesn't necessarily even have to be stories of trauma, but I think even in sharing their stories and their experience in perspective in a safe environment, you're experiencing a safe environment which is helpful for trauma and trauma and stress as well.

Similarly to RJ, staff members additionally described how relationships were key in allowing students to feel safe within the school:

I think the trust level that they have with the person that they are speaking with is a big thing. The more they trust, the more they are willing to open up. I think it just gives them that safe space. Like they can say, 'I can walk in here, I can be safe, I am going to be taken care of by someone who is there for me.'

Although staff members endorsed this tenet the least out of the central tenets, staff members were able to describe how it can provide healing through relationships and providing a safe space without judgements.

Six staff members were able to describe honoring student voice when discussing both RJ and TI-C. Within RJ, staff members identified giving student voice and power within decision making as a central component of the RJ process. One staff member stated:

I think a lot of student voice came from knowing, seeing, and recognizing their power and giving them the tools to exercise it, to use it and speak truth to power. To also let them

know they're the ones who get to advocate and create the future and that we're not the sole people who are making decisions.

Staff members also endorsed honoring student voice by allowing them opportunity to speak their story. One staff member stated:

I probably would ask them, 'Hey you don't seem like yourself today. Can you tell me about what's going on? And if there is, anything we can do to help when we get back in the circle or anything you would want to talk about?' Hopefully they'd open up.

Within this quote, the staff member emphasizes that in order to work with students in RJ, it is essential that staff allow student to share his or her story. Similarly, staff endorsed honoring students' stories as integral within TI-C. One staff member described the necessary components in working with students who have been exposed to trauma:

I would go back to affirming that this is a safe space where we respect privacy and honor messages from the heart, and honor the things people share in the circle, and appreciate and affirm the personal anecdote that was expressed.

The staff member within this quote describes how within circles it is essential that the facilitator honor the story and allows the student to speak about a difficult topic.

The central tenet described the most by staff members in both RJ and TI-C was repairing harm. Eight of the fourteen staff endorsed this tenet within both programs. There were individual differences in how each of these programs were enacted. One way that repairing harm was described as a central tenet in RJ was through conflict mediation. One staff member described:

We do a lot of mediation, we try to get the kids to understand what took place inside of an incident. Whether it's kids getting into a fight, kids having a verbal discussion, or whether that be a misunderstanding of things, we want them to understand that there are

other points of view and sometimes people get hurt in things.

Staff members also described how RJ processes and practices may help repair traumatic harms that happen:

I think it can. Instead of punishment, it takes responsibility and accountability for things that have caused them harm. Even if the harm comes directly out of their trauma but it cares for them and views them as a human who is wounded and needs support. Some of the students that we teach that get into trouble are people who have been hurt. I think that the punitive responses can re-traumatize them more and harden them from being open to therapeutic interventions.

Within TI-C, staff members indicated that referring to other health care providers, and providing referrals as helping students to repair harm. One staff member described:

We have Heart Share which is an agency for kids who have home issues or just issues, period. It could be anything, home, school, friendship, boyfriend, who think they just have a hard time dealing with it themselves. We do recommend them to the Heart Share if we think it's traumatic

The staff member alludes to the need for resources to help students repair harm within the self (as opposed to harm between people). These individual differences were echoed by other staff members, indicating an overarching goal of repairing harm, but different ways which it is enacted.

Overall, 11 of the staff members explicitly indicated that there was an overlap between the two initiatives in their practices and their central tenets. One succinctly stated, “I think RJ is and should be trauma-informed care. I think it is a trauma-informed practice.” Other staff members who did not indicate any overlap stated that it was due to a lack of knowledge of TI-C.

One staff member further explained, “Maybe it could be linked a little better because I don’t know about trauma-informed care. So, I really think it could be linked a little better.” Despite the lack of direct knowledge of TI-C, 13 of the 14 staff members indicated a pressing need for the staff to learn more about trauma. One quote that illustrates this:

Yes, I feel like staff do need to know more about that. I feel staff need to be trained more about trauma and the mental issues of students and I feel like staff need to take the time to read or get to know their students. Because if you have a class and you’re teaching and you look at the student and the student is doing something, but you don’t quite understand and you just going to kick the child out, I’m kind of blaming you because you didn’t take the time to find out, “Who is this student? What is this student’s problem?”

Furthermore, three staff members described that it was equally important for TI-C practices to be implemented for the faculty and staff themselves. One staff member further described:

I also think that our staff has experienced a lot of trauma. Vicarious trauma at school, vicarious trauma in their families, and also in their lives. I think being trauma-informed and aware of the vicarious trauma for our faculty would be very valuable.

Several staff members raised concerns about learning further about trauma, citing their demanding schedules and the difficulties from administration. One staff member stated that the administration was not open to addressing trauma within their students. She described:

You know what...I wish I could say yes. But even in the school...just the absolute lack of interest in addressing the kids needs for critical incident debriefing and counseling in relation to the slashing or cutting incident was unbelievable.... And when we said, perhaps we need to get mental health involved, perhaps we need counseling supports, do you think the school did anything about it? They didn’t even address trauma that was in

their sanction, that was in the students' direct experience adequately, let alone address the sort of trauma that a kid walks in the door with... Because I've said, in terms of harm to the community, there was an immediate and direct harm. And the way in which the school has handled it, there's ongoing harm.

Summary

Results indicated that more staff members were able to describe the central tenets of RJ as repairing harm, fostering a sense of community and honoring student voice. Several staff members were not knowledgeable about TI-C and were not able to describe its central components. Staff members who were knowledgeable about both programs were able to describe the same central tenets within both programs, however staff were not as able to explicitly state the linkages or overlaps. Staff stated that the central tenet that was most described in both programs was repairing harm and the tenet least endorsed was fostering a sense of community. The majority of the staff stated that while there was a pressing need for staff to be knowledgeable about trauma, the administration's demands and scheduling made this difficult to implement.

Study 2: Staff Openness to the RJ and TI-C Central Tenet of Student Voice

Study 2 asked the following research question: "To what degree are authoritarian staff open to integrating programs that honor student voice?" Specifically, it was hypothesized that staff who have authoritarian attitudes are less open to integrating programs that honor student voice, relative to staff with less authoritarian attitudes.

Methods

Participants

Similar to Study 1, Study 2 drew its participants from a larger study examining RJ implementation in four schools in an urban city in the Northeastern United States. The participants were 124 staff members who worked at four schools. Three of the schools were high schools (grades 9-12) and one was a middle school (grades 6-8). The majority of staff surveyed (71.8%) were teachers. Other members who took the survey were administrative staff such as principals and vice principals, counselors, school psychologists, as well as any other support staff. The staff surveyed were racially diverse with 44.3% of the staff identifying as “White,” 31.5% identifying as “Black or African American,” 5.6% identifying as “Hispanic/Latino,” 3.5% identifying as “Asian,” 7.0% identifying as “Two or More Races,” and 8.4% identifying as “Other”. Staff surveyed identified as majority female (58.7%) compared to male (35%) and primarily self-identified as “straight or heterosexual” (86%). Staff who were surveyed had different levels of experience within the school. Of the staff surveyed (28.7%) were employed at the school for 0 - 3 years, 19.6% who had been employed by the school for 4 - 6 years, 14.7% who had been employed by the school for 7 - 9 years, and 19% identifying that they had been employed by the school for 13 or more years.

Measures

Authoritarian attitudes. Staff who have more authoritarian attitudes, characterized by high amount of rigidity and strictness were examined through three items adapted from the Teacher/Staff version of the School Disciplinary Structure Scale (Cornell, 2015). The items were scalar in nature and asked respondents on a 4-point scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree”, “Disagree”, “Agree” and “Strongly Agree.” The selected items from the School Disciplinary Structure Scale included: “Students at this school are only punished when they deserve it”,

“Students are suspended without a good reason”, and “The adults at this school are too strict.”

According to the original authors of the scale, these items were theorized to capture attitudes around school discipline structure that are strict and fair (Huang et al., 2015). Two of the items were reverse coded for a higher degree of internal consistency. The items selected were used to form a potentially new “Authoritarian-Attitudes” scale. The adapted scale was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha of .20, indicting poor internal reliability among the items selected. As such, the items were treated as individual predictors in the final analysis theorized to capture the aforementioned aspects of authoritarianism.

Honoring Student Voice. Honoring student voice, characterized by taking into account students’ perspectives and staff behaviors was examined through four items adapted from the RP Use Scale (Gregory et al., 2015). The items were scalar in nature and asked respondents to rate their answers on a 5-point scale ranging from “Not at all”, “Rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Often”, and “Always.” The items included, “I ask my students to express their feelings, ideas and experiences”, “When someone misbehaves, I have those who were hurt have a say in what needs to happen to make things right”, “I use circles as a time for students to share feelings, ideas and experiences” and “I take the thoughts and ideas of students into account when making decisions.” Staff was given a mean number for each of the four items calculated. The adapted scale was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha of .79, indicating a high degree of internal consistency.

Demographic Questionnaire. Included on the questionnaire were questions regarding staff race, and number of years employed in the school as variables that may differentially predict “Honoring Student Voice.” Race was dichotomously coded into three groups (Black,

White, and all other racial groups). Given the racial composition of the respondents and the sample size, it was necessary to do so. For the analyses, two dummy coded variables were created—Black (1/0) and all other race (1/0) with White staff members as the reference group. Number of years employed at the school was given a numeric code corresponding to the number of years that the staff was employed at the school (i.e. 0 - 3 years = 1, 4 - 6 years = 2, 7 - 9 years = 3, 10 - 12 years = 4, 13 - 15 years = 5, 15 or more years = 6).

Procedures

The Rutgers research team administered the surveys to staff within the four schools during Spring 2017. Staff were asked to answer survey items about demographics, their involvement within RJ, use of restorative practices (RP) and their perception of school rules and discipline. Staff completed the surveys on computers with online access although paper survey measures were available as well. The online and paper survey measures were identical in content. The average length of completion time for the staff was 30 minutes. Survey data was collected in an anonymous manner.

Data Analytic Plan

First, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and Pearson's correlations were run to assess for general trends in the data among all variables of interest. Included in the Pearson's correlation matrix were staff demographics (number of years employed and race) as well as the variables of interest (authoritarian attitude items and "Honoring Student Voice" scale).

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine whether authoritarian attitudes, race and years employed for staff differentially predicted significant levels of honoring student voice. In the first analytic block of the statistical model, the analyses controlled for

number of years of employment to account for the potential confounding impact of this variable on the final outcomes. In the second block, staff race (dichotomously coded into Black, White and All Other Race categories) was entered into the model to account for the potential confounding impact of this variable on the final outcome. And finally, in the third block, the three items that measured authoritarian attitudes were entered into the model simultaneously.

Missing Data

Missing data analyses were conducted on the complete data set. Analyses indicated that 11.9% of data was missing for the variable “Students at This School Are Only Punished When They Deserve It,” 14% missing for the variable, “Students Are Suspended Without a Good Reason,” and 12.6% of the data missing for the item, “Adults at This School Are Too Strict.” 4.2% of the data was missing for the “Honoring Student Voice” scale. There were no indications missing data were missing systematically from particular staff subgroups. Due to the large amount of missing data, multiple imputation was performed, and five datasets with imputed data were created (Royston, 2004). Even with imputation, seven cases were missing from variables of interest. These seven cases were deleted using list wise deletion. Descriptive statistics and statistical analyses are presented using the pooled estimates.

Results

Descriptive Findings

Descriptive statistics for the “Honoring Student Voice” scale can be found in Table 4. The scale means were clustered into the five response choices (i.e., between 0 - .99 = Not at All = 1 - 1.99, Rarely = 2 - 2.99, Sometimes = 3 - 3.99, Often = 4 - 4.99, Always = 5 - 5.99) with results clustered into five groups that matched the five responses chosen. Responses indicated

that the majority of staff stated that they “Sometimes” honored student voice ($M = 3.67$; $SD = .87$) and took into account students’ perspectives. Table 1 also shows the three items originally described in the “Authoritarian attitudes” scale. The low alpha score ($\alpha = 0.20$) suggested that they tapped into different constructs or aspects of authoritarian attitudes. As such, the items were analyzed for their association with the outcome individually. The scale means were also clustered into five response choices (i.e., 0 - .99 = Strongly Disagree, 1 - 1.99 = Disagree, 2 - 2.99 = Agree, 3 - 3.99 = Strongly Agree), with results clustered into four groups that matched the four responses chosen. Responses indicated that the majority of the staff “Disagreed” with the variable: “Students Were Suspended Without Good Reason ($M = 1.67$, $SD = .88$) and “Adults at the School Were Too Strict ($M = 1.67$, $SD = .73$). Staff responses also indicated that the majority of the staff “Agreed” that “Students Were Only Punished When They Deserved It ($M = 2.54$, $SD = .96$).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	M	SD	Min	Max
Honoring Student Voice	3.67	.87	1.5	5.0
Authoritarian Attitudes Items				
Students Suspended Without Good Reason	1.67	.88	1.0	4.0
Adults at School Are Too Strict	1.67	.73	1.0	4.0
Students Only Punished When Deserve It	2.54	.96	1.0	4.0

$N=120$

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation. 4-point scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” (1), “Disagree” (2), “Agree” (3) and “Strongly Agree” (4).

Correlations

Table 5 displays correlations for all variables included in the analysis. Results from the Pearson correlation indicate that there was overall no significant relationship between staff who

honored student and those who endorse items of with more authoritarian perspective. Honoring student voice was not significantly correlated with the item, “Students Are Suspended Without a Good Reason” ($r = .002, p = .99$), and “Adults at This School Are Too Strict” ($r = .06, p = .54$). However, the variable, “Students Are Only Punished When They Deserve It” was trending toward significance with “Honoring Student Voice” ($r = .16, p = .09$). Unexpectedly, staff who tended to agree that students are only punished when they deserve it also reported that they engaged in practices that honor student voice. There was a small positive correlation between staff who identified as Black and the number of years employed at the school ($r = .24, p < .01$). This means that the staff who identified as Black tended to have worked on the school longer than the staff who identified as White.

Table 5

Correlations among staff characteristics, Honoring Student Voice, and authoritarian perspective

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Student Voice	_____	.12	.13	.03	.002	-.06	.16 †
2. Years Employed		_____	.24**	-.003	.01	-.05	-.001
3. Black Staff			_____	-.39**	-.05	.07	.126
4. All Other Race Staff				_____	.02	.02	.03
5. Students Are Suspended with No Reason					_____	.11	-.14
6. Adults at This School Are Too Strict						_____	.03
7. Students Are Only Punished When They Deserve It							_____

Note. † trend level effect, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression was used to test whether race, years employed, and authoritarianism attitudes were significantly associated with staff's endorsement of "Honoring Student Voice". Based on the imputed datasets, the resultant pooled estimates of the unstandardized regression coefficients, and adjusted ΔR^2 are presented in Table 6. In the first block, number of years employed were entered into the model. Results indicated that years employed was not a significant predictor and did not explain a large amount of the variance in "Honoring Student Voice" ($\Delta R^2 = .002$, $\beta = .04$, $p = .46$). In the second block, race was entered by two dichotomous variables. Staff race also did not predict much of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .003$)

and was not significantly associated with “Honoring Student Voice” for Black staff members ($\beta = .27, p = .17$) and for All Other Race staff members ($\beta = .17, p = .43$). In the final step of the model, the “Authoritarian attitudes” items were entered into the model. The “Authoritarian attitudes” items did not explain a large amount of variance in “Honoring Student Voice” ($\Delta R^2 = .004$). “Students Are Suspended Without a Good Reason” ($\beta = .09, p = .69$), “The Adults at This School Are Too Strict” ($\beta = .12, p = .44$), and “Students Are Only Punished When They Deserve It” ($\beta = .09, p = .12$) were not significant predictors in “Honoring Student Voice”.

Table 6

Predicting honoring student voice using multiple regression

Honoring Student Voice	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	β at each step	β at each step	β at each step
Block 1:			
Number of Years Employed	.05	.04	.04
$\Delta R^2 = .002$			
Block 2:			
Black Race Staff		.27	.24
All Other Race Staff		.17	.15
$\Delta R^2 = .003$			
Block 3:			
Students Are Suspended Without a Good Reason			.04
The Adults at This School Are Too Strict			-.09
Students at This School Are Only Punished When They Deserve It			.14
$\Delta R^2 = .004$			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Summary

Whereas the majority of staff indicated that they “Sometimes” honored student voice, this was not significantly correlated with authoritarian attitudes, race or years of employment at the school. The item, “Students at This School Are Only Punished When They Deserve It” was trending significant, indicating that this may, with a larger sample, be associated with the

honoring student voice scale. However, it was trending in an unexpected direction. Staff who were more likely to agree that students are only punished when they deserve were more likely to self-report using practices that honor student voice, relative to students who were less likely to agree that punishment is meted out fairly. However, when multiple regression analyses were preformed to predict honoring student voice from the predictor variables, none of the predictor variables were significant. Results of this study in combination with the results from Study 1 will be discussed in the following section.

Discussion

The two studies in this dissertation examined the overlap between trauma-informed care (TI-C) and restorative justice (RJ). In the first study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 school staff involved in implementing RJ. Through qualitative analysis, their perceptions of the intersecting core tenets of RJ and TI-C were examined. It was hypothesized that the majority of school staff would depict the central tenets as being very aligned as well as describe honoring student voice, fostering a sense of community, and repairing harm as healing and empowering to children who have undergone trauma. The results of Study 1 indicated that the hypothesis was supported. Staff members who were knowledgeable about both programs were able to describe the same central tenets within both programs (fostering a sense of community, repairing harm, and honoring student voice). However, a handful of staff members were not knowledgeable about TI-C and were not able to adequately describe its components. Results also suggested that while core tenets of both initiatives are similar, there were pragmatic differences in how tenets could be implemented. Study 2 examined one central tenet, student voice. It identified whether staff with more or less authoritarian attitudes were open to honoring student voice as compared to other staff. It was hypothesized that staff who had authoritarian attitudes

would be less open to integrating programs that honor student voice, relative to staff with less authoritarian attitudes. The results of Study 2 were not supportive of this hypothesis. Overall, authoritarian attitudes were not significantly correlated with honoring student voice.

Unexpectedly, the results of this study showed that the majority of staff reported that they honored student voice, which held despite their attitudes about authority and discipline in school.

Similar and Dissimilar Components of RJ and TI-C

Results of Study 1 demonstrated that staff members were able to describe central tenets of the two initiatives in a similar manner, suggesting that there is direct overlap between the two programs. While only a minority of staff members (44.4%), described the central tenet of fostering a sense of community and relationship building as important to both RJ and TI-C; those who did were very aligned with their descriptions. Both of the initiatives were described by staff as providing a “safe space” for students to be able to feel comfortable within the school. Staff members additionally depicted relationships within the building as key to facilitating the safe space. These results are consistent within the literature that both RJ and TI-C schools seek to provide a sense of safety for their students which could include physical, social, emotional and academic needs (Sprague et al., 2017; Walkley et al., 2013).

When asked to describe the central tenets of RJ, the majority of staff (84.6%) described fostering a sense of community and relationship building, whereas only 55.6% of staff indicated this within TI-C. This is inconsistent with new research that states that building positive relationships is central to TI-C (Brown, King, & Wissow, 2017). The higher percentage of staff who were able to indicate this within RJ as compared to TI-C, may be indicative of the fact that RJ had already been implemented within the schools with specific programming and activities to build positive school culture. Indeed, several of the staff members whose interviews were coded

as fostering a sense of community mentioned the RJ activities and programming as examples of an increased positive school community.

Repairing harm was the central tenet that was endorsed by the majority of staff members in both initiatives (88.9%). Staff members discussed a responsibility on the part of the school to repair a harm and indicated that this was important for students to progress. A closer examination of the context of the “repairing harm” interview excerpts suggested that repairing harm was described differently amongst both initiatives. The majority of staff members described the process of repairing harm within RJ as conflict mediation (Gregory et al., 2014). Staff members also indicated repairing harm from a disciplinary standpoint, depicting a new approach to rule infractions that does not immediately punish or expel students (Schiff, 2013). Within TI-C, staff members described repairing a traumatic harm. Staff members stated that they would provide outside referrals including counseling services in order to help the student address their trauma exposure and receive treatment (Fallot & Harris, 2009). The focus of repairing harm within TI-C appeared to be individually oriented. It allows a student the opportunity to process and discuss their trauma and provides treatment referrals. The results of this study generally aligned with previous research findings that the focus of repairing harm within RJ as more systemic, concentrating on everyone impacted within the harmful incident (Sprague & Tobin, 2017). Moreover, the focus on the harm in RJ is between individuals, rather than from an outside source of harm that occurred to a student.

Due to the source of the harm happening outside of the school, schools may be less likely to address it within their students. Schools may believe that the harm is outside of their sanction. In one interview, a staff member described a traumatic event near school grounds involving gang violence, in which administrators did not address the incident with students. Several students had

witnessed the confrontation, and two students were physically hurt. Nevertheless, the school did not provide any additional supports and services despite advocacy. When asked why the school had not adequately addressed the harm taken place, the staff member stated:

It's a couple of things. I think it was, "We don't want this to spread like wildfire so who doesn't know about it, we don't want them to know about it." So, they didn't want to address it.... It's something about wanting to close it down, normalize it, business as usual.

This finding suggests that schools may not want to repair community-based harm. This is supported within the research that shows that TI-C schools face challenges to implementing services including: lack of administrator support, lack of parent engagement, logistical barriers, and other competing responsibilities (Langley, Nadeem, Katoaka, Stein & Jaycox, 2010). School based interventions that have been successful are so as a result of administrator and teacher support (Domitrovich et al., 2008; Forman et al., 2009). While schools may not want to or be able to adequately address trauma exposure, they could better link to outside agencies and supports who could provide further resources. Within this study, only one interview participant was able to name a community resource referral for students to address trauma. It is unknown if schools are already linking up with trauma treatment resources. Further research and development is needed within this area.

The majority of staff (66.7%) described honoring student voice when discussing both TI-C and RJ. Staff members conceptualized student voice similarly. They believe that both initiatives allow students to share their story and speak freely. However, it appeared that the content of honoring student voice differed amongst the programs. Results of honoring student voice within TI-C generally align with previous research studies and existing literature. TI-C

posits that students need to express their perspectives within school as a large part of the healing process (Carello & Butler, 2015). Within Study 1, staff described allowing students to freely share their story, as well as process their feelings and reactions in settings such as community-building circles. Staff also described allowing students more autonomy, choices and collaboration within the school when describing the central tenets of RJ.

Lack of Knowledge

While the majority of staff were able to describe the central tenets of both programs, there were a handful of staff members (35.7%) who were not knowledgeable about TI-C and therefore could not describe its components and practices. While these participants were excluded from the final analyses within this study, their lack of knowledge is noteworthy. This may be best explained by the sample selection, as interview subjects came from schools in which RJ had already been implemented within the past two years. Nevertheless, the lack of knowledge of what TI-C entails is consistent within the literature as well. Recent research has indicated that TI-C appears to be proliferating through multiple sectors including schools but needs clearer operationalization and subsequent empirical measurements (Hanson & Lang, 2016; Reinbergs & Fefer, 2018). Within the research, TI-C has been criticized as lacking definition clarity and being undistinguishable from good clinical care (Berliner & Kolko, 2016). A qualitative study found that providers desired more concrete action steps in addition to further training in the central tenets of TI-C (Donisch, Bray, & Gewirtz, 2016). The findings of Study 1 provide further insight as to the central tenets of TI-C. As the body of literature within TI-C continues to grow, defining the central tenets is imperative to identifying how it can concretely be implemented and subsequently what the barriers are to successful implementation.

Discipline Reform

Study 2 aimed to further research within one of the central tenets, honoring student voice. As indicated by the results of Study 1, honoring student voice was a central tenet endorsed by staff members for both initiatives. Due to this, it is now imperative to understand to what extent teachers with different disciplinary styles are open to implementing programs that honor student voice. It was hypothesized that staff with more authoritarian attitudes would not endorse honoring student voice relative to staff with less authoritarian attitudes. Results of Study 2 were not supported by the hypothesis. While the majority of staff indicated that they “sometimes” honored student voice, this was not significantly correlated with authoritarian attitudes. One item on the scale, “Students at This School Are Only Punished When They Deserve It” was trending significant, indicating that this may, with a larger sample, be associated with honoring student voice. This suggested that staff who were more likely to agree that students were only punished when they deserve it, are more likely to self-report using practices that honor student voice, relative to staff who were less likely to agree that punishment is meted out fairly. This result was unexpected, given the longstanding research of teachers’ disciplinary styles in which authoritarian teachers endorse higher rigidity, increased structure, and demands and expectations (Walker, 2008). This finding may be related to the context of the schools themselves. The schools surveyed were already deeply engaged in discipline reform and have reduced their suspension rates. Currently in New York City (NYC), suspension rates have been plummeting. According to the biannual report released in October 2017 from NYC Board of Education, from January to June 2017, compared to 2016, there was a decrease of 6.7% in total suspensions (New York City Board of Education, 2017). Furthermore, principal suspensions decreased by 5.7% and superintendent suspensions decreased by 9.3%. It may be that due to city-wide discipline reform, the most serious safety threatening behaviors are now resulting in suspension. Therefore, it may

be the case that staff members now feel that when students are suspended, they deserve it. Furthermore, the staff surveyed had been a part of schools that had implemented RJ within the last year. Their overall endorsement of honoring student voice, could be reflective of changing attitudes towards students' decision making and power. Further research is needed to ascertain if this is the case.

Study Limitations

There are several limitations to the studies within this dissertation that are important to consider. The generalizability of the findings from Study 1 is limited due to the small sample size of the interview participants ($n = 14$) at four urban schools. Moreover, the participants from both studies had been recruited from schools that had enacted RJ within the past year and had familiarity with the program. Their lack of knowledge of the central tenets of TI-C may be a result of the lack of exposure to the program itself. Therefore, participants may have had less difficulty responding to the RJ questions compared to TI-C questions.

The use of two coders served to minimize bias and enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of the findings in Study 1. Intraclass correlations and percent agreement were calculated between the codes to enhance credibility and trustworthiness of the coding. Despite this, it is possible that the findings reflect the coders' interpretations of the data instead of the actual views of staff. Furthermore, ICC's for the codes, RJ Repairing Harm, TI-C Student Voice, and TI-C Repairing Harm had fair and poor standards respectively. The poor ICC's could be a result of the coding manual, which needed more conceptual clarity for the raters. It additionally could be reflective of the small sample size, which resulted in heavy weighting of disagreements. Greater reliability may have been found with a larger sample size. Due to this, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Implications and Future Directions of Research

This dissertation explored two initiatives of RJ and TI-C in its overlapping central tenets. Further research should be conducted strengthening and expanding the findings from this study. Due to the characteristics of the sampled participants who were already familiar with RJ, future research should be with participants who have knowledge of implementing both programs. Nevertheless, the results of this study point to an emerging trend of TI-C and RJ being aligned and having similar underlying values. Training groups are already beginning to recognize the overlap. The International Institute for Restorative Practices (IIRP) is offering a symposium on restorative responses to trauma and adversity (Rundell, 2018). Additionally, the Restorative Justice Initiative is holding an annual conference on trauma-informed practices as related to building restorative communities (CUNY Lehman College, 2018). These conferences and trainings point to the field recognizing the need for trauma integration within RJ practices. Furthermore, 13 of the 14 participants (92.9%) stated that there was a need for staff to be more knowledgeable about trauma within schools. As research continues, it could be that RJ becomes a TI-C practice. The future of this could be very promising as RJ could not only empower students and provide schoolwide disciplinary reform, but also identify students struggling with trauma and link them with resources for treatment.

As researchers continue to ascertain the overlap between TI-C and RJ, staff openness to their central tenets should be examined. Further research could clarify whether the central tenets align with teachers' underlying values and if such alignment is necessary for implementation with high fidelity. This could be conducted with the central tenets of repairing harm and fostering a sense of community, which were not examined within this study. Future research should be conducted with a larger sample size in diverse settings to increase generalizability of

its findings. Overall, the findings of this dissertation provide greater conceptual clarity to RJ and TI-C. The two studies contribute to the emerging literature on the overlap and alignment between the two initiatives. Their alignment offers promise that in future implementation efforts, staff will find that the initiatives build on or complement one another, although continued research is needed.

Appendix A

40-minute Interview Protocol with
School Staff Engaged in RJSection 1: Restorative Justice Involvement

1. What is your role in the school?
2. In your opinion, what is restorative justice? What types of activities belong in RJ?
3. To what extent have you been involved in implementing Restorative Justice in your school?
 - What have you been doing, specifically?
4. Have you had prior experience with RJ before this? If so, please describe it.
5. If any, what kind of RJ training have you had?
 - Details: How many days or hours, content of training, who led it?
6. Please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?

Section 2A: Implementing RJ in your school

7. What has worked in implementing RJ in your school?
8. What has not worked in implementing RJ in your school?
9. Has there been an openness to doing RJ from administrators? From teachers? From other school staff? From students?
 - What helped increase that “openness”? What gets in the way?
 - Your thoughts on staffs’ “readiness for change”?
10. Please open the 11 indicators check list:
 - a. What aspect of RJ programming has made the most inroads? Why did you select those?
 - b. What aspect of RJ programming has made the least in-roads? Why did you select those?

11. To what extent does RJ in this school try to increase racial and social justice? If so, how does it?

- Does your current RJ program address issues of power and privilege adequately?

12. What types of RJ programming is needed the most at this point? Why?

Section 2B: Day to day realities

13. With students, how do you handle time constraints in the school day and still try to use restorative justice (e.g., run shorter mediations, limit use of longer circles)?

- How has the RJ work fit into your school given stressors/challenges or the flood of other initiatives?

14. Please describe an incident that resulted in a “restorative process” or resolution?

15. Can you describe a time when you thought an RJ practice was used in a high quality way? What made it “high quality”? What about a time when it was done in a “low quality” way?

16. Is RJ connecting to other types of programs or initiatives in the school?

- In *what ways is it connecting* to similar initiatives?

Section 3: Trauma-Informed Care

17. Now, we are going to switch gears. Please imagine the following scenario: During a community-building circle in a classroom, a student discloses that he has experienced a traumatic event and is feeling shaken-up and worried it might happen again.

- a. How would you approach this scenario? What are your next steps?

18. In your perspective, what is trauma-informed care?

19. Now, please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. This is unlike the students’ typical behavior.

If the staff member was educated about trauma, how would it affect their mindset and their actions? What would the staff member do next?

20. What background do you have in trauma informed care prior to joining RJ?

- Have you ever had any professional training in trauma?
- If so, what might be some signs a student is experience symptoms of trauma?

21. In general, are staff knowledgeable about trauma within the school?

- Should professional development about the effects of trauma be a priority?
- 22. To what extent has your professional development in RJ addressed trauma?
- 23. Have students' exposure to trauma come up during RJ processes and practices?
- 24. In what ways might RJ processes and practices help students who have been exposed to trauma?
- 25. Are there ways trauma-informed programs in the building already link to RJ practices?
 - a. Are there ways the RJ practices and processes might better link to trauma-informed care in the building?
 - b. What would be the challenges in linking up RJ practices with trauma-informed care in the building?

Section 4: Perceived Change

- Please look over the “Perceived Change Due to RJ Sheet”
- Please circle any possible positive change you have seen as a result of programming?
- Put an X by what you want to improve in the coming year as a result of RJ programming?

Have any of these had negative changes due to RJ programming?

- What types of RJ indicators of change might be overlooked or not detected so easily (e.g., ways of relating, engaging in a process to resolve disputes)?
- What would we see in your school in several years to indicate there has been substantial change?

Section 5: Imagining possibilities

- If you could imagine a school that is fully based on restorative justice and racial and social justice, what would that school look like?

(open ended, but query about how it would affect/transform varying aspects of the school: hallways, programming, climate of the school, parent involvement, curriculum, mission, security guards etc.)?

- c. What would the staff experience in this school?
 - d. What would shift for teachers in this school?
 - e. How would the student experience in this school change?
 - f. How would you personally change in this school?
- What impact can racial-justice based, restorative justice have beyond the four walls of your school?

- Finally, one last big picture question: What does “justice” mean to you? And what are challenges in your ideal form of justice existing?

Section 6: Demographics.

So we can get a sense of the diversity of the people we are interviewing, we have a few last questions about you:

Research id: _____

- How many school years have you been in your current role at this school? _____
- How many years were you in this role prior to coming here? _____
- If you feel comfortable sharing what is your race and ethnicity? _____
- If you feel comfortable sharing what is your gender or gender identity? _____
- Anything else you would like to share about your identity? _____

Anything else you want to add about your hopes for RJ in your school?

Appendix B

Trauma Informed Care and Restorative Justice

Coding Manual

Neela Karikhalli, Psy.M and Anne Gregory, Ph.D.

Directions on how to use the manual

The coding manual is designed to address the following research question.

Research Question 1): “According to school staff, to what degree **do the central tenets of RJ align with trauma-informed care** (e.g., repairing harm, sense of community, honoring student voice)?”

Hypothesis 1: It is hypothesized that school staff will identify the central tenets of RJ and TI-C as being very aligned. Specifically, school staff will indicate shared central tenets of honoring student voice, fostering a sense of community, and repairing harm as healing and empowering to children who have undergone trauma.

Codes in this manual will be **dichotomous (e.g., 0 for Absence, 1 for Presence)**.

You will be reading the staff interviews that are highlighted and noting the sections within the dialogue that correspond to one of the codes. There are sample interview questions that tend to elicit each code to guide the reader however codes are also **global**.

A global code refers to a single code that is assigned to an entire interview record that indicates the extent to which each coding category is endorsed by the interviewee. Please also allow for emergent codes that you believe are reflected within the dialogue and note this within your coding.

Please refer to this manual prior to assigning a code, as it provides descriptions of the codes and examples of potential coding responses.

SUMMARY OF CODES:

1. RJ-Elements
2. RJ-Student Voice
3. RJ-Sense of Community/Relationship Building
4. RJ-Repairing Harm
5. TI-C-Elements
6. TI-C-Student Voice
7. TI-C-Sense of Community/Relationship Building
8. TI-C-Repairing Harm
9. TI-C-Need
10. Overlap

You will be filling out the excel document with the final codes for each interviewee. As you read the interview, highlight the section or quote that corresponds with a code and write this down as your justification as a track changes comment

Code 1: To what extent can staff identify the common values or central tenets of RJ? (RJ-Elements)

Interview Questions That Address This Code:

- In your opinion, what is restorative justice? What types of activities belong in RJ?
- Please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?

Coding Scheme:

- (0) **Does Not Identify.** Unfamiliar with RJ, minimal exposure to RJ, unable to identify any of the central tenets of RJ.
 - a. SKIP TO CODE 2 IF 0.
- (1) **Identifies.** Familiar with RJ, able to identify at least one central tenet of RJ (whatever subject states).
- (N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Responses:

- “Um that’s a really good question (laughs). I will try to give a somewhat satisfactory response, so I don’t sound like a complete idiot. Um... I certainly know what not to do. Just to kind of jump on the student and get in his face or be aggressive...um I really don’t know when it’s getting out of hand, I don’t know the polite way to bring it back in.” (HAS NOT HAD MUCH EXPOSURE TO RJ)
- “I know you want to gather data but it’s hard for me to really speak to that one way or another. I’m not having the first-hand answers, or the first-person accounts, so to speak.” (DOES NOT KNOW RJ)

Sample 1 Responses:

- “Um I think of it in terms of an approach of building community and adjusting harm that occurs in that community. So, in schools I think about the way we create connections among students and teachers and other members of the whole community and establish ways to address harms. I think of it as being more.... the opposite of punitive maybe? I think about it in terms of creating a system for accountability that will hopefully encourage better decision making and better more functional connections and relationships between people.” (ABLE TO NAME AN RJ TENET)
- “I think it is a practice of coming up with alternatives and using different modes of actions that can teach the kids a better path sometimes in decision making. And y’know kind of keep themselves out of trouble and self-regulate themselves and each other.”

Code 2: To what extent do staff identify that honoring student voice as an RJ tenet? (RJ-Student Voice)

RJ defines honoring student voice as: "the ability to make a difference through what one says, and to have a say in key decisions. When parties have a voice, their viewpoints, thoughts, and feelings receive a 'fair hearing'" (Sprague & Tobin, 2017, p. 11).

Interview Questions That Address This Code:

- Please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?
- In your opinion, what is restorative justice? What types of activities belong in RJ?

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Staff does not identify “honoring student voice” when describing the central tenet of RJ or the process of RJ

(1) **Identifies.** Staff identifies honoring student voice as a central tenet in RJ.

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

- “Uh it’s y’know an alternative to suspension. It’s moving away from suspensions at any time so it’s just nice to have another kind of intervention to try and address what’s going on with the students” DOES NOT IDENTIFY

Sample 1 Responses:

- “Um I might have a private conversation after class and say “listen, what’s going on?” Have that little sit-down and just say ‘listen there was an incident in class, what kind of brought us to this, is everything okay?’
- “So, I probably would bring them to the side and just ask them you know, “hey you don’t seem like yourself today, you seem a little but tweaked, like you know. Can you tell me a little bit about you know what’s going on? And if there’s anything we can do to help when we get back in the circle or anything you’d want to talk about when we get back into it?” hopefully they’d open up.”
- “And so that were I think a lot of that student voice came from was in knowing, and seeing, and recognizing their power um and then giving them the tools to exercise it um and to, to, to use it and speak truth to power. Um and to also let them know you know like they-, they’re the ones who get to advocate and create the future um and that we’re not the sole like indicators, or we’re not the sole people who are making decisions, but that they have-, and that’s primarily restorative, that’s the practice right? To eliminate hierarchy, to say that like there’s no “us” and “you” or “them” and “us” but to say that like we all have an equal seat in this circle, at this table and wherever it is that we are.”

Code 3: To what extent is repairing harm identified as an RJ tenet? (RJ-Repairing Harm)

“RJ repairs harm after an infraction has occurred by asking the victim and disputant to sit together and discuss their subjective experience of the incident. By providing both of these individuals’ opportunities to speak, RJ acknowledges the emotions and those impacted by the wrongdoing (Gregory et al., 2014).”

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- Please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?
- In your opinion, what is restorative justice? What types of activities belong in RJ?
- Please describe an incident that resulted in a “restorative process” or resolution?

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Staff does not identify repairing harm (conflict resolution) when describing RJ and its processes and practices

(1) **Identifies.** Identifies circles, conflict resolution, repairing harm as central to RJ (N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

- “Um definitely I see there are more groups um and then I’m on the fringe of this, not because I don’t want to because of the time what we don’t have. But I know our students are more engaged in small groups and just seeing them interacting and understanding that they are people who are different and being able to appreciate differences and being more outspoken about appreciating each other and thinking about what they should say and do to someone else. I’ve seen a change, not on a grand scale, but there is a change in people’s attitudes towards people who are perceived to be different. **“DOES NOT IDENTIFY REPAIRING HARM**

Sample 1 Response:

- “Um I deal with it more in discipline. We do a lot of mediation, we try to get the kids to understand what took place inside of an incident. Whether it’s kids getting into a fight, kids just having a verbal discussion, or whether that be a misunderstanding of things, we want them to understand that there are other points of view and sometimes people get hurt in things. And that there are other ways to talk about it, and see other points of view, so we can come to a common understanding and understand how we move forward from there and what we can take out of and learn from it.”
- “Um I think of it in terms of an approach of building community and adjusting harm that occurs in that community. So, in schools I think about the way we create connections among students and teachers and other members of the whole community and establish ways to address harms.”
- “So, I think circles being a huge piece of that. Circles are practices where people can choose to share, choose to express y’know responses about themselves and get to know other people. And also conflict resolution is also what I would say is really important in that.”

Code 4: To what extent is sense of community/relationship building identified as an RJ tenet? (RJ- Sense of Community/Relationship Building)

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- Please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. If the teacher had an RJ mindset, how would the teachers handle this behavior?
- In your opinion, what is restorative justice? What types of activities belong in RJ?
- Please describe an incident that resulted in a “restorative process” or resolution?

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Staff does not identify sense of community/ relationship building as an RJ tenet.

(1) **Identifies.** Identifies sense of community/relationship building as central to RJ

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

- “One, engage the other kids into doing something to take their minds off of him, whether you give them some type of assignment to do, and then you pull this kid out to the side. I would say, take him out in the hallway and not aggressively talk to them. But ask them, "Are you having a bad day? Do you need time to yourself?" And see-- kids, I know they can be rude and-- but they are still kids who think they know everything.” DOES NOT IDENTIFY SENSE OF COMMUNITY

Sample 1 Response:

- “Um there’s a lot of events, we have more events each year, then we did in prior years. I don’t know if there’s been a big initiative or a big push. I’ve definitely seen more things happening, like a kick boxing class, a poetry slam. I can’t think of all at the top of my head. I have been... I don’t have a whole lot of time to go and visit all the events when I’m teaching or I’m working so I can’t really see first-hand, but I know that they’re happening and um I think it’s really good for the school community that they are happening.”
- “Um definitely circles. Is that what you mean? Like that or like today they’re having- like um positive I guess self-building activities. Like today there’s going to be kickboxing. And there was like- RJ is doing- it’s supposed to be Day of Silence in conjunction with (?). Things in that nature. Making students more conscious of others. Uh what else? We had that weeklong like activities where there are different workshops for students. There was yoga here. And how to do a resume. And different topics up for discussion. I thought it was really positive and the students really enjoyed it.”

Code 5: Can staff describe what Trauma-Informed Care (TI-C) is? Are they able to define or describe it in some way? (TI-C-Elements)

Trauma-informed care is to understand the ways in which traumatic experiences may have impacted the lives of the individuals involved and to apply that understanding to the design of systems and services so they accommodate needs and promote healing (Carello & Butler, 2015).

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- In your perspective, what is trauma-informed care?
- Have you ever heard of the term, “Trauma-informed care”?

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Absence.** Staff does not know or cannot identify what TI-C is.

a. **If 0, skip to code 6.**

(1) **Presence.** Staff can identify what TI-C or has heard of the term.

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

- “Uh, a term I have not heard about.”
- “I have not heard of it, but I’m kind of piecing together what I think it means based on the words.”
- “Mhm, no”

Sample 1 Response:

- “Trauma informed care? Trauma can be anything that causes harm to a person...emotionally, physically, mentally... And being informed is having all the information and utilizing all the resources at our disposal to help with the situation.”
- “I mean it’s something that we started talking about this year is like having specific training around trauma, and students that have experienced trauma and addressing it because that’s very different from um, you know some of the R-, I mean its connected but it’s a different you know, it’s a different um topic so um, I don’t think we’ve done the training. I don’t, as far as I know no one has been trained or anything, but to me, the idea is that you are able to identify like the signs of trauma and be able to address it appropriately or find the appropriate person to help address the issue. Um, I mean to me like even my most difficult student they’re difficult because they’ve been traumatized. You know, all behavior is a result, is rooted in some kind of trauma or something that they’ve experienced in their lives so to me it’s very much connected but it’s a you know being able to identify it appropriately and then being able to get them the right resources.”

Code 6: To what extent is honoring student voice identified as a TI-C tenet? (TI-C-Student Voice)

TI-C schools are concerned with students' perspectives not just the staff perspectives. A well-implemented TI-C school tries to understand the situation from the student's point of view as a way of addressing trauma and empowerment (Hodas, 2006)

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- "Now, please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. This is unlike the students' typical behavior...If the staff member was educated about trauma, how would it affect their mindset and their actions? What would the staff member do next?"
- "Now, we are going to switch gears. Please imagine the following scenario: During a community-building circle in a classroom, a student discloses that he has experienced a traumatic event and is feeling shaken-up and worried it might happen again...How would you approach this scenario? What are your next steps?"

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Student voice not identified, or not considered central to TI-C.

(1) **Identifies. Honoring** student voice identified as a central tenet of TI-C.

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

Sample 1 Response:

- "If the teacher knew-- if the staff member knew. If they think they're capable of handling that, then I would say, go for it. How they handle it is communicating with them, just talking to them. They might just want you to listen to them. I don't know. Not necessarily talk. Just listen to me. I've had kids that say, "Don't talk. Just let me vent to you right now." I've had that, and sometimes it's just that. It's just venting."
- "Um, first I would ask the student if they're still comfortable to continue the conversation within the circle. Um and then ask the peers if they're comfortable and if they are going to respect that, you know say J is telling us a serious story and we do find that it's something really serious that needs to like go to the principal or something you know we would still give advice but I would personally take that child aside and say, "this is a serious matter and um me alone cannot only know the story for this reason"; I would explain why and then tell the counselor and then the counselor can take it from there to tell. You know because there's like a chain..."

Code 7: To what extent is repairing harm or healing identified as a TI-C tenet? (TI-C- Repairing Harm)

“TI-C schools posit that after a trauma has occurred, that the student hurt by the incident needs to be empowered and encouraged to process these instances as a way of moving forward and to prevent further symptoms and psychopathology (Fallot & Harris, 2009).”

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- “Now, please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. This is unlike the students’ typical behavior...If the staff member was educated about trauma, how would it affect their mindset and their actions? What would the staff member do next?”
- “Now, we are going to switch gears. Please imagine the following scenario: During a community-building circle in a classroom, a student discloses that he has experienced a traumatic event and is feeling shaken-up and worried it might happen again...How would you approach this scenario? What are your next steps?”

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Repairing Harm not identified, or not considered central to TI-C.

(1) **Identifies.** Repairing harm identified as a central tenet of TI-C.

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

****Note that the interviewee does not need to use the words “repair harm” in their discussion. They need to mention that TI-C is part of a process of helping a student recover, address trauma, or heal****

Sample 0 Response:

Sample 1 Response:

- “I think it can. Instead of punishment (inaudible), it takes responsibility and accountability for things that have caused them harm. Even if the harm comes directly out of their trauma but it cares for them and views them as a human who is wounded and needs support. Some of the students that we teach that get into trouble are people who have been hurt. I think that the punitive responses can re-traumatize them more and harden them from being open to therapeutic interventions. “
- “I don’t know exactly how I would respond, but I know for certain I would follow up with the student to kind of take more actionable steps to make sure that they are safe and okay. I’d probably engage guidance and other people in the school that know how to deal with students and trauma.”

Code 8: To what extent is a sense of community and relationships identified as a TI-C tenet? (TI-C- Community Building/Relationship Building)

A child who has experienced trauma is in need of this sense of safety not only to participate in the classroom, but also to obtain a sense of well-being (Walkley & Cox, 2013). To help a child feel safe in the educational setting, a school must provide structure and limits, routine, and consistency (Steinke, 2016).

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- “Now, please imagine the following scenario: A student in a community-building circle is disruptive and talks back to teachers. She seems irritable and easily distracted. This is unlike the students’ typical behavior...If the staff member was educated about trauma, how would it affect their mindset and their actions? What would the staff member do next?”
- “Now, we are going to switch gears. Please imagine the following scenario: During a community-building circle in a classroom, a student discloses that he has experienced a traumatic event and is feeling shaken-up and worried it might happen again...How would you approach this scenario? What are your next steps?”

Coding Scheme:

(0) **Does Not Identify.** Community-Building/Relationship building not considered central to TI-C.

(1) **Identifies.** Community-Building/Relationship Building identified as a central tenet of TI-C.
(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

Sample 1 Response:

- “We have students that just come in here for no apparent reason and they’re just crying um, they just don’t wanna talk and you just sit there you just, I literally will sit here and stay quiet with you. Won’t say a word, but I want you to feel that I’m here supporting you even if we’re not talking. So, we have a lot of that, and it’s not only with crying some of them just lash out from just punching the wall. Um, or you know they don’t want to do the work or they just feel stressed. It’s just so much different emotions that I see and this is like, I wouldn’t say everyday but being here of a year, you see it a lot.”
- “And hopefully building a rapport so that you can kind of be a safe place or a safe space to share what’s going on, and also, they know that if they-, they’re having a moment (laughs)-sometimes it really more than a moment-if they’re experiencing distress in some way you can give them space. Actually, had a small, I had a situation like that last week. I had a student come down and he was very frantic he had engaged in protected sex but the young lady had told him the she thought she was pregnant. I’ve never seen a young man respond so frantically and I think at that time-because I could’ve started questioning him, I could’ve started started saying “why are you,

why are you pacing and nervous and sweating” but what we did was, we took a walk. And we walked to a bench that’s out in the open um, in between the office that he had come in to and I kind of just let him calm down.”

Code 9: To what extent is knowledge about trauma needed in schools? (TI-C-Need)

Interview Questions that address this Code:

- In what ways might RJ processes and practices help students who have been exposed to trauma
- Do you think staff in general are knowledgeable of trauma in the school?
- Do you think there should be more professional development on the effects of trauma? Should that be a priority in your staff and colleagues?

Coding Scheme:

(0) Absence. Knowledge of trauma not needed or identified.

(1) Presence. Knowledge of trauma needed, staff members state that staff are not knowledgeable about trauma currently and a need for more trauma knowledge is necessary.

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

- “I would feel more comfortable leaving it up to the administrator. I’m just a school counselor.”

Sample 1 Response:

- “Yes, I feel like staff do need to know more about that. I feel staff need to be trained more about trauma and the mental issues of students and I feel like staff need to take the time to read or get to know their students. Because if you have a class and you’re teaching and you look at the student and the student is doing something but you don’t quite understand and you just gonna kick the child out, I’m kind of blaming you because you didn’t take the time to find out, “who is this student? What is this student’s problem?” you know.”
- “You know what...I wish I could say yes. But even in the school in Harlem, just the absolute lack of interest in addressing the kids needs for critical incident debriefing and counseling in relation to the slashing or cutting incident was unbelievable.... And when we said, perhaps we need to get mental health involved, perhaps we need counseling supports, do you think the school did anything about it? They didn’t even address trauma that was in their sanction, that was in the students’ direct experience adequately, let alone address the sort of trauma that a kid walks in the door with.”

Code 10: Do staff identify an overlap on the usefulness of both programs? (Overlap)Interview Questions that address this Code:

- In what ways might RJ processes and practices help students who have been exposed to trauma?
- Are there ways trauma-informed programs in the building already link to RJ practices?
- Are there ways the RJ practices and processes might better link to trauma-informed care in the building?
- What would be the challenges in linking up RJ practices with trauma-informed care in the building?

Coding Scheme:

(0) Absence. Overlap not noted between the two programs.

(1) Presence. Overlap between two programs discussed, or identified as having common components

(N/A). Subject was not asked the question during the interview.

Sample 0 Response:

Sample 1 Response:

- “I think RJ is and should be trauma-informed care. I think it is a trauma-informed practice. I think it's a really big question if it is trauma-informed so much.”
- “Empowerment. You know, when students learn and I think the connectivity of maybe being on a task force or something like that, definitely could be supportive of someone who has experienced trauma. You know, the vibe is like; it’s like a no judgment club. You could be the nerd, you could be- I mean this is predominately Black school- but you could be the only one of a certain race and everyone is welcome. So I think that’s tremendous for anyone but definitely someone who might need more support because they’ve experienced something traumatic or currently in the midst of something. And they’re all working on something positive”
- “And we were looking at seeing how we can incorporate what they want to offer the school along with what, what programs or things may exist. Because you know therapy is still taboo in a lot of communities and getting help with something this taboo in a lot of communities both culturally and religiously so, I think giving students exposure to certain things would be helpful in helping them. I think RJ is a place to start because a lot of the components of RJ is not just “restoring harm” but really focusing on community-building and you know all these things kind of fall back in connection with each other, you know.”

References

- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools: An evidentiary review and recommendations. *The American Psychologist*, 63, 852-862.
- Balfanz, R., Byrnes, V., & Fox, J. (2014). Sent home and put off-track: The antecedents, disproportionalities, and consequences of being suspended in the ninth grade. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In Brooks-Gunn, J., Lerner, R., and Peterson, A. C. (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Adolescence*, (pp. 746-758). New York, NY: Garland.
- Berliner, L., & Kolko, D. J. (2016). Trauma informed care: A commentary and critique. *Child Maltreatment*, 21(2), 168–172.
- Brown, J. D., King, M. A., & Wissow, L. S. (2017). The central role of relationships with trauma-informed integrated care for children and youth. *Academic Pediatrics*, 17(7), S94-S101.
- Cameron, M., & Sheppard, S. M. (2006). School discipline and social work practice: Application of research and theory to intervention. *Children & Schools*, 28(1), 15-22.
- Carello, J., & Butler, L. D. (2015). Practicing what we teach: Trauma-informed educational practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 35(3), 262-278.
- Carrion, V. G., & Wong, S. S. (2012). Can traumatic stress alter the brain? Understanding the

- implications of early trauma on brain development and learning. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 51(2), S23-S28.
- Cornell, D. (2014). The authoritative school climate survey and the school climate bullying survey: Description and research summary. *Charlottesville: University of Virginia, Virginia Youth Violence Project*.
- De Bellis, M. D., Hooper, S. R., Spratt, E. G., & Woolley, D. P. (2009). Neuropsychological findings in childhood neglect and their relationships to pediatric PTSD. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 15(06), 868-878.
- Delaney-Black, V., Covington, C., Ondersma, S. J., Nordstrom-Klee, B., Templin, T., Ager, J., & Sokol, R. J. (2002). Violence exposure, trauma, and IQ and/or reading deficits among urban children. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 156(3), 280-285.
- Domitrovich, C. E., Bradshaw, C. P., Poduska, J. M., Hoagwood, K., Buckley, J. A., & Olin, S. (2008). Maximizing the implementation quality of evidence-based preventive interventions in schools: A conceptual framework. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, 1, 6-28.
- Donisch, K., Bray, C., & Gewirtz, A. (2016). Child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health, and education providers conceptualizations of trauma-informed practice. *Child Maltreatment*, 21(2), 125-134.
- Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., Weissberg, R. P., & Gullotta, T. P. (2016). *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*. Guilford Publications.

- Fallot, R. D., & Harris, M. (2009). Creating cultures of trauma-informed care (CCTIC): A self-assessment and planning protocol. Washington, DC: *Community Connections*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthcare.uiowa.edu/icmh/documents/CCTICSelf-AssessmentandPlanningProtocol0709.pdf>
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., Turner, H., & Hamby, S.L. (2005). The victimization of children and youth: A comprehensive, national survey. *Child Maltreatment, 10*, 5-25.
- Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., Shattuck, A., & Hamby, S. L. (2015). Prevalence of childhood exposure to violence, crime, and abuse. *JAMA Pediatrics, 168*, 540–546.
- Forman, S. G. (2015). *Implementation of mental health programs in schools: A change agent's guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Forman, S. G., Olin, S. S., Hoagwood, K. E., Crowe, M., & Saka, N. (2009). Evidence-based interventions in schools: Developers' views on implementation barriers and facilitators. *School Mental Health, 1*, 26–36.
- Forman, S. G., Shapiro, E. S., Coddling, R. S., Gonzales, J. E., Reddy, L. A., Rosenfield, S. A., & ... Stoiber, K. C. (2013). Implementation science and school psychology. *School Psychology Quarterly, 28*(2), 77-100.
- Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2016). Restorative justice in US schools: A research review. *San Francisco, CA: WestEd Justice and Prevention Training Center*.
- Goldberg, C. (2003). Settings for school improvement. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 50*(1), 7-16.

- Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2014). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 26(4), 325-353.
- Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond zero tolerance policies in high school. *Theory into Practice*, 48(2), 106-113.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Mediratta, K., (2017). Eliminating disparities in school discipline: A framework for intervention. Special Issue on equity in school. *Review of Research in Education*, 47, 253-278.
- Gregory, A., & Weinstein, R. S. (2004). Connection and regulation at home and in school predicting growth in achievement for adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19(4), 405-427.
- Han, S. S., & Weiss, B. (2005). Sustainability of teacher implementation of school-based mental health programs. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 33(6), 665-679.
- Hanson, R. F., & Lang, J. (2016). A critical look at trauma-informed care among agencies and systems serving maltreated youth and their families. *Child Maltreatment*, 21(2), 95–100.
- Hodas, G. R. (2006). Responding to childhood trauma: The promise and practice of trauma informed care. *Pennsylvania Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services*, 1-77.
- Hunt, K. L., Martens, P. M., & Belcher, H. M. (2011). Risky business: Trauma exposure and rate of posttraumatic stress disorder in African American children and adolescents. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 24(3), 365-369.
- Huang, F. & Cornell, D. (2016). Multilevel factor structure, concurrent validity, and test–retest

- reliability of the high school teacher version of the authoritative school climate survey. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 34(6), 536-549.
doi:10.1177/0734282915621439
- Huang, F. L., Cornell, D. G., Konold, T., Meyer, J. P., Lacey, A., Nekvasil, E. K., & Shukla, K. (2015). Multilevel factor structure and concurrent validity of the teacher version of the authoritative school climate survey. *Journal of School Health*, 85(12), 843-851.
- Huang, L. N., Flatow, R., Biggs, T., Afayee, S., Smith, K., & Clark, T. (2014). SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach. *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration*.
- Ko, S. J., Ford, J. D., Kassam-Adams, N., Berkowitz, S. J., Wilson, C., Wong, M., & Layne, C. M. (2008). Creating trauma-informed systems: child welfare, education, first responders, health care, juvenile justice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39(4), 396.
- Kataoka, S., Jaycox, L. H., Wong, M., Nadeem, E., Langley, A., Tang, L., & Stein, B. D. (2011). Effects on school outcomes in low-income minority youth: Preliminary findings from a community-partnered study of a school trauma intervention. *Ethnicity and Disease*, 21: 71-77.
- Langley, A. K., Nadeem, E., Kataoka, S. H., Stein, B. D., & Jaycox, L. H. (2010). Evidence-based mental health programs in schools: Barriers and facilitators of successful implementation. *School mental health*, 2(3), 105-113.
- McInerney, M., & McKlindon, A. (2014). Unlocking the door to learning: Trauma- Informed classrooms & transformational schools. *Education Law Center*.
- McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., & Weedon, E. (2008). Can restorative

- practices in schools make a difference? *Educational Review*, 60(4), 405-417.
- New York City Board of Education. (2017). Local law 93 of 2015- Biannual Report [Table]. Retrieved from: <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/89A68127-9414-4189-9F65-8D76B2C61C5B/0/October2017LL93BiannualReportfinal103017.pdf>
- Noell, G., Witt, J., Slider, N., Connell, J., Gatti, S., Williams, K., et al. (2005). Treatment implementation following behavioral consultation in schools: A comparison of three follow-up strategies. *School Psychology Review*, 34, 87–106.
- Oberle, E., Domitrovich, C. E., Meyers, D. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2016). Establishing systemic social and emotional learning approaches in schools: A framework for schoolwide implementation. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(3), 277-297. doi:10.1080/0305764X.2015.1125450
- Oehlberg, B. (2008). Why schools need to be trauma informed. *Trauma and Loss: Research and Intervention*, 8(2), 12-15.
- Perkins, S., & Graham-Bermann, S. (2012). Violence exposure and the development of school-related functioning: Mental health, neurocognition, and learning. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(1), 89-98.
- Porche, M. V., Costello, D. M., & Rosen-Reynoso, M. (2016). Adverse family experiences, child mental health, and educational outcomes for a national sample of students. *School Mental Health*, 8 (1), 44-60.
- Reinbergs, E. J., & Fefer, S. A. (2018). Addressing trauma in schools: Multitiered service delivery options for practitioners. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(3), 250-263.

Restorative Justice Initiative. (2018, May). *Restorative practices and transformative justice: Challenges and opportunities*. Restorative Practices and Transformative Justice Conference at Lehman College.

Royston, P. (2004). Multiple imputation of missing values. *Stata journal*, 4(3), 227-41.

Rundell, F. (2018, July). *A restorative journey: Transforming relational harm*. Presentation to be presented at the International Institute of Restorative Practices (IIRP) Summer Symposium.

Schiff, M. (2013, January). Dignity, disparity, and desistance: Effective restorative justice strategies to plug the “school-to-prison pipeline.” Paper presented at the *Center for Civil Rights Remedies National Conference, Closing the School to Research Gap: Research to Remedies*, Washington, DC.

Schnurr, M. P., & Lohman, B. J. (2013). Long term effects of exposure to abuse during childhood: Longitudinal impact of toddler's exposure to domestic violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 22, 1015–1031.

Shriver, T., & Weissberg, R. (1996). No new wars! Prevention should be a comprehensive strategy, not a fad. *Education Week*, 15, 34-47.

Souers, K., & Hall, P. (2016). *Fostering resilient learners: Strategies for creating a trauma-sensitive classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sprague, J., & Tobin, T. (2017). *Aligning positive behavioral interventions and supports and restorative practices: An implementation fidelity manual*.

Steinke, C. M. (2016). Trauma informed schools and the lasallian tradition-rooted in the same values. *AXIS: Journal of Lasallian Higher Education*, 7(3).

- Stormont, M., Newman Thomas, C., & Van Garderen, D. (2012). Introduction to the special issue: Building capacity to improve student outcomes through collaboration: Current issues and innovative approaches. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49 (5), 399-401. doi: 10.1002/pits.21605
- Walker, J. M. (2008). Looking at teacher practices through the lens of parenting style. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 76(2), 218-240.
- Walkley, M., & Cox, T. L. (2013). Building trauma-informed schools and communities. *Children & Schools*, 35, 123–126.
- Wallace Jr, J. M., Goodkind, S., Wallace, C. M., & Bachman, J. G. (2008). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in school discipline among US high school students: 1991-2005. *The Negro Educational Review*, 59(1-2), 47.
- Wachtel, T., Costello, B., & Wachtel, J. (2009). The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians and administrators. Bethlehem, PA: *International Institute of Restorative Practices*.
- Warren, M. R. (2011). Building a political constituency for urban school reform. *Urban Education*, 46(3), 484-512.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 73(1), 287-301.