DOI: https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2023.1102.0583

Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 11, Number 02, 2023, Pages 2855–2873
Journal Homepage:
https://journals.internationalrasd.org/index.php/pjhss

Relationship between Restorative Practices and School Climate at Secondary Level District Lahore

Fahd Naveed Kausar [1], Zareen Ghaffar[2], Shahida Jan[3]

[1] Assistant Professor, School of Education, Minhaj University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: fahdnaveed1@hotmail.com
[2] M.Phil. Scholar, School of Education, Minhaj University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: zareenghafar31@gmail.com
[3] Deputy Regional Director, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Regional Campus, Multan, Pakistan, Email: shahida.jan@aiou.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: April 20, 2023
Revised: June 28, 2023
Accepted: June 29, 2023
Available Online: June 30, 2023

Keywords:
Restorative Practices
School Climate
Secondary Level
District Lahore

Funding:
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to explore and compare the relationships between RPs and SC. The population consists of all public (male/female) and private (male/female) secondary school systems with 10 or more branches in the Lahore district. Multistage sampling techniques were used. The researcher used the cluster sampling approach to split the entire population into five groups (Tehsils). By using the stratified sampling approach, the researcher was able to identify two groups of strata: public/private, as well as male/female. From the private sector, a sample consisting of five male and five female schools from each tehsil in Lahore was selected. 520 teachers as a sample were selected. A questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The researcher used both descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings revealed a strong positive relationship between restorative practices and school climate, there is no significant difference between RPs and SC of public and private schools and there is a significant difference between RPs and SC of male and female. For future research, it recommended that Schools should invest in training and resources to effectively implement RPs, which can promote a more inclusive, supportive, and positive SC.

Corresponding Author's Email: fahdnaveed1@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

A safe learning environment must be established in the classroom to make students learn effectively and successfully. A student's growth and development are significantly influenced by their environment at school. A functioning disciplinary system and a positive climate are essential for school success. For many years, administrators and educators have placed a high priority on finding efficient methods of monitoring and managing the behaviour of students. Many scholars and researchers think that punishment has been associated with school discipline (Katic, Alba, & Johnson, 2020). In addition to making sure that students and staff are safe and fostering a climate where students may succeed, the discipline of the school is also meant to reduce future undesirable behaviour. Schools, their stakeholders, and legislators are becoming increasingly concerned about pensions, particularly about the suspension of students at the secondary level. Students who are suspended have a lower likelihood of graduating, which may be at least partially because they lose out on the necessary instructional time to improve academically.

Exclusionary punishment methods like suspension, according to recent studies, may be hindering the academic accomplishment of students (Thorsborne, 2000). Correlational Studies have linked student academic decline to suspension. In addition to the unfavourable effects of suspensions, there is little proof that they alter misbehaviour or improve the climate of the school. As a method to lower suspension rates, RPs have earned support from schools, their stakeholders, and legislators. Many scholars think that using constructive methods as opposed to punitive ones can improve school discipline. Increased efficacy and the development of

positive relationships result in more effective learning settings (Liang et al., 2020). Students may be less likely to misbehave if connections between students and staff are improved proactively, and if classrooms and schools are made to feel like communities. Additionally, by dealing with serious behaviour in a restorative way, students may come to understand the consequences of their conduct and become less inclined to offend in the future. In order to achieve the goal of safe schools with effective learning climates, numerous researchers have recently pushed for research-based approaches to improve SC (Gregory, Ward-Seidel, & Carter, 2021).

Restorative strategies have been marketed as a research-based approach for improving school environment. These techniques reduce harm by fostering positive relationships and deal with conflict in a way that mends broken ones (Acosta et al., 2019). For a long time, educators have engaged in a critical discussion about how to manage student conduct and discover methods that can improve climate of school without using punitive techniques. This study offered a distinctive viewpoint about positive discipline strategy that aimed at improving climate of school. Hence, At the secondary level in the district of Lahore, this study aims to investigate the relationship between Restorative Practises (RPs) and School Climate (SC). It is essential to maintain discipline in schools so that students of all ages are able to learn in an atmosphere free from disruptions. The question of which strategies are the most effective in addressing disruptive student behavior has been a topic of discussion amongst school administrators and educators for quite some time. Despite the significance of having an effective and well-functioning school discipline system, many school administrators and instructors maintain a zero-tolerance policy toward infractions (Bazemore & Leip, 2000).

Many educators and professionals believe that the terms "punishment" and "school discipline" have essentially become interchangeable. The goals of school discipline are to minimize potentially disruptive behavior in the future, teach children how to communicate and behave appropriately in school and in society, ensure the safety of everyone, and provide an atmosphere in which children can learn (Dickey, 1998). However, strict methods of discipline are ineffective when it comes to achieving the aim of raising overall student success. Due to the many different interpretations and applications of school policies, it is difficult to ensure that all students are treated equitably (Dickey, 1998). There are statistics on the disproportionate amount of students from ethnic minorities who get lengthy suspensions. Absence from school for disciplinary reasons poses inherent concerns that may cause or exacerbate troubles for the absent students (Haft, 1999). Zero tolerance policies have not been proved to improve student behavior or make schools more inviting. Growing evidence indicates that expulsion and suspension from school increase the risk that a student would participate in disruptive behavior in the future, as well as reduce their academic performance and cause them to drop out of school (Thorsborne, 2000). Researchers concur that severe punishments have a substantial role in maintaining the "school-to-prison pipeline" (Schweigert, 1999).

Darling-Hammond and DePaoli (2020) looked at the relationship between student activities and suspensions discovered that removal from school has consequences that extend beyond the classroom. A two-year study of teachers' perceptions on disruptive student behaviors and the methods used to address these issues found that administrators and instructors need professional development on how to handle disruptive student behaviors. Students that demonstrate disruptive behaviors are routinely removed from the classroom, resulting in low academic achievement. As a result, removing a student from the learning environment has a detrimental influence on the learner's possibilities and capacity to learn (Darling-Hammond & DePaoli, 2020). Traditional educational system is the application of punitive consequences, which influences student learning. Few studies have looked at SC and discipline from a preventive perspective. The disproportionate suspension of African-American pupils for minor violations exemplifies the uneven application of harsh disciplinary measures. According to Katic et al. (2020), teachers are more likely to send African-American kids to the office than White children, owing to racial inequalities in out-of-school suspensions. Several studies have shown that, contrary to popular belief, disciplinary discipline is not necessary to preserve order in the discipline (McCold, 1998). Fostering relationships and enhancing efficiency can help to establish effective and happy learning environments.

2. Theoretical Framework

The literature on zero tolerance legislation, the school-to-prison pipeline, positive behavior support at the school level, RPs, and school counselors provided the theoretical basis for this research. According to the findings of a recent study, even one suspension can increase the likelihood of a kid having poor academic performance and eventually dropping out of school (Ramirez, 2018). Data also shows that minority students, specifically African-American and Latino pupils, are more likely to be subjected to harsher disciplinary punishments for behavioral offenses than White students (González, Sattler, & Buth, 2019). The vast majority of the time, kids get these kinds of penalties for offenses that do not include acts of violence or criminal behavior and that might be dealt with more effectively in the classroom. Studies show that African-American and Latino male students receive disproportionately harsh punishments for transgressions such as disrespect, insubordination, and wilful disobedience (Frias-Armentia, Rodríguez-Macías, Corral-Verdugo, Caso-Niebla, & García-Arizmendi, 2018). These offenses are all considered interpretable crimes. Several unfavourable characteristics of school punishment play a significant part in the maintenance of the school-to-prison pipeline (Hulvershorn & Mulholland, 2018). The Objectives are to identify RPs and SC at secondary level of district Lahore, to explore relationship between RPs and SC at secondary level of district Lahore and to compare RPs and SC of secondary level schools on the base of school type and gender in district Lahore.

In recent years, restorative practices have gained increasing attention as an effective approach to address disciplinary issues and promote positive school climates. While numerous studies have been conducted in various international contexts, Understanding the relationship between restorative practices and school climate in the local setting of Pakistan, especially within District Lahore, still has a large study gap. Most existing literature on restorative practices and school climate has focused on Western countries and cultures, which may not be directly applicable to the unique social, cultural, and educational dynamics present in Pakistani schools. As a result, there is a need for empirical investigation to explore the efficacy and implementation of restorative practices in improving school climate within the Pakistani context. Additionally, limited research has been conducted on the challenges and opportunities faced by educators and administrators in District Lahore when implementing restorative practices in their schools. Understanding these factors is crucial for the development of targeted interventions and support systems that can be tailored to the needs and resources of local schools. This study aims to address this research gap by examining the relationship between restorative practices and school climate in District Lahore, exploring the potential benefits, challenges, and opportunities for implementing such practices in Pakistani schools, and providing valuable insights that can contribute to the ongoing discourse on restorative practices and school climate in Pakistan.

2.1. Socioeconomic / Rational /Practical & Scientific Applications

Only through the implementation of constructive school discipline can a healthy SC be produced (Haft, 1999). Disruptive student conduct is a common problem in today's classrooms. Successful schools have strong disciplinary systems in place and prioritize student education, but they also use discipline strategies that prioritize instruction over punishment. The importance of this research stems from the requirement and challenge in managing negative attitude of students by creating a supportive school environment that encourages healthy student behavior, high standards of academic performance. This research will give crucial knowledge to school staff and administrators who are contemplating these restorative approaches as a substitute to punitive discipline procedures at their schools. RPs is a rapidly expanding method to community development and discipline in schools, but little is known about how it affects teachers and their desire to become teachers. Although a lot of studies have been done in international scenario but very limited work is done in Pakistani scenario. After reviewing literature and considering its effectiveness, I decided to conduct research that will examine relationship between SC and RPs in Pakistani context.

Many Pakistani school officials and teachers have been witnessed attempting to regulate student conduct through the use of unsuccessful penalties in the past. Exclusionary discipline diminishes a student's chances of graduating from high school since he or she is absent from class (Garnett et al., 2020). Students who have frequent conflict with school authorities are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system (Siddiqui, Muhammad, & Naseer, 2021). Long-standing evidence shows that the use of exclusionary disciplinary procedures hurts discipline populations that are already vulnerable (Katic et al., 2020). Because administrators have a big

role in deciding student discipline, they have the most control over disciplinary policies and processes. If school officials do not pay special attention to minority student groups, unfavorable policies and practices would remain. The educational community as a whole can gain insight into the obstacles that prevent administrators from abandoning traditional punitive discipline models by gaining discipline of administrator beliefs, leadership styles, and disciplinary philosophies in relation to the implementation of RPs (Payne & Welch, 2018). Although effective disciplinary systems are critical in schools, harsh punishments frequently fail to dissuade or modify students' undesired behavior. Class management and student discipline are still sources of stress for teachers in certain suburban schools. Negative SCs are related with an increased likelihood of students engaging in self-destructive conduct (Huang & Anyon, 2020).

Typically, punishments are used to preserve school discipline Payne and Welch (2018). The procedures of the approaches are explained broadly, allowing for a wide range of applications. According to a study administrators were unable to agree on a common definition of aggressive behavior, exhibiting this ambiguity (Sajjad, Siddique, & Tufail, 2022). Punitive discipline policies are frequently broad in reach and fail to account for the specifics of unique cases. Many instructors believe that this simply adds to the ambiguity of these regulations' applicability. Because of the ambiguity surrounding the implementation of harsh disciplinary actions, their application is sometimes susceptible to interpretation. Researchers are concerned that these rules will have a detrimental impact on student performance and high school graduation rates. A growing body of academic literature indicates that these approaches are ineffectual and may even encourage harmful student conduct (Velez, Hahn, Recchia, & Wainryb, 2020). The Hypothesis are as follows;

H_1: There is no relationship between RPs and SC at secondary level of Lahore district.
H_2: There is no significant difference between RPs and SC of public and private secondary level of Lahore district.
H_3: There is no significant difference between RPs and SC of male and female secondary level of Lahore district.

2.2. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study stems from the necessity and challenge of regulating disruptive student conduct while simultaneously establishing an uplifting climate conducive to exceptional academic success. Only through the implementation of constructive school discipline can a healthy SC be produced (Short, Case, & McKenzie, 2018). Disruptive student conduct is a common problem in today's classrooms. Successful schools have strong disciplinary systems in place and prioritize student education, but they also use discipline strategies that prioritize instruction over punishment. The importance of this study stems from the necessity and complexity of regulating disruptive student conduct while simultaneously maintaining a good SC conducive to high academic achievement. A SC that fosters strong ties and mutual respect reduces the likelihood of students participating in disruptive behavior (Umbreit, 2000). If schools wish to create a learning climate, they must use non-punitive forms of discipline. Positive school discipline strategies that stress the use of discipline as a teaching tool rather than a form of punishment can help schools achieve this goal. RPs are one example of a positive school discipline method that has been shown to reduce disruptive conduct while enhancing academic success and motivation in students.

Lastly, RPs can help students stay in school, which is beneficial to their academic future (Siddiqui et al., 2021). The findings of this study will pique the interest of scholar-practitioners since it pertains to a problem that exists in schools all around the world. Furthermore, the RPs are unexplored in the context of Pakistan. The employment of harsh discipline processes by educators vs more positive approaches for dealing with student transgression has long been a climate of contention (Koth, Bradshaw, & Leaf, 2008). In an effort to enhance SC, this study provides new insight into a promising type of school discipline. As a result, the findings of this study will help schools promote a positive learning climate without resorting to punishment. Because it attempts to solve a significant issue, this study will add to the body of knowledge in education. Because educational practices are in constant upheaval, this research will inevitably create new questions. Future study will focus on discovering the root source of this problem and viable solutions. More study is needed on school discipline and other sorts of discipline practices in Pakistan. Restorative techniques as an alternative to more traditional forms of disciplinary

punishment may benefit significantly from the insights provided by this study. Positive SC provides a fresh perspective on a kind of disciplinary action that has the ability to improve the discipline of both students and instructors. As a result, the findings of this study will be valuable for schools who want to create a positive learning climate without utilizing punishment. This study will contribute to the advancement of education knowledge by suggesting a solution to a pressing issue. This study just lays the groundwork for future investigations, as educational practices are always changing. Future researchers will look deeper into the root reasons of this problem and potential solutions. Academics should pay more attention to discipline discipline and alternatives to traditional disciplinary systems.

3. Research Design and Methodology

The researcher deployed the Positivists paradigm using Quantitative research design to examine the relationship between RPs and SC. The population consists of all public (male and female) and private (male and female) secondary school systems with 10 or more branches in the Lahore district. As an example, eight private school systems were chosen (stem, city, allied, KIPS, Unique, Smart, Dar-e-arqam and educator). The total number of public secondary schools in the Lahore district is 710, and there is a total of 3115 teachers working in those institutions (SIS, 2022). There are a total number of 1137 private schools, with 7822 private school teachers employed throughout all of these institutions (PEPRIS, 2022). As a consequence of this, the research contacted a sizable representative sample of teachers.

Table 1: Detail of population of public and private secondary schools and teachers of District Lahore

	Schools			Teachers		
Tehsils	**Public**	**Private**	**Total**	**Public**	**Private**	**Total**
Cantt	133	191	324	305	1155	1460
City	158	383	541	1267	2139	3406
Model town	143	292	435	664	1952	2616
Raiwind	129	142	271	243	1336	1579
Shalimar	147	130	277	636	1240	1876
Total	710	1137	1848	3115	7822	14632

(School Information System Punjab, 2022) (Private Education Provider Registration and Information System, 2022)

Table 2: Detail of population of public male and female, private male and female secondary schools and teachers of District Lahore

	Schools				Teachers			
Tehsils	**Public**		**Private**		**Public**		**Private**	
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
CANTT	71	62	111	80	105	200	488	667
CITY	66	92	101	282	667	600	900	1239
MODEL TOWN	70	73	150	142	344	320	852	1100
RAIWIND	69	60	67	75	156	87	436	900
SHALIMAR	71	76	77	53	302	334	600	640
TOTAL	347	363	506	632	1574	1541	3276	4546
G. TOTAL	710		1137		3115		7822	

(School Information System Punjab, 2022) (Private Education Provider Registration and Information System, 2022)

Multistage sampling techniques was used. The researcher used the cluster sampling approach to split the entire population into five groups (Tehsils). By using the stratified sampling approach, the researcher was able to identify two groups of strata: public/private, as well as male/female. From the private sector, a sample consisting of five male and five female schools from each tehsil in Lahore was selected. As a sample, ten male and ten female public schools in Lahore were chosen, two from each tehsil. The sample consisted of 10 public school teachers and 4 private school teachers from each respective type of school who were chosen at random. Resultantly, 520 teachers as a sample were selected.

Table 3 : Sampling from public and private (male and female) schools

	Public		Private																
			Stem		**Unique**		**KIPS**		**Allied**		**educator**		**smart**		**city**		**DA**		**T**
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	
Schools	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	100
Teacher	100	100	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	520

4. Data Collection Tool

The researcher adapted the questionnaire for measuring RPs among secondary school teachers from the study by Guckenburg, et al., (2016). The study also made use of an adapted version of the "SC survey" originally developed by the California Department of Education.

4.1. Data Analysis Approach

The IBM statistical software for social science was used to do the analysis of the quantitative data. In order to provide answers to the issues posed by the research, descriptive and inferential statistics (such as frequency, mean and standard deviation, t-test, and Pearson r) were used to the data for analysis.

In order to investigate the connection, the Pearson correlation test was carried out. The independent sample t-test was utilized so that the differences in regard to the kind of school and gender could be determined.

5. Data Analysis

5.1. Restorative practices

5.1.1. Self-efficacy

The below table illustrates description of restorative practices factor self-efficacy. According to the responses of the respondents, I am well aware of Restorative Practice (M=1.48; SD=0.523), If I feel tension among a few students, I am able to integrate RP in my class room" (M=1.72; SD=0.552), I feel confident as a teacher when I resolve student conflicts using RP (M=1.68; SD=0.501), I am aware of RP circles and conferences (M=1.70; SD=0.550), I use RP circles and conferences when an offense is observed among the students (M=1.48; SD=0.656) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am well aware of Restorative Practice	520	1.48	.523
If I feel tension among a few students, I am able to integrate RP in my class room."	520	1.72	.552
I feel confident as a teacher when I resolve student conflicts using RP."	520	1.68	.501
I am aware of RP circles and conferences."	520	1.70	.550
I use RP circles and conferences when an offense is observed among the students."	520	1.72	.656

5.2. Administrative Support

The below table illustrates description of restorative practices factor administrative support.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
In my school, there is a specific individual to speak with regarding RP.	520	1.77	.674
I have the chance to talk about RP with other educators.	520	1.67	.547
I get the chance to talk about RP with other administrative employees.	520	1.79	.648
If I need to refer students for a restorative conference, I know where to go in my school.	520	1.78	.571
The use of RP is mandatory for all teachers according to school policies."	520	1.74	.635
My school places a high focus on RP.	520	1.83	.712
When I incorporate RP components, school administrators support me.	520	1.77	.679

According to the responses of the respondents, In my school, there is a specific individual to speak with regarding RP (M=1.77; SD=0.674), I have opportunities to discuss RP with other teachers (M=1.67; SD=0.547), I get the chance to talk about RP with other administrative employees (M=1.79; SD=0.648), If I need to refer students for a restorative conference, I know where to go in my school (M=1.78; SD=0.571).

The use of RP is mandatory for all teachers according to school policies (M=1.74; SD=0.635), My school places a high focus on RP (M=1.83; SD=0.712) and When I incorporate

RP components, school administrators support me (M=1.77; SD=0.679) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

5.3. Teacher Implementation

The table illustrates description of restorative practices factor teacher implementation. According to the responses of the respondents, I aggressively urge pupils to utilize emotional language to describe how other people's actions have affected them.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I aggressively urge pupils to utilise emotional language to describe how other people's actions have affected them.	520	1.60	.602
I request that the perpetrator specify who was hurt and what harm was done.	520	1.76	.631
I use the restorative questions to help me structure conversations when dealing with student misbehaviour.	520	1.70	.570
I ask the pupils to do particular things to make things right.	520	1.82	.651
Give kids the chance to express their thoughts, feelings, and experiences through circles.	520	1.76	.528
I aggressively engage pupils in the topic of rules and solicit their opinions.	520	1.73	.507

(M=1.60; SD=0.602), I request that the perpetrator specify who was hurt and what harm was done (M=1.76; SD=0.631), I use the restorative questions to help me structure conversations when dealing with student misbehaviour (M=1.70; SD=0.570), I ask the pupils to do particular things to make things right (M=1.82; SD=0.651), Give kids the chance to express their thoughts, feelings, and experiences through circles (M=1.76; SD=0.528), and I aggressively engage pupils in the topic of rules and solicit their opinions (M=1.73; SD=0.507) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

5.4. School Climate

5.4.1. Social Environment

The table illustrates description of school climate factor social environment. According to the responses of the respondents, Teachers get along well with one another at work (M=1.51; SD=0.627),

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teachers get along well with one another at work.	520	1.51	.627
Teachers discuss emotional understanding and regulation with their students.	520	1.66	.562
In this school, parents are made to feel welcome.	520	1.69	.552
At this school, students have cordial relations with one another."	520	1.77	.643
There is good parent-teacher relationship in the school."	520	1.71	.707
At this school, students are respected by the teaching staff."	520	1.72	.579
At this school, students are respected by non-teaching staff."	520	1.73	.530
Parents are aware of their children’s activities within this school’s premises."	520	1.74	.622
The code of conduct is conveyed to teachers, students and administration."	520	1.71	.584
Parents are told by teachers how to help their children's learning and academic performance.	520	1.72	.649
The school administration encourages regular communication between school teachers and the administration."	520	1.65	.624
Students feel comfortable reporting a bullying incident to a teacher or other adult."	520	1.73	.616

Teachers discuss emotional understanding and regulation with their students (M=1.66; SD=0.562), In this school, parents are made to feel welcome (M=1.69; SD=0.552), At this school, students have cordial relations with one another (M=1.77; SD=0.643), There is good parent-teacher relationship in the school (M=1.71; SD=0.707), At this school, students are respected by the teaching staff (M=1.72; SD=0.579), At this school, students are respected by non-teaching staff (M=1.73; SD=0.530), Parents are aware of their children’s activities within this school’s premises (M=1.74; SD=0.622).

The code of conduct is conveyed to teachers, students and administration (M=1.71; SD=0.584), Parents are told by teachers how to help their children's learning and academic performance (M=1.72; SD=0.649), The school administration encourages regular communication between school teachers and the administration (M=1.65; SD=0.624) and Students feel comfortable reporting a bullying incident to a teacher or other adult (M=1.73; SD=0.616) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

5.5. Physical Environment

The programs and resources at this school are adequate to...

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Give all students top-notch instruction.	520	1.64	.581
Help academically challenging pupils with their instruction.	520	1.68	.535
Encourage good diet and physical fitness among students.	520	1.74	.597
Maintain campus safety and security"	520	1.73	.592
Address the staff's needs for professional growth.	520	1.75	.651
Address student mental health needs."	520	1.70	.658
Support pupils who have impairments or special needs.	520	1.73	.587
Facilitate the classroom learning."	520	1.81	.583
Make campus is clean and well maintained."	520	1.74	.616

The above table illustrates description of school climate factor physical environment. According to the responses of the respondents, Give all students top-notch instruction (M=1.64; SD=0.581), Help academically challenging pupils with their instruction (M=1.68; SD=0.535), Encourage good diet and physical fitness among students (M=1.74; SD=0.597), Maintain campus safety and security (M=1.73; SD=0.592), Address the staff's needs for professional growth (M=1.75; SD=0.651), Address student mental health needs (M=1.70; SD=0.658), Support pupils who have impairments or special needs (M=1.73; SD=0.587), Facilitate the classroom learning (M=1.81; SD=0.583), Make campus is clean and well maintained (M=1.74; SD=0.616) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

5.6. Learning Environment

The table 9 illustrates description of school climate factor learning environment. According to the responses of the respondents, this school's teachers struggle to maintain discipline in their classrooms (M=1.74; SD=0.695), Teachers and other staff members at this school receive clear information from school officials (M=1.69; SD=0.536),

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
This school's teachers struggle to maintain discipline in their classrooms.	520	1.74	.695
Teachers and other staff members at this school receive clear information from school officials.	520	1.69	.536
Teachers apply new strategies to strengthen teaching and learning."	520	1.70	.518
Group activities are encouraged in classes."	520	1.78	.610
Students are given opportunities to work together during classroom activities."	520	1.72	.599
It is mandatory for students to work in groups once in a week."	520	1.77	.619
Teachers set high expectations for learning."	520	1.72	.642
Teachers make regular lesson plans which ensure achievement of curricular goals."	520	1.71	.646
Teachers assign work that encourages student creativities and critical thinking."	520	1.68	.584

Teachers apply new strategies to strengthen teaching and learning (M=1.70; SD=0.518), Group activities are encouraged in classes (M=1.78; SD=0.610), Students are given opportunities to work together during classroom activities (M=1.72; SD=0.599), It is mandatory for students to work in groups once in a week (M=1.77;SD=0.619), Teachers set high expectations for learning (M=1.72; SD=0.642), Teachers make regular lesson plans which ensure achievement of curricular goals (M=1.71; SD=0.646), Teachers give students homework

that promotes creativity and critical thinking (M=1.68; SD=0.584) were reflected toward the level of agreement.

H_1: There is no relationship between RPs and SC at secondary level of Lahore district.

The table 10 illustrates that relationship between restorative practices and school climate. The values (r=.663, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically strong positive relationship between restorative practices and school climate; so null hypothesis rejected.

Table 10: Relationship between restorative practices and school climate

Correlations			
		Restorative practices	**School climate**
Restorative practices	Pearson Correlation	1	.663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
School climate	Pearson Correlation	.663**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 11: Relationship between self-efficacy and social environment

Correlations			
		Self-Efficacy	**Social environment**
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.429**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Social environment	Pearson Correlation	.429**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 12: Relationship between self-efficacy and physical environment

Correlations			
		Self-Efficacy	**Physical environment**
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.376**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Physical environment	Pearson Correlation	.376**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 11 illustrates that relationship between self-efficacy and social environment. The values (r=.429, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between self-efficacy and social environment; so null hypothesis rejected. The table 12 illustrates that relationship between self-efficacy and physical environment. The values (r=.376, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically weak positive relationship between self-efficacy and physical environment; so null hypothesis rejected.

Table 13: Relationship between self-efficacy and learning environment

Correlations			
		Self-Efficacy	**Learning environment**
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.233**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Learning environment	Pearson Correlation	.233**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 14: Relationship between Admin support and social environment

Correlations

		Admin Support	Social environment
Admin Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.567**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Social environment	Pearson Correlation	.567**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 13 illustrates that relationship between self-efficacy and learning environment. The values (r=.233, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically weak positive relationship between self-efficacy and learning environment; so null hypothesis rejected. The table 14 illustrates that relationship between Admin support and social environment. The values (r=.567, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between Admin support and social environment; so null hypothesis rejected.

Table 15: Relationship between Admin support and physical environment

Correlations

		Admin Support	Physical environment
Admin Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.579**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Physical environment	Pearson Correlation	.579**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 16: Relationship between Admin support and learning environment

Correlations

		Admin Support	Learning environment
Admin Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.415**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Learning environment	Pearson Correlation	.415**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 15 illustrates that relationship between Admin support and physical environment. The values (r=.579, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between Admin support and physical environment; so null hypothesis rejected. The table 16 illustrates that relationship between Admin support and learning environment. The values (r=.415, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between Admin support and learning environment; so null hypothesis rejected. The table 17 illustrates that relationship between teacher implementation and social environment. The values (r=.571, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between teacher implementation and social environment; so null hypothesis rejected.

Table 17: Relationship between teacher implementation and social environment

Correlations

		Teacher Implementation	Social environment
Teacher Implementation	Pearson Correlation	1	.571**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Social environment	Pearson Correlation	.571**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 18: Relationship between teacher implementation and physical environment

Correlations

		Teacher Implementation	Physical environment
Teacher Implementation	Pearson Correlation	1	.536**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Physical environment	Pearson Correlation	.536**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 18 illustrates that relationship between teacher implementation and physical environment. The values (r=.536, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically moderate positive relationship between teacher implementation and physical environment; so null hypothesis rejected.

Table 19: Relationship between teacher implementation and learning environment

Correlations

		Teacher Implementation	Learning environment
Teacher Implementation	Pearson Correlation	1	.381**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	520	520
Learning environment	Pearson Correlation	.381**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	520	520

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above table illustrates that relationship between teacher implementation and learning environment. The values (r=.381, p<0.00) shows that there is statistically weak positive relationship between teacher implementation and learning environment; so null hypothesis rejected.

H_2: There is no significant difference between RPs and SC of public and private secondary level of Lahore district.

Table 20: Difference between public and private sector regarding restorative practices

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 518)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Restorative practices	Public	329	1.7278	.25236	1.001	0.317
	Private	191	1.7020	.33125		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding restorative practices. The p=0.31; t=1.00 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding restorative practices; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 21: Difference between public and private sector regarding self-efficacy

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Self-Efficacy	Public	329	1.6796	.23758	2.081	0.038
	Private	191	1.6241	.37056		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding self-efficacy. The p=0.03<0.05; t=2.081 shows that there is a significant difference between public and private sector regarding self-efficacy; so null hypothesis is rejected. The table 22 illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding Admin support. The p=0.55>0.05; t=0.59 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding Admin support; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 22: Difference between public and private sector regarding Admin support

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Admin Support	Public	329	1.7577	.35954	-0.590	0.55
	Private	191	1.7786	.43692		

Table 23: Difference between public and private sector regarding teacher implementation

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Teacher Implementation	Public	329	1.7462	.33988	1.363	0.17
	Private	191	1.7033	.35598		

The table 23 illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding teacher implementation. The p=0.17>0.05; t=1.36 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding teacher implementation; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 24: Difference between public and private sector regarding school climate

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
School climate	Public	329	1.7194	.27744	0.454	0.650
	Private	191	1.7078	.28407		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding school climate. The p=0.65>0.05; t=0.454 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding school climate; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 25: Difference between public and private sector regarding social environment

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Social environment	Public	329	1.7069	.29700	1.026	0.30
	Private	191	1.6767	.36566		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding social environment. The p=0.30>0.05; t=1.026 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding social environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 26: Difference between public and private sector regarding physical environment

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Physical environment	Public	329	1.7163	.36797	-.767	0.443
	Private	191	1.7400	.28142		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding physical environment. The p=0.44>0.05; t=0.767 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding physical environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 27: Difference between public and private sector regarding learning environment

Group Statistics

	School sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*p* (∝ = 0.05)
Learning environment	Public	329	1.7349	.33626	0.924	0.356
	Private	191	1.7068	.33021		

The above table illustrates that Difference between public and private sector regarding learning environment. The p=0.35>0.05; t=0.924 shows that there is no significant difference between public and private sector regarding learning environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

H_3: There is no significant difference between RPs and SC of male and female secondary level of Lahore district.

Table 28: Difference between genders regarding restorative practices

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Restorative practices	Female	332	1.7397	.30151	2.284	0.023
	Male	188	1.6807	.24592		

The table 28 illustrates that Difference between genders regarding restorative practices. The p=0.02<0.05; t=2.284 shows that there is significant difference between genders regarding restorative practices; so null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 29: Difference between genders regarding self-efficacy

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Self-Efficacy	Female	332	1.6861	.31198	2.789	0.005
	Male	188	1.6117	.25431		

The above table illustrates that Difference between genders regarding self-efficacy. The p=0.00<0.05; t=2.789 shows that there is significant difference between genders regarding self-efficacy; so null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 30: Difference between genders regarding admin support

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Admin Support	Female	332	1.7758	.39397	0.811	0.417
	Male	188	1.7470	.38172		

The above table illustrates that Difference between genders regarding admin support. The p=0.41>0.05; t=0.811 shows that there is no significant difference between genders regarding admin support; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 31: Difference between genders regarding teacher implementation

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Teacher Implementation	Female	332	1.7570	.38283	2.337	0.020
	Male	188	1.6835	.26397		

The table 31 illustrates that Difference between genders regarding teacher implementation. The p=0.02<0.05; t=2.337 shows that there is significant difference between genders regarding teacher implementation; so null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 32: Difference between genders regarding school climate

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
School climate	Female	332	1.7213	.28128	0.665	0.506
	Male	188	1.7043	.27723		

The table 32 illustrates that Difference between genders regarding school climate. The p=0.50>0.05; t=0.665 shows that there is no significant difference between genders regarding school climate; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 33: Difference between genders regarding social environment

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 498)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Social environment	Female	332	1.7073	.33606	1.076	0.283
	Male	188	1.6755	.30101		

The table 33 illustrates that Difference between genders regarding social environment. The p=0.28>0.05; t=1.076 shows that there is no significant difference between genders regarding social environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

The table 34 illustrates that Difference between genders regarding physical environment. The p=0.57>0.05; t=0.560 shows that there is no significant difference between genders regarding physical environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 34: Difference between genders regarding physical environment

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 518)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Physical environment	Female	332	1.7313	.35300	0.560	0.576
	Male	188	1.7139	.31237		

Table 35: Difference between genders regarding learning environment

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*-value (df = 518)	*P* (∝ = 0.05)
Learning environment	Female	332	1.7252	.32768	0.060	0.952
	Male	188	1.7234	.34577		

The above table illustrates that Difference between genders regarding learning environment. The p=0.95>0.05; t=0.060 shows that there is no significant difference between genders regarding learning environment; so null hypothesis is accepted.

6. Findings and Discussion

The primary objective sought to explore the relationship between RPs and SC in secondary schools in Lahore district. A significant positive association between RPs and SC was discovered by the Pearson correlation analysis (r = .663, p=.000< 0.05). This suggests that as the implementation of RPs increases, there is a corresponding improvement in the SC. This result is in line with other studies, which has demonstrated that the use of RPs can benefit the SC (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005; Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2016; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). RPs, which emphasize dialogue, understanding, and repair of harm, can create an environment where students feel respected, valued, and connected to their school community (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012).

In turn, a positive SC can contribute to improved academic achievement, decreased disciplinary incidents, and enhanced overall well-being for students and staff (Bradshaw, et al., 2008; Thapa et al., 2013). It is a widely held belief that one of the most effective means of enforcing discipline is to do it via the utilization of various RPs (Gregory et al., 2016). RPs, as described by educators who make use of them, are said to assist students in cultivating a more profound awareness not only of themselves but also of their place in the larger world (Bevington, 2015). In an effort to interrupt the cycle of violence, there has been pressure put on school districts, individual schools, and even individual administrators to foster more peaceful learning environments (Skiba, 2000).

According to the findings of a number of studies, the implementation of the program in secondary schools results in the collection of relatively little information from both interviews with students and instructors and surveys (Ozgenel, YILMAZ, & Baydar, 2018). In secondary schools, the administration of school-wide discipline makes use of a wide variety of different tactics (G. McCluskey et al., 2008).

The second goal was to see if there were gender-based significant variations in RP and SC scores. Female and male teachers in both RPs showed statistically significant differences, according to an independent sample t-test (t (518) = 2.284, p = .023) and SC (t (518) = .665, p = .506). Female teachers had higher scores on average for both variables, indicating that they perceived greater implementation of RPs and a more positive SC compared to male teachers. These findings align with previous research on gender differences in perceptions of SC (Koth et al., 2008; Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013).

One possible explanation for these gender differences could be that female teachers are more sensitive to relational aspects of the school environment, such as teacher-student relationships and peer interactions, which are central to RPs (Zimmer-Gembeck, 2002). Additionally, female teachers might be more inclined to participate in RPs, such as circles and conferences, as they often emphasize communication and empathy, skills that are generally more developed among females (Eisenberg, Lennon, & Roth, 1983; Rose & Rudolph, 2006). There has been a substantial amount of research done on the relationships that exist between teachers and students, and it has been shown that these bonds are very important to the academic achievement that occurs in schools (González et al., 2019).

Evaluations of school disciplinary policies almost never incorporate insufficient adult definitions; instead, the emphasis is placed on the effects of the policies on the students. It can take anywhere from one to three years to successfully implement RPs in schools, and the success of this endeavor is greatly dependent on the skills, experiences, and attitudes of the teaching staff (Pointer & McGoey, 2019). As a consequence of this, there is a risk that educators will arrive to various conclusions, which can have a significant impact on how well RPs are applied (van Alphen, 2014).

If teachers do not take the time to examine their own attitudes and objectives with regard to classroom management, they run the risk of unintentionally inflicting harm to children who are members of underrepresented groups in their classrooms (Carter Andrews & Gutwein, 2020). Although the vast majority of teachers believe that suspension and expulsion should only be used as a final resort for addressing students' behavioral concerns in the classroom, these disciplinary procedures continue to play an essential role in maintaining order in schools (Deakin & Kupchik, 2016). Professional development, in the words of Vaandering (2014), "explicitly put the potential for change in the hands of educators, rather than lawmakers or department consultants."

The third objective sought to determine whether there were significant differences in RPs and SC scores based on the type of school (public vs. private). The independent sample t-test showed no statistically significant differences in RPs (t (518) = 1.001, p = .317) or SC (t(518) = .454, p = .65) scores between public and private schools in the Lahore district. This indicates that both public and private schools have similar levels of RPs implementation and comparable SC perceptions. These findings contrast with some previous research that has shown differences between public and private schools in terms of SC.

One possible reason for the lack of differences in this study could be that both public and private schools in Lahore district have been exposed to similar levels of training and resources related to RPs. Another explanation could be that the unique cultural context of Lahore district may not align with previous findings from other regions or countries. G. McCluskey et al. (2008) provide evidence in support of the contention that RP may be successfully implemented in educational settings. According to the findings of a study that was carried out in Scotland, there was a rise in morale among students as well as staff members in primary, secondary, and special schools. Moreover, there was an increase in academic performance while there was a decrease in exclusion.

Clearly a novel approach to correcting and reprimanding behavior, this method. Using RP can result in a variety of positive outcomes for students. It is important to investigate the effects that RP has in academic environments. On the topic of restorative practice, Belinda Hopkins has accumulated a substantial body of work and carried out a substantial amount of study. She is certain that the life lessons imparted to children and teenagers throughout the course of the process will serve them well for the rest of their lives (Budd, 1982). Her

investigation is predicated on Howard Zehr's practical investigations of RP in instructional settings from the year 1990.

According to Zehr (1990), the distinctive characteristic of RP is respect. This is something that Hopkins draws upon rather frequently in her writing. The writers are well aware of both the positive and negative aspects of the method. They were all of the opinion that there would be a reduction in the number of disruptive incidents that took place in schools if the strategy was implemented as intended. One of the most significant problems with their research is that it is not always applicable to the present circumstances in the globe. The environment in which we were raised no longer exists, and the proliferation of social media together with the phenomenon of cyberbullying has introduced brand new challenges to the process of enforcing classroom discipline. Their study is legitimate, despite the fact that it seems out of date in light of more recent discoveries (N. McCluskey, 2015).

7. Conclusion

The conclusion revealed a significant positive relationship between RPs and SC, indicating the potential benefits of implementing RPs in fostering a positive SC. By adopting a whole-school approach to RPs and addressing the unique needs and perspectives of different student groups, schools can create a more inclusive and supportive environment for all students to thrive. In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between RPs and SC in secondary schools in Lahore district, Pakistan, with a focus on male and female teachers. The results of the study indicate a positive association between RPs and SC, with higher levels of RPs being linked to more favorable perceptions of the SC.

This suggests that the implementation of RPs can contribute to a more positive, supportive, and inclusive school environment, which in turn can promote teacher well-being, job satisfaction, and effective teaching practices. Moreover, the study highlights notable gender differences in perceptions of RPs and SC, with female teachers reporting higher scores on average compared to male teachers. This finding underscores the importance of addressing the unique needs and perspectives of different teacher groups in order to ensure that RPs are effective and equitable for all educators. By offering gender-specific restorative circles, providing targeted interventions for male teachers, and fostering a culture of respect and inclusivity, schools can better support both male and female teachers in their professional growth and effectiveness.

The study also reveals no significant differences between public and private schools in terms of RPs and SC in the Lahore district. This finding contrasts with some previous research that has shown differences between public and private schools in terms of SC (Jeynes, 2002). One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that both public and private schools in Lahore district may have been exposed to similar levels of training and resources related to RPs, leading to comparable levels of implementation and SC perceptions. Another possibility is that the unique cultural context of Lahore district might not align with previous findings from other regions or countries, suggesting that more research is needed to understand the nuances of RPs and SC in different settings.

Engaging teachers and families in the design and implementation of RPs is another crucial component of a successful RPs program. Schools should involve teachers and families in restorative conferences, family circles, and regular opportunities for feedback and input to ensure their perspectives are considered and to foster a sense of ownership and commitment to the process. This collaborative approach can strengthen relationships between teachers, families, and schools, and create a shared vision and understanding of the goals and expectations of RPs. Finally, schools should establish systems for evaluating and monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of RPs.

This could include the use of surveys, focus groups, and observational data to assess changes in SC, teacher behavior, and instructional outcomes over time. By regularly monitoring and evaluating the impact of RPs, schools can identify areas for improvement and make data-driven decisions to refine and enhance their RPs program. This study also highlights the need for further research on the implementation and impact of RPs in different cultural and educational contexts. Future research should explore the experiences and perspectives of male

and female teachers from various backgrounds, as well as the potential barriers and facilitators to the successful implementation of RPs. By deepening our understanding of the factors that contribute to the effectiveness of RPs, researchers and practitioners can work together to develop strategies and interventions that are tailored to the unique needs of diverse teacher populations.

7.1. Recommendations

1. Schools should invest in training and resources to effectively implement RPs, which can promote a more inclusive, supportive, and positive SC.
2. Schools should examine their RPs and SC initiatives to ensure that they are addressing the needs of both male and female students. This may involve providing additional support or targeted interventions for male students to enhance their engagement with RPs and improve their overall SC experience.
3. To promote the effective implementation of RPs, schools should invest in comprehensive training and on-going support for teachers, administrators, and support staff. This could include professional development workshops, coaching, and opportunities for collaboration and learning from peers.
4. Longitudinal studies and experimental designs could help establish causal relationships between RPs and SC, while qualitative research may offer a deeper understanding of the experiences of students and educators in implementing RPs.

References

Acosta, J., Chinman, M., Ebener, P., Malone, P. S., Phillips, A., & Wilks, A. (2019). Evaluation of a whole-school change intervention: Findings from a two-year cluster-randomized trial of the restorative practices intervention. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*, 876-890. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01013-2

Bazemore, G., & Leip, L. (2000). Victim participation in the new juvenile court: Tracking judicial attitudes toward restorative justice reforms. *Justice system journal, 21*(2), 199-226. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/23277556.2000.10871282

Bevington, T. J. (2015). Appreciative evaluation of restorative approaches in schools. *Pastoral Care in Education, 33*(2), 105-115. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2015.1046475

Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2005). *The challenge of culture change: Embedding restorative practice in schools.* Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices: Building a Global Alliance for Restorative Practices and Family Empowerment, Sydney, Australia.

Budd, G. (1982). School climate and school organization: A case study in relationships. *School Organisation, 2*(1), 31-43. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/0260136820020105

Carter Andrews, D. J., & Gutwein, M. (2020). Middle school students' experiences with inequitable discipline practices in school: The elusive quest for cultural responsiveness. *Middle School Journal, 51*(1), 29-38. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2019.1689778

Darling-Hammond, L., & DePaoli, J. (2020). Why School Climate Matters and What Can Be Done to Improve It. *State Education Standard, 20*(2), 7.

Deakin, J., & Kupchik, A. (2016). Tough choices: School behaviour management and institutional context. *Youth justice, 16*(3), 280-298. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1473225416665610

Dickey, W. J. (1998). Forgiveness and crime: The possibilities of restorative justice. *Exploring forgiveness*, 106-120.

Eisenberg, N., Lennon, R., & Roth, K. (1983). Prosocial development: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 19*(6), 846. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.19.6.846

Frias-Armentia, M., Rodríguez-Macías, J. C., Corral-Verdugo, V., Caso-Niebla, J., & García-Arizmendi, V. (2018). Restorative justice: A model of school violence prevention. *Science Journal of Education, 6*(1), 39-45. doi:https://doi.org/10.11648/j.sjedu.20180601.15

Garnett, B., Moore, M., Kidde, J., Turner, T. A., Kervick, C. T., Bedinger, L., . . . Sparks, H. (2020). Needs and readiness assessments for implementing school-wide restorative practices. *Improving Schools, 23*(1), 21-32. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480219836529

González, T., Sattler, H., & Buth, A. J. (2019). New directions in whole-school restorative justice implementation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 36*(3), 207-220. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.2123
Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016). 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. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929950
Gregory, A., Ward-Seidel, A. R., & Carter, K. V. (2021). Twelve indicators of restorative practices implementation: A framework for educational leaders. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 31*(2), 147-179. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2020.1824788
Haft, W. (1999). More than zero: The cost of zero tolerance and the case for restorative justice in schools. *Denv. UL Rev., 77*, 795.
Huang, F., & Anyon, Y. (2020). The relationship between school disciplinary resolutions with school climate and attitudes toward school. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 64*(3), 212-222. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2020.1722940
Hulvershorn, K., & Mulholland, S. (2018). Restorative practices and the integration of social emotional learning as a path to positive school climates. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, 11*(1), 110-123. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-08-2017-0015
Jeynes, W. H. (2002). Examining the effects of parental absence on the academic achievement of adolescents: The challenge of controlling for family income. *Journal of family and Economic Issues, 23*, 189-210. doi:https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015790701554
Katic, B., Alba, L. A., & Johnson, A. H. (2020). A systematic evaluation of restorative justice practices: School violence prevention and response. *Journal of school violence, 19*(4), 579-593. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2020.1783670
Koth, C. W., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2008). A multilevel study of predictors of student perceptions of school climate: The effect of classroom-level factors. *Journal of educational psychology, 100*(1), 96. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.1.96
Liang, C. T., Rocchino, G. H., Gutekunst, M. H., Paulvin, C., Melo Li, K., & Elam-Snowden, T. (2020). Perspectives of respect, teacher–student relationships, and school climate among boys of color: A multifocus group study. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 21*(3), 345. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000239
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. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910802393456
McCluskey, N. (2015). Better Than NCLB? That's Not Saying Much.
McCold, P. (1998). Restorative justice: variations on a theme. *Restorative justice for juveniles: Potentialities, risks and problems for research*, 19-53.
Morrison, B. E., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and discipline. *Journal of school violence, 11*(2), 138-155. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.653322
Ozgenel, M., YILMAZ, F. C., & Baydar, F. (2018). School climate as a predictor of secondary school students' school attachment. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 18*(78), 87-116.
Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2018). The effect of school conditions on the use of restorative justice in schools. *Youth violence and juvenile justice, 16*(2), 224-240. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016681414
Pointer, L., & McGoey, K. (2019). Teaching restorative practices through games: An experiential and relational restorative pedagogy. *Int'l J. Restorative Just., 2*, 34.
Ramirez, E. D. M. (2018). *Restorative Practices in Schools: A Qualitative Research Study on the Impact Dialogue Circles Have on African American and Latino/A Students*: California State University, Long Beach.
Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological bulletin, 132*(1), 98. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.98
Sajjad, Q., Siddique, M., & Tufail, I. (2022). Teacher-student interaction towards chemistry at secondary level. *Global Educational Studies Review, VII*, 167-174. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022(VII-II).16

Schweigert, F. J. (1999). Learning the common good: Principles of community-based moral education in restorative justice. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(2), 163-183. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/030572499103197

Short, R., Case, G., & McKenzie, K. (2018). The long-term impact of a whole school approach of restorative practice: The views of secondary school teachers. *Pastoral Care in Education, 36*(4), 313-324. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2018.1528625

Siddiqui, M. F., Muhammad, Y., & Naseer, H. (2021). Principals' self-efficacy beliefs about managing bullying cases in secondary schools. *sjesr, 4*(1), 338-349. doi:https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol4-iss1-2021(338-349)

Skiba, R. J. (2000). Zero Tolerance, Zero Evidence: An Analysis of School Disciplinary Practice. Policy Research Report.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of educational research, 83*(3), 357-385. doi:https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907

Thorsborne, M. (2000). School violence and community conferencing: The benefits of restorative justice. In: Queensland, Australia. Retrieved from: http://www. thorsborne. com. au ….

Umbreit, M. S. (2000). *Multicultural implications of restorative justice: Potential pitfalls and dangers*: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of ….

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

van Alphen, F. (2014). Tango and enactivism: First steps in exploring the dynamics and experience of interaction. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 48*(3), 322-331. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-014-9267-1

Velez, G., Hahn, M., Recchia, H., & Wainryb, C. (2020). Rethinking responses to youth rebellion: Recent growth and development of restorative practices in schools. *Current opinion in psychology, 35*, 36-40. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.02.011

Wang, C., Berry, B., & Swearer, S. M. (2013). The critical role of school climate in effective bullying prevention. *Theory into practice, 52*(4), 296-302. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829735

Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2002). The development of romantic relationships and adaptations in the system of peer relationships. *Journal of adolescent health, 31*(6), 216-225. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(02)00504-9