Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 62, No. 2, 2006, pp. 371–392

School Bullying and Restorative Justice: Toward a Theoretical Understanding of the Role of Respect, Pride, and Shame

Brenda Morrison*
Australian National University

The adverse effects of school bullying and victimization have been well documented; yet, there has been little theoretical development in understanding these heterogeneous behavior patterns. This study integrates three theories that support the practice of restorative justice in responding to school bullying: Scheff's theory of unacknowledged shame, Braithwaite's reintegrative shaming theory; and Tyler's procedural justice theory. Specifically, the aim is to test the constructs of shame management (shame acknowledgment and shame displacement) and group value (pride, respect, and emotional group value) in explaining differences across four bullying status groups: nonbully/nonvictim, victim, bully, bully/victim. The results reveal different, but predictable, patterns of social and emotional disconnection from school across these groups. The importance of being emotionally intelligent when addressing bullying behaviors is discussed.

Positive youth development is central to the development of civil society (Lerner, 2000; Morrison, 2001). School bullying, through the systematic abuse of power, hinders positive youth development (Peterson, 2004). Victims of bullying are more likely to suffer from depression (Bond, Carlin, Lyndal, Rubin, & Patton, 2001), posttraumatic stress (Mynard, Joseph, & Alexander, 2000), and suicidal ideation (Kaltialo-Heino, Rimpela, Marttunen, Rimpela, & Ratenen, 1999; Rigby

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Brenda Morrison, Centre for Restorative Justice, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia [e-mail: Brenda.Morrison@anu.edu.au].

At the Australian National University, I would like to acknowledge the supportive environment of the Regulatory Institutions Network within the Research School of Social Sciences. In particular, the influence of Eliza Ahmed, Valerie Braithwaite, and John Braithwaite, and the data analysis assistance of Monica Reinheirt. I would like to thank Irene Freize, Rick Hoyle, and a number of anonymous reviews for their thoughtful comments on this article.

& Slee, 1999), with significant numbers of students missing school every day due to safety concerns (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000). Students who bully are prone to carry this pattern of dominating behavior into the workplace and close personal relationships (Oliver, Hoover, & Hazler, 1994). Bullying in school is also correlated with delinquency (Farrington, 1993) and criminal activity (Olweus, 1993). Further, students who bully, like victims, are at risk for depression and suicidal ideation (Kaltialo-Heino et al., 1999; Rigby & Slee, 1999). As the above studies indicate, there are heavy personal and social costs to bullying behavior in school, adversely impacting positive youth development and civil society.

In reaction to these rising concerns about the effects of school bullying, a number of intervention programs have been developed and evaluated (see Smith, Pepler, & Rigby, 2004, for review). Interestingly, while Olweus (1993) reduced bullying by up to 50 % in his seminal Norwegian study, this result is yet to be replicated. In fact, two different meta-evaluations have shown "relatively small effects in reducing the proportion of children being victimized and little or no effect in the reduction of children bullying others (Rigby, 2004, p. 28; see also Smith, Schneider, Smith, & Ananiadou, 2004). This prompted Rigby (2004) to review a range of theoretical perspectives underpinning the study of bullying behaviors: individual differences, developmental process, sociocultural phenomenon, peer pressure response, and restorative justice. Rigby (2004) concludes that "research has not produced any conclusive evidence on which of the different perspectives and associated practices are most likely to reduce bullying in schools" (p. 297).

This article seeks to develop the theoretical perspective of restorative justice, with the aim to advance the understanding of school bullying and the effectiveness of interventions. The foundation of restorative justice is theoretically eclectic across a range of disciplines (see Braithwaite, 2002a). This article will focus on three theoretical perspectives: Scheff's (1994) theory of unacknowledged shame; Braithwaite's (1989; see also Ahmed, Harris, Braithwaite, & Braithwiate, 2001) reintegrative shaming theory; Tyler's (see Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Blader, 2000) procedural justice theory. The aim of the present study is to build theoretical understanding of restorative justice in the context of school bullying, particularly the interplay of students feeling of respect within the school community, pride in being a member of the school community, the emotional value of being a member of the school community, and shame management over harmful behavior to others within the school community.

Bullying and restorative justice have a serendipitous fit; in that, bullying has been defined as the systematic abuse of power (Rigby, 2002) and restorative justice seeks to transform power imbalances that affect social relationships (Braithwaite, 2002a). Through strengthening mechanisms of support and accountability within the community, along with mechanisms that promote healthy shame management,

restorative justice seeks to empower those affected by harmful behavior to take responsibility and address the harm done (Morrison, 2006). There is a notable synchronicity to the emergence of the growing fields of study of bullying and restorative justice: both have a recent history, emerging strongly in the 1990s. This coincides with Braithwaite's (2002b) analysis of the decline of democracy, where: "The lived experience of modern democracy is alienation. The feeling is that elites run things, that we do not have a say in any meaningful sense" (p. 1). By way of illustration, the Index of Leading Cultural Indicators in the United States (Bennett, 1999) reports that over the last three decades we have experienced "substantial social regression," reporting there has been a 560 % increase in violent crime, with the fastest growing segment of the criminal population being our children. The teenage suicide rate is another worrying indicator, with the rate being more than three times what it was in 1960. Violence toward the self or others is a strong indicator of alienation. Research on the school rampage shootings has shown that bullying can feed the wider cycle of violence in schools (Leary, Kowalski, Smith, & Phillips, 2003; Newman, 2004); thus, the study of bullying is important to understanding and addressing the escalation of violence. Restorative justice has been found to be an effective intervention in cases of bullying in schools, as well as other harmful behavior (see Morrison, 2003; 2005; 2006). Hence, both restorative justice and bullying have implications for civil society, albeit in opposite directions.

The practice of restorative justice empowers individuals and communities through building healthy relationships, where fellow citizens support each other while holding each other accountable for behavior. In the context of harmful behaviors, these practices seek to empower victims, offenders, and communities to take responsibility for themselves, and in doing so, for others. Through empowerment, the multiplicity of voices within communities rises, and healthy deliberative democracies emerge. Kay Pranis (2001) helps us understand how listening and storytelling, key elements of restorative processes, are important to empowerment:

> Storytelling is fundamental for healthy social relationships. To feel connected and respected we need to tell our own stories and have others listen. For others to feel respected and connected to us, they need to tell their stories and have us listen. Having others listen to your story is a function of power in our culture. The more power you have, the more people will listen respectfully to your story. Consequently, listening to someone's story is a way of empowering them, of validating their intrinsic worth as a human being (p. 7).

Feeling respected and connected are intrinsic to one's self-worth; they are basic needs of all human beings (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The reciprocal relationship between these two needs, respect from others and connection with others, empowers individuals to act in the interest of the group, as well as their own. In the context of schools, feeling connected to the school community increases prosocial behavior and decreases antisocial behavior (McNeely, Nonnemaker, &

Blum, 2002). In summary, bullying behavior corrodes the feeling of connection to school, resulting in harmful behavior to self and others (see also Williams, Forgas, & von Hippell, 2005, for a review of the literature on ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying).

Alienation, Shame, and Restorative Justice

The act of bullying casts a web of harm, for persistent domination has the potential to alienate both the perpetrator and the victims from their communities, albeit in different ways. Alienation can then feed the continuing cycle of harmful behavior to self and others. Scheff (1994), following Durkheim (1952), has developed an analysis of how the process of alienation is different for those who abuse power, as compared to those who are dominated. He argues that in any social context there must be a balance between the emphasis given to individuals and the emphasis given to groups. Scheff (1994) uses the terms solidarity and alienation to explain his model of social integration. Solidarity, characterized by effective cooperation, is a product of a balance between the "I" (who we are as individuals) and the "we" (who we are as members of social groups). As opposed to solidarity, alienation has two forms: isolation and engulfment. Each characterizes a form of unresolved conflict. Isolation results when there is too much emphasis on the "I" in conflict; while, engulfment results when there is too much emphasis on the "we" in conflict. As Scheff (1994, p. 29) states:

> Effective cooperation between human beings involves the ability to deal rapidly with complex and novel problems as they arise. Because of the complexity and novelty of the problems we face, solidarity requires that we draw upon our whole selves, and connect with the whole selves of other participants. Alienation occurs if important parts of self are withheld (engulfment) or if participants are completely divided (isolation).

Scheff (1994) argues that shame rests at the heart of the alienation process. While the nature of shame is different for engulfment and isolation, in either case the respective parties are only able to self-regulate, in a cooperative and inclusive sense, when shame is acknowledged and worked through. Through this process a balance between "I" and "we" can be reaffirmed.

The concept of shame is also central to reintegrative shaming theory (Ahmed et al., 2001; Braithwaite, 1989). The theory argues that shame is the central affect underlying alienation and harmful behavior, such as crime (see also Gilligan, 2001; Nathanson, 1997). As such, how a community manages shame is central to the process of resolving the harm done. Two different types of regulatory mechanisms have been put forward: reintegrative shaming and stigmatizing shaming. A simple way of differentiating these two shaming mechanisms is through conceptually separating the person from the behavior. Reintegrative shaming takes the wrongdoer through a process that offers respect and dignity to the individual but does not condone the wrongful act; stigmatizing shaming takes the wrongdoer through a

process that is devoid of respect and dignity, which outcasts the wrongdoer as a "bad" person, who does "bad" things. The former respects the person while not condoning the act, while the later conflates the person with the act.

In the context of restorative justice there are two main features inherent to the process of successful reintegration ceremonies, also known as restorative conferences (see Braithwaite, 2002a). First, to achieve successful reintegration the conferencing process must involve the presence and participation of a community of support for the offender and the victim. This community would be made up of the people who respect and care most about these two (or more) people. Second, the process of shaming requires the wrongdoing to be confronted by the victim and offender within this community of support. In other words, the process separates the person from the harmful behavior, making it clear to the offender that their behavior is not condoned within the community, while being respectful of the individuals involved. In summary, the theory states that through the act of reintegrative shaming from respected others a process of forgiveness and reconciliation can emerge.

In the recent recasting of the theory, the authors argue that "the key issue with shame management is helping wrongdoers to acknowledge and discharge shame rather than displace it into anger" (Ahmed et al., 2001, p.17). When wrongdoers acknowledge shame and take responsibility for harmful behavior, social bonds strengthen and individuals participating in the process are more likely to act in the interest of the community in the future. While the original emphasis of the theory was the reintegrative shaming of offenders, victims have also been found to suffer shame over harmful events, and they too should be offered opportunities for restoration and reintegration. Shame is felt by victims when they experience violations of trust and autonomy (Lewis, 1987). In summary, for all those affected by harmful behavior within a community, there is an established theoretical basis that shame plays a role in the repairing of social bonds.

Shame and School Bullying

Ahmed (see Ahmed et al., 2001) has found that shame management processes are a central mediating variable in the understanding of bullying and victimization in schools. Shame management can be broadly understood in terms of two factors: shame acknowledgment and shame displacement. Shame acknowledgment is adaptive to maintaining healthy relationships, while shame displacement is maladaptive to maintaining healthy relationships. The first step to adaptive shame management is to acknowledge harmful behavior to others, and the associated feelings of shame. Second, individuals must take responsibility for the harm done. Third, amends must be made for the harm caused, such as a simple expression that one is sorry, and/or making other symbolic gestures of regret, or it could involve compensating those affected in some way. Ahmed argues that these three

steps optimize the adaptive functioning of individual's internal sanctioning system, wherein harm to others is acknowledged and action is taken to repair the harm done. Shame management becomes maladaptive when one's internal sanctioning system fails to act on one of these three steps. There are many reasons why individuals' internal sanctioning system would fail to operate at an optimal level; these include dispositional differences and/or situational effects such as family and school social climate, and the associated feelings of safety and connectedness therein (see Morrison, 2006).

Building on the categories associated with bullying behavior in schools—nonbullies/nonvictims, victims, bullies, and bully/victims—Ahmed (2001) has shown that these four groups of students can be differentiated on the basis of their shame management style. Bullies deny wrongdoing, take no responsibility, and feel no rejection from others. As argued by Lewis (1971) they displace and bypass shame. Victims take on responsibility for wrongdoing but feel others will reject them for the transgression. They are caught in cycles of persistent shame through ongoing feelings of disrespect, and disconnection, from others (Lewis, 1987). Students caught in the cycle of being both bully and victim deny wrongdoing, take no responsibility, but also feel chronically rejected by others, with little social support. They have been characterized as experiencing denied bypassed shame (see also Lewis, 1971), in that they feel the shame over the wrongdoing but then suppress it, not discharging it in a healthy manner through taking responsibility and making amends. Students who are neither bullies nor victims acknowledge wrongdoing, take responsibility, and feel others will not reject them over the transgression. Thus shame over wrongdoing is discharged.

Drawing on Scheff's (1994) analysis, it could be that victims, who are caught up in cycles of persistent shame, are experiencing the form of alienation characterized by engulfment. There is too much emphasis for them on the "we" within a social group; who they are as individuals, the "I," has not been socially validated. At great personal and social costs, victims sacrifice who they are as individuals to belong and become beholden to the collective. Over time this unhealthy balance affects victims in negative ways, as typified by social withdrawal or participating in behaviors that are harmful to self and others (see also Nathanson's (1997) compass of shame). For bullies Scheff's analysis may also fit, but is no doubt more complex too, as the "we" defined by group life can be highly variable, with some groups being more inclusive than others. Further, the norms that define different groups can be highly variable. As a simple example, students who bully may bypass shame through creating a subculture (or group) where bullying is legitimated and condoned. They become focused on the "I," opposed to the inclusive "we" of the wide school community. They may also isolate themselves and create a subculture where a "we," in a less inclusive sense, can validate their antisocial behavior patterns. Thus, they take on the form of alienation characterized by isolation, through increasingly affiliating with less inclusive subcultures. However, this analysis of

bullying behavior becomes more complicated where dominating behavior, that is bullying, is legitimated by the wider culture. Further, the pattern becomes more complex for students who experience both bullying and victimization, as alienation can be experienced as both isolation and engulfment. Finally, for students who are neither bullies nor victims, solidarity exists: there is a healthy balance between who they are as individuals and who they are as group members. Through this balance, cooperative relations emerge and healthy social relationships are fostered.

Tyler and Blader's (2000) analysis of cooperative behavior helps us to take this analysis further. Like Scheff (1994), their analysis of social cooperation (or solidarity) is conceptualized as a function of the balance between who we are and how we feel, as individuals (the "I') within a group, and who we are, and how we feel, as a collective or group (the "we"); however, they develop an identity-based model of social relations, building on Lind and Tyler's (1988) group value model of procedural justice and Tyler and Lind's (1992) relational model of authority. They argue that two aspects of group-oriented status are important in shaping cooperation within groups: (1) the respect one feels as an individual within a group and (2) the pride one feels as a member of a group. High levels of cooperative relations within organizations are found when individuals feel a high level of pride in being a member of the group as well as a high level of respect within the group. In other words, both pride and respect are indicators of social status. Pride reflects individuals' feelings about the status of their group, while respect reflects people's feelings about their status within their group. When status is high at both levels, cooperation and compliance with organizational goals and standards are also high.

This status analysis resonates with the findings of Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, and Kaukianinen (1996) who investigated school bullying as a group process involving a range of social status groups. This Finnish study looked at a number of roles that sustain bullying behavior in schools (victim, bully, reinforcer/assistant, defender, and outsider) and their relation to four status groups within the school (popular, rejected, controversial, and average). While there were significant gender differences, the status of the students was found to be associated with their participant roles; for example, the study found that while male students who bullied ranked low on social status, female students who bullied were found to be high status; victims, on the other hand, consistently ranked as low-status group members (scoring low on social acceptance and high on social rejection). Given this evidence, there is good reason to believe that bullying behavior patterns are related to social status within the school (see also National Research Council, 2003).

When Tyler and Blader's (2000) group value analysis is applied to the four bullying status groups, different patterns of pride and respect can be predicted for each of the four bullying status groups. For the "victim" group, the balance between social status as an individual (respect) and social status as a group member (pride) is breaking down at the individual level, as these students do not feel

respected within the group. For the "bully" group, the results could be mixed depending on a number of factors, such as the legitimacy of bullying behavior within the school. Yet, on balance between individual and group level status, it could well be that individual level status (respect) is secured through their dominating behavior, whereas group level status (pride) is more variable, depending on their motivation for bullying and the legitimacy of bullying within the community. The "bully/victims" group reflects the worst of both groups, experiencing low social status at both an individual and group level. While the "nonbully/nonvictim" group, experiences high social status at both an individual and group level.

Given that Tyler and Blader (2000) build on a social identity analysis of cooperative behavior, the nonbullies/nonvictims should identify strongest with the school community, while bully/victims should identify the least with the school community, with victims and bullies falling between these two groups. While social identity has been conceptualized and measured in many different ways, Tajfel's (1972) original conception of social identity is defined as an "individual's knowledge that he [or she] belongs to certain groups together with some *emotional* and *value* significance to him [or her] of the group membership" (p. 31, emphasis added). As such, the emotional value of group membership is of interest to the present study, as it builds on the emotional understanding of social behavior that the shame management perspective also makes.

Building on this theoretical integration of the role of shame management and group value, specifically the role of shame acknowledgment, shame displacement, respect, pride, and emotional group value within the school community, these predictor variables will be used to differentiate the four bullying status groups. The study aims to test the following predictions (see Table 1):

1. The "nonbullies/nonvictim" groups are more likely to acknowledge shame, rather than displace shame. They experience high levels of both pride and respect at school. The emotional group value of the school community is high.
2. The "victim" groups are also more likely to acknowledge shame, rather than displace shame. They experience low levels of respect, relative to pride, at school. The emotional group value of the school community is moderate.
3. The "bully" groups are more likely to displace shame, rather than acknowledge shame. They experience high levels of respect relative to pride at school. The emotional group value of the school community is moderate.

Table 1. Shame Management and Group Value Predictions across the Bullying Status Groups

	Shame Management		Group Value		
	Acknowledge	Displace	Respect	Pride	Emotional
NB/NV	High	Low	High	High	High
Victim	High	Low	Low	Med	Med
Bully	Low	High	High	Med	Med
Bully/victim	Low	High	Low	Low	Low

4. The "bully/victim" groups are also more likely to displace shame, rather than acknowledge shame. They experience low levels of pride and respect at school. The emotional group value of the school community is low.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Self-report data were collected from 343 students (mean age = 13.5 years; age range = 12–16 years; males = 163; females = 180). These students, and their parents, had taken part in a previous bullying survey, 3 years earlier. The original sample was drawn from 22 public schools and 10 private schools in the Australian Capital Territory (see Ahmed et al., 2001). Parents of students, from the first study ($N = 978$), volunteered to be contacted to participate in the follow-up study and were sent two independent questionnaires (parent and student) that contained some of the original measures, and some new measures. Parents and students filled out independent questionnaires. Of the 581 families who agreed to participate in the follow-up survey, 368 families (63.3%) returned their questionnaire. Of these only 365 children's surveys were included in the present analysis, as there was a mismatch between the sex of the student indicated in the first survey and the sex of the student indicated in the second survey. From these 365 surveys, only students who fell into one of the four bullying status groups identified by Ahmed (see Ahmed, Harris, Braithwaite, & Braithwaite , 2002) were included in the analysis ($N = 307$): students in the "nonbully/nonvictim" group had neither bullied others nor were victims of bullying ($n = 61$); students in the "victim" group had been victimized without provocation and had not bullied anyone ($n = 96$); students in the "bully" group had not been victimized but had bullied others, alone or in a group, without provocation ($n = 91$); students in the "bully/victim" group both, without provocation, bullied others and were bullied themselves ($n = 59$). For all questions about bullying, participants in the study were given definitional information about bullying before the questions: "We call it bullying when someone repeatedly hurts or frightens someone weaker than themselves on purpose. Remember that it is not bullying when two young people of about the same strength have the odd fight or quarrel. Bullying can be done in different ways: by hurtful teasing, threatening actions or gestures, name-calling or hitting or kicking."

Measures

Bullying and victimization was measured using the same items as the Peer Relations Questionnaire (PRQ; Rigby & Slee, 1993). Bullying was measured using two questions: (1) "How often have you been part of a group that bullied someone during the last year?" and (2) "How often have you, on your own, bullied someone during the last year?" Response options ranged from "never" (1) to "several times

a week" (5). To construct the bullying measure, responses of these two items were averaged ($r = .56$; $p < .001$; $N = 323$; $M = 1.66$; $SD = .74$). Victimization was measured using one question: (1) How often have you been bullied by another student or group of students? Response options ranged from "never" (1) to "most days" (6). Follow-up questions were asked to measure provocation. Students who indicated that they had been victimized, but responded "yes" to the reason being "I did something hurtful to someone," were excluded from the categorization process. Students who indicated that they had bullied, but responded "yes" to the reason being "To get even," were also excluded from the categorization process.

Shame management was measured using the management of shame state–shame acknowledgement shame displacement (MOSS; see Ahmed et al., 2001). The students were given four scenarios that described a bullying incident at school where the student is asked to imagine a situation where they are caught (by a school teacher) hurting another child in school (physically or socially). After reading each scenario, the students were asked five questions that reflected shame acknowledgment and five questions that reflected shame displacement, answering yes or no to each. Responses were averaged across the four scenarios for each of the two shame management dimensions. The shame acknowledgment ($\alpha = .84$) and displacement questions ($\alpha = .69$) are listed in Table 2.

Group value was measured using items adapted from Tyler and Blader (2000) and Tajfel (1972). Respect was measured using three items: "I feel valued and respected as a student at my school"; "At school I am listened to when I have something to say"; "I feel good about how I am treated at school." Students responded on a 4-point scale, ranging from disagree a lot (1) to agree a lot (4). Responses were averaged across the three measures ($\alpha = .79$). Pride was measured using three items: "I feel very proud of being a student at my school"; "What my school expects from me is clear to me"; "I often speak proudly about being a student at my school." Students responded on a 4-point scale, ranging from disagree a lot (1) to agree a lot (4). Responses were averaged across the three measures ($\alpha = .71$). Building on Tajfel's (1972) original emphasis on emotional and value significance of group membership, four measures of the emotional value of being a member of

Table 2. Shame Acknowledgment and Shame Displacement Items from the MOSS-SASD

Shame Acknowledgment Items	Shame Displacement Items
Would you feel ashamed of yourself?	Would you feel angry at this situation?
Would you wish you could just hide?	Would you feel like getting back to that student?
Would you feel angry with yourself in this situation?	Would you feel like blaming others for what happened?
Would you feel like making the situation better?	Would you feel unable to decide if you were to blame?
Would you feel like blaming yourself for what happened?	Would you feel like doing something else, e.g., throwing or kicking something?

the school community were used: "I really like being a student at my school"; "I feel very comfortable at school"; "I feel very satisfied going to school each day"; "Going to school makes me very happy." Students responded on a 4-point scale, ranging from disagree a lot (1) to agree a lot (4). Responses were averaged across the four items ($\alpha = .87$).

Results

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted using the five factors of interest—shame acknowledgment, shame displacement, pride, respect, and emotional group value—as the dependent variables and the bullying status group as the independent variables. The results from the MANOVA were statistically significant according to Wilke's Lambda (.75), $F(15, 826) = 6.24$, $p < .001$. The results of the five univariate tests are shown in Table 3, as are the results of the post hoc multiple comparison tests.

Shame Acknowledgment

Consistent with Ahmed's (see Ahmed et al., 2001) findings, shame acknowledgment was found to be significantly different across the four bullying status groups, $F(3,303) = 13.59$, $p < .001$, with the "nonbully/nonvictim" group, along with the "victim" group, reporting the greatest use of shame acknowledgment strategies. As predicted, both the "bully" group, and the "bully/victim" group, reported less use of shame acknowledgment strategies. Post hoc multiple comparison tests showed that the "nonbully/nonvictim" and the "victim" groups were significantly different than the "bully" and the "bully/victim" groups.

Shame Displacement

Again, consistent with Ahmed's (see Ahmed et al., 2001) findings, shame displacement was found to be significantly different across the four bullying status groups, $F(3,303) = 5.36$, $p < .001$, with the "nonbully/nonvictim" group, along with the "victim" group, reporting the least use of shame displacement strategies. As predicted, both the "bully" group, and the "bully/ victim" group, reported the greatest use of shame displacement strategies. Again, post hoc multiple comparison tests showed that the "nonbully/nonvictim" and the "victim" groups were significantly different than the "bully" and the "bully/victim" groups.

Respect

Respect was also found to be significantly different across the four bullying status groups, $F(3,303) = 8.58$, $p < .001$, with the "nonbully/nonvictim" and the

Table 3. Shame Management and Group Value across the Four Bullying Status Groups

	Shame Management				Group Value					
	Acknowledge		Displace		Respect		Pride		Emotional Value	
Bullying status group	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)
Nonbully/nonvictim (N) ($n = 61$)	1.84	(.22)	1.06	(.13)	3.21	(.58)	2.92	(.66)	3.16	(.66)
	B, BV		B, BV		V, BV		BV		V, BV	
Victim (V) ($n = 96$)	1.84	(.20)	1.08	(.13)	2.85	(.72)	2.76	(.67)	2.90	(.73)
	B, BV		B, BV		N, B		BV		N, B	
Bully (B) ($n = 91$)	1.65	(.28)	1.15	(.19)	3.16	(.53)	2.75	(.67)	3.09	(.61)
	N, V		N, V		V, BV		BV		V, BV	
Bully/Victim (BV) ($n = 59$)	1.67	(.31)	1.14	(.17)	2.75	(.74)	2.51	(.63)	2.71	(.75)
	N, V		N, V		N, B		N, V, B		N, B	
$F(3,303)$	13.59 ***		5.36***		8.58 ***		3.90 **		5.71 ***	

Note. Significant differences in mean value among the groups are indicated by capital letters (N = nonbully/nonvictim; V = victim; B = bully; BV = bully/victim; for example, for shame acknowledgment the nonbully/nonvictim groups (N) are significantly different from bully groups (B) and the bully/victim groups (BV). ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

"bully" groups reporting the highest level of respect within their school and the "victim" and "bully/victim" groups reporting the lowest level of respect within their school. Post hoc multiple comparisons showed that the "nonbully/nonvictim" and "bully" groups were significantly different than the "victim" and "bully/victim" groups.

Pride

Pride was also found to be significantly different across the four groups, $F(3,303) = 3.90$, $p < .01$, with the "nonbully/nonvictim" group reporting the highest level of pride in their school and the "bully/victim" group reporting the lowest level of pride in their school. The "bully" group and the "victim" group reported intermediate levels of pride in their school. However, post hoc multiple comparisons showed that only the "bully/victim" group was significantly different than the other three groups.

Emotional Group Value

Emotional group value was found to be significantly different across the four groups $F(3,303) = 5.71$, $p < .001$, with the "nonbully/nonvictim" and the "bully" groups reporting the greatest level emotional group value with the school and the "victim" and "bully/victim" groups reporting the least emotional group value with the school. Like the respect measures, post hoc multiple comparisons showed that the "nonbully/nonvictim" and "bully" groups were significantly different than the "victim" and "bully/victim" groups.

Within subject contrast revealed significant colinearity between the respect measures and the emotional value measures. Also, the correlations among the three group value measures are all high: respect and pride ($r = .64$), respect and emotional group value ($r = .61$), pride and emotional group value ($r = .74$). Despite this, it was decided that the full pattern of results revealed a systematic pattern across the four bullying status groups, worthy of full discussion.

Discussion

The results support the predictions that shame management (acknowledgment and displacement), status within the school community (respect), status as a member of the school community (pride), as well as the emotional value of being a member of the school community vary with bullying status category.

Students who reported that they did not participate in bullying in school, nor felt they were victims of bullying (nonbullies/nonvictim group), indicated that they were more likely to use shame acknowledgment strategies (i.e., taking responsibility and making amends), and less likely to use shame displacement strategies

(i.e., blaming others and externalizing anger), when involved in harmful behavior to others. In other words, these students were adaptive shame managers, enabling them to maintain healthy social relations. The health of social relationships within the school was also reflected in the measures of pride, respect, and emotional group value of the school community, which are all high relative to the other bullying status groups.

Like the nonbully/nonvictim group, students who reported that they did not participate in bullying in school, but felt they were victims of bullying, indicated that they were more likely to use shame acknowledgment strategies, and less likely to use shame displacement strategies following harmful behavior to others; however, the social status measures of pride and respect help to differentiate this group from the nonbullies/nonvictims. As expected, this group reported significantly less levels of respect within the school community; following this they also reported lower levels of emotional group value. Their level of pride within the school community was less affected, being slightly lower than the "nonbullies/nonvictim" group, but not to a significant extent. Hence, for these students the health of their social bonds at schools is most strongly affected by their low social status within the school community, as measured by feelings of respect. It is this factor that differentiates this group from the "nonbully/nonvictim" group, along with the measure of emotional group value.

Unlike the two previous groups, students who reported that they did participate in bullying in school, but felt they were not victims of bullying, indicated that they were more likely to use shame displacement strategies (i.e., externalizing blame and anger), and less likely to use shame acknowledgment strategies (i.e., taking responsibility and making amends), when involved in harmful behavior to others in school. Their level of feeling respected within the school community was much stronger than the "victim" group. However, their level of pride in being a member of the school was similar to victims, again not significantly lower than the "nonbully/nonvictim" group. Their emotional group value was slightly lower than the "nonbully/nonvictim" group, but not to a significant extent. Thus, for this group it is their maladaptive shame management style that is most characteristic of this group, in that it is the only factor that differentiates it from the "nonbully/nonvictim" group.

Finally, the students who reported both participating in bullying as well as feeling they were victims of bullying were characterized by the distinguishing features of both these bullying status groups, along with a range of other measures. Like the "bully" group, they reported greater use of shame displacement strategies, and less use of shame acknowledgment strategies. Like the "victim" group, these students reported the lowest levels of respect within the school community. The other factors that further distinguishes this group is their significantly lower level of pride in being a member of the school community, as also reflected in the emotional group value of the school community. In summary, these students reported the lowest levels of pride, respect, and emotional group value with their

school community. The health of their social bonds and status was weak on all dimensions.

Social Status and Social Bonds

The evidence suggests that shame management and group value is related to bullying status group within school communities, with measures of these factors varying along these dimensions for each of the four groups. It seems that the group dynamics of social status and connection to the school community, along with the management of shame following harmful behavior to others, is important to understanding and addressing the problem of bullying in school. Further, the evidence suggests that there is a reciprocal relationship between shame management and group value; in other words, when social life is functioning optimally, indicative of healthy levels of respect, pride, and emotional group value, shame management is also functioning in healthy ways. As the health of social bonds breaks down, shame management reflects maladaptive practices to the healthy functioning of social life within the school community. Simply put, strong social ties reflect healthy shame management; weak social ties reflect poor shame management. That is, when shame management becomes maladaptive, signs of alienation from the school community also become evident. However, it seems that disconnection from the school community, in other words alienation, emerges in different ways for students that are victimized, than for students who bully. For victims of bullying, these students are moving toward the form of alienation that is typified by engulfment in the wider community, their autonomy as unique and productive individuals is affected. For students who bully, these students are moving toward the form of alienation that is typified by isolation in the wider community, as they drift toward relationships and subcultures that better capture a normative stance they are comfortable with. At the same time, the evidence suggests that schools can provide a social space that offers substantial emotional value to students who bully, as reflected in the emotional group value measure. It would be interesting to test if emotional group value is decreased by effective intervention measures.

This analysis of alienation resonates with the longitudinal finding for children who bully, as well as children who are victims of bullying. For children who bully in early life, their behavior patterns are later associated with the subcultures of delinquency (Farrington, 1993) and crime (Olweus, 1993). For students who are bullied by others, their behavior patterns are characterized by social isolation and suicide (Hawker & Boulton, 2000). Finally, this study also characterizes a smaller group that captures the worst of both these forms of alienation, albeit unclear if these are bullies turned victims, or victims turned bullies, or both. Research has shown that students who bully in early life, develop the same depressive symptoms as victims over time. Similarly, Newman (2004) and colleagues showed that many of the students who carried out the mass school shootings of the 1990's suffered depression and experienced some form of social marginalization, such as being

bullied by their peers. These students not only became active in subcultures that promoted violent behavior, they acted on these behavioral norms, not only taking the lives of others, but in many instances taking their own life as well, or intending to. Thus, these students exhibit both forms of alienating behavior.

What is unclear from the results of this study is the direction of causation. Is it maladaptive shame management that drives the social and emotional disconnection from school, or is it through social and emotional disconnection from school that students become less adaptive in managing shame in thoughtful and caring ways, or perhaps both? Further, what is the influence of other spheres of social life, such as the family, in determining shame management style? Despite the need for further study to establish causal pathways, it is clear that keeping students connected to their school communities, through healthy social and emotional processes, is important to curbing antisocial behavior patterns, for both victims and perpetrators of school bullying.

There is evidence of the importance of social ties from a range of literatures. From the youth violence literature, the Surgeon General's report on Youth Violence (2001) found that weak social ties was the most significant risk factor for adolescent violence, well above gang membership, poverty, and drug use. In the context of educational outcomes, school connectedness was the key element identified in strengthening health and educational outcomes, as well as curbing antisocial behavior (Blum & Libbey, 2004). Within the field of social psychology, it has been shown that when a sense of belonging and connectedness diminishes, individuals are more likely to take on self-defeating behaviors, which could lead to aggressive behavior to oneself and others (see Williams et al., 2005 for review).

Hence, like other harmful behaviors to oneself and others, a significant factor in understanding school bullying is students' feeling of connection within the school community, as influenced by factors such as a sense of respect within the school community, feeling of pride in being a member of the school community, adaptive shame management skills, and emotional group value. Bullying is an important indicator of the development of a range of antisocial behavior problems. The growing literature of school bullying not only recognizes just how harmful bullying behavior can be, students themselves recognize this; for example, in one study of the "big problems" at school, students (age 8 years to 15 years) identified bullying and teasing as a more significant problem than drugs or alcohol, racism, AIDS, or pressure to have sex (Kaiser Family Foundation & Children Now, 2001). At the same time, the relationship among the factors of interest to this study is not straightforward.

Social Norms, Pride, and Shame

While social status was measured within the school in two ways (pride and respect), the respect measure was much more helpful in differentiating the bullying

status groups. While it is beyond the scope of this article to tease the pride results out further, it is worthwhile to reflect on why the measure of pride is less predictive than respect. While it could well be that better measures are needed, the result could also reflect the influence of social norms; that is, some schools, and other social institutions, normalize, condone, and ignore (and therefore passively condone) bullying. Thus, an individual could take pride in communities that condone this form of behavior. If schools, and other social institutions, provided a clear and consistent message that bullying is not condoned, one could expect the pride measure to be lower. Thus, while social norms may color pride, respect could be more resistant to the tide of social norms.

Elster (1999) has also argued that shame is the key emotion underlying the power of social norms; however, the relationship is not straightforward, norms are regulated by emotions, which in turn regulate norms. The following vignette by Tompkins (1962) shows the importance of social norms to generating shame:

> Our hero is a child who is destined to have every affect totally bound by shame. We see him first with his age equals. He is a friendly, somewhat timid child, who is being bullied. He is not angry with the bully, indeed he is a little afraid of him. His reluctance to fight evokes taunts of "sissy," "chicken," "yellow" from those who themselves may be shamed by his timidity. Rather than tolerate his shame he will permit himself to be coerced into flying in the face of fear and fight the dreaded bully. The same timid one, coerced into tolerating fear by his age equals and into fighting the bully, may be shamed into mortification for having fought. "Nice little boys don't fight like ruffians. Mother is ashamed of you. Whatever got into you? You know better than that." The timid one now starts to cry in distress. The feeling of shame has passed into critical density, and tears well up in the eyes and add to the intensity of his sobbing. At this point his father, attracted by the childlike, even effeminate display of tears, expresses manly contempt for such weakness. "What are you crying for, like a two-year old? Stop it-you make me sick." (pp. 228–229)

As this child moves through the different social spheres that make up his life, shame rises and falls, as the norms of the different social spheres come into play. This descriptive account of shame typifies the context-specific nature of shame, and its management. In each of the three interpersonal situations, the norms of appropriate behavior shift and, so too, the associated feeling of shame.

Shame and Social Connectedness

In regard to the shame results, these are consistent with Nathanson's (1997) compass of shame, which builds on Tompkin's (1987) work on affect theory. Within this framework shame inhibits the positive affects of interest and enjoyment that are characterized by affiliation and engagement, in other words connection with others. Nathanson's (1997) compass of shame maps out the possible reactions to a shame situation: withdrawal, avoidance, attack others, and attack self. Withdrawal involves the desire to be away from others and in some cases can be so severe that it involves complete isolation, typical of victims of bullying. Attacking self is another reaction to poor shame management, whereby the self is depreciated

in relation to others, also typical of those who are victimized. Avoidance involves distracting the self from the negative experience of shame, often through the abuse of mood-altering substances and behaviors. The final strategy deflects shame from the self by attacking others, reflecting shame displacement strategies. Individuals can adopt a range of these strategies. For example, a good number of the perpetrators of the mass school shootings, first attacked others and then attacked self through committing suicide, or intending to (Newman, 2004). The key question with shame management in school is how to create institutional space to work through emotional disconnection in ways that are healthy for the individuals involved, as well as the school community as a whole.

Braithwaite and colleagues argue that: " . . . regulating social conduct is more likely to be effective when the following principles are in play: shaming of bad acts that averts shaming of the actor's character; praise of good character that uncouples praise from specific acts. In this way, we achieve: shaming acts but not persons that repairs identity; praising virtues of the person rather than just their acts that nourishes a positive identity" (Ahmed et al., 2001 , p. 16). Simply put, moral balance is achieved when shame can be discharged in ways that rebuild the social fabric of individuals' lives and reconnects them with institutions (e.g., schools) such that they identify with the institution, and are nourished as individuals within its care. What is not clear from the data presented is whether interventions should focus on building a healthy sense of respect and pride, which in turn enhances the use of adaptive shame management strategies, or if maladaptive shame management impedes or masks the development of pride and respect.

Many practitioners and researchers working within the field of restorative justice argue that shame is the more powerful social regulator of behavior. For example, McDonald and Moore's (2001) review of pride and shame in the context of restorative conferencing, argue that shame precedes pride in the transformation of conflict into cooperation. Similarly, Retzinger and Scheff (1996) argue "that shame plays a crucial role in normal cooperative relationships, as well as conflict. . . . shame signals a threat to the social bond, and therefore is vital in establishing where one stands in a relationship. Similarly, pride signals a secure bond. Shame is the emotional cognate of a threatened or damaged bond, just as threatened bonds are the source of shame" (p. 5). While Scheff (1994) acknowledges the interplay between pride and respect, he argues that: "shame seems to occupy a singular place among the emotions, and social relationships. [He calls] it the 'master emotion' because it may have powerful psychological and social functions" (p. 53). Similarly, in the recasting of reintegrative shaming theory, Braithwaite and colleagues' (see Ahmed et al., 2001) data suggest that "once we have reached the point where a major act of bullying has occurred or a serious crime is being processed by the justice system, it may be that shame management is more important than pride management in building a safer community" (p. 17). They conclude that shame when acknowledged reconnects individuals with their social world; shame that is

bypassed underlies shame-rage cycles that characterize the worst types of conflict (see Ahmed et al., 2001 p. 315).

In summary, building theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that shame is an important signal about the state of our social relationships. It seems that shame management involves a search for coherence of identity, and the way the many identities that each person holds relate to each other. Shame acknowledgment can lead to greater integrity of the self and the social world, captured by a unifying coherence (of humanity) that is carried through the multiplicity of identities that each individual carries. Shame avoidance, as well as persistence, can lead to social alienation, conflict and violence toward the self and the social world. Restorative justice, whether applied to families, schools, the work place or governance, seeks to reweave the social fabric of individuals' lives through mechanisms of support and accountability. As the present evidence suggests, a central feature to this process may well be repairing social bonds through effective shame management practices.

Restorative Justice and Social Emotions

Restorative justice interventions work from an emotional base. The aim is to discharge negative affect and build positive affect (see Morrison, 2006). Sherman (2003), in his presidential address to the American Society of Criminology, argued that:

> Research on [restorative justice] interventions can help modify both theory and innovations as a basis for democratic institutions to agree upon a new paradigm of "emotionally intelligent justice," focused on the central role of emotions in the causation and regulation of behavior" (p. 1)

The aim is to make regulation of civil society more responsive and more restorative, building on the centrality of emotions. Instead of sidelining emotions to the primacy of rational judgment, working through emotions becomes central to the regulation of a civil society.

Strang, Sherman and Colleagues (this volume) have carried out some of the most rigorous tests of restorative justice in the context of juvenile and criminal justice. While their results show variable effects for offenders in terms of recidivism rates, relative to offence type and location, the benefits to victims are consistent. One particularly relevant finding to the present study is the reduction in posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms for victims who participate in restorative justice conferences. This is an important finding given that victims of bullying in school have been found to experience posttraumatic stress following chronic school bullying (Mynard et al., 2000). Restorative justice conferencing and circles have also been found to be effective interventions in the context of school bullying. A study of a proactive intervention, based on principles of restorative justice, has also found

that shame management strategies can be shifted from the use of maladaptive to adaptive strategies, through social and emotional skills training (see Morrison, 2006).

Conclusion

Howard Zehr (2002), one of the founding fathers of the restorative justice movement, characterizes the process of restoration as a concurrent journey to belonging for both "victims" and "offenders," creating opportunities to reweave their identities, to renarrate their stories, to recreate meaning in their lives. This vision resonates with that of Pranis (2001) who speaks of the importance of story telling and listening to feeling connected and respected. Creating safe spaces where stories of harm and of hope can be told and listened to is an important social agenda for schools and civil society. In the aftermath of the deadly school shooting in the 1990s, the National Research Council (2003) concluded that:

> One message that comes through loud and clear in the [deadly school rampage] cases is that adolescents are intensely concerned about their social standing in their school and among their peers. For some, their concern is so great that threats to their status are treated as threats to their very lives and status as something to be defended at all costs. (p. 336)

They go on to recommend that:

> Young people need some places where they feel valued and powerful and needed–this is part of the journey from childhood to adulthood. . . . Holding spaces and pathways open for them may be an important way of preventing violence. (p. 336)

While these deadly rampage shootings are rare, they are symptomatic of a much deeper problem; in other words, they reflect only the tip of the iceberg. All students deserve to feel valued, powerful, and needed. Many students suffer bullying everyday at school but do not strike back through violence. Instead, they carry emotional scars for a lifetime. These students, and others, deserve our attention too. Through better understanding of the social and emotional dynamics of shame, pride, and respect, the hope is that more effective pathways can be created and held open to help curb the debilitating effects of bullying, violence, and alienation that affect many members of our school communities. Failure to address this social and emotional dynamics may be to the detriment of positive youth development and civil society.

References

Ahmed, E., Harris, N., Braithwaite, J., & Braithwaite, V. (2001). *Shame management through reintegration*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497–529.

Bennett, W. J. (1999). *The index of leading cultural indicators: American society at the end of the 20th century*. Colorado Springs, CO: Waterbrook Press.

Blum, R. W., & Libbey, H. P. (2004). School connectedness: Strengthening health and education outcomes for teenagers. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 231–234.

Bond, L., Carlin, J., Thomas, L., Rubin, K., & Patton, G. (2001). Does bullying cause emotional problems? A prospective study of young teenagers. *British Medical Journal, 323*(7311), 480–484.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J. B. (2002a). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. Oxford, UK: University Press.

Braithwaite, J. B. (2002b). *Democracy, community and problem solving*. Retrieved September 1, 2005, from http://restorativepractices.org/library/vt/vt˙brai.html.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2000). *CDC Surveillance Summaries*. MMWR 2000; 49(No. SS-5): Table 10. Retrieved September 1, 2005, from http://www.cdc.gov /mmwr/ preview/mmwrhtml/ss4905a1.htm#tab10.

Durkheim, E. [1897] (1952). *Suicide*. New York: Free Press.

Elster, J. (1999). *Alchemies of the mind: Rationality and the emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice* (*Vol. 17*). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gilligan, J. (2001). *Preventing violence*. New York: Thames and Hudson.

Hawker, S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*(4), 441–455.

Kaiser Family Foundation & Children Now. (2001). *Talking with kids about tough issues: A national survey of parents and kids*. Retrieved September 1, 2005 from http://www.talkingwithkids.org/ nickelodeon/summary.pdf.

Kaltialo-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpela, A., & Ratenen, P. (1999). Bullying, depression and suicidal ideation in Finish adolescents: school survey. *British Medical Journal, 319*, 348–350.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 202–214.

Lerner, R. M. (2000). Developing civil society through the promotion of positive youth development. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 21*, 48–49.

Lewis, H. B. (1971).*Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International University Press.

Lewis, H. B. (1987). *The role of shame in symptom formation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.

McDonald, J., & Moore, D. (2001). Community conferencing as a special case of conflict transformation. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative justice and civil society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McNeely, C. A., Nonnemaker, J. M., & Blum, R. W. (2002). Promoting school connectedness: Evidence for the national longitudinal study of adolescent health. *Journal of School Health, 72*(4), 138–146.

Morrison, B. E. (2001). The school system developing its capacity in the regulation of a civil society. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative justice and civil society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Morrison, B. E. (2003). Regulating safe school communities: Being responsive and restorative. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*(6), 689–704.

Morrison, B. E. (2005). Restorative justice in schools. In E. Elliott & R. Gordon (Eds.), *New directions in restorative justice: Issues, practice, evaluation*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Morrison, B. E. (2006). *Restoring safe school communities: A whole school response to bullying, violence and alienation*. Sydney: Federation Press.

Mynard, H., Joseph, S., Alexander, J. (2000). Peer-victimization and posttraumatic stress in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 815–821.

Nathanson, D. L. (1997). Affect theory and the compass of shame. In M. R. Lansky (Ed.), *The widening scope of shame*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

National Research Council. (2003). *Deadly lessons: Understanding lethal school violence*. National Academies Press. Retrieved September 1, 2005, from http://www.nap.edu/.

Newman, K. S. (2004). *Rampage: The social roots of school shootings*. NY: Basic Books.

Oliver, R., Hoover, J. H., & Hazler, R. (1994). The perceived roles of bullying in small-town Midwestern schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(4), 416–419.
Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying in schools: What we know and what we can do. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
Peterson, C. (Ed.). (2004). Positive development: Realizing the potential of youth [Special Issue]. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 591*.
Pranis, K. (2001). *Building justice on a foundation of democracy, caring and mutual responsibility*. Retrieved September 1, 2005, from http://www.doc.state.mn.us /rj/pdf/rjbuildingjustice.pdf.
Retzinger, S. M., & Scheff, T. J. (1996). Strategy for community conferences: Emotions and social bonds. In B. Galaway & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative justice: International perspectives*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Rigby, K. (2004). Addressing bullying in schools: Theoretical perspectives and their implications. *School Psychology International, 25*(3), 287–300.
Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relating among Australian school children and their implications for psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(1), 33–42.
Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1999). Suicidal ideation among adolescent school children, involvement in bully/victim problems and perceived low social support. *Suicide and Life-threatening Behavior, 29*, 119–130.
Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 1–15.
Scheff, T. J. (1994). *Bloody revenge: Emotions, nationalism and war*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Sherman, L. W. (2003). Reason for emotion: Reinventing justice with theories, innovations and research. *Criminology, 41*, 1–37.
Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 548–561.
Smith, P. K., Pepler, D. K., & Rigby, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Surgeon General. (2001). *Youth violence*. Retrieved September 1, 2005, from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/youthviolence/report.html.
Tajfel, H. (1972). La categorization sociale (English trans.). In S. Moscovici (Ed.) *Introduction a la psychologie sociale*. Paris: Larouse.
Tompkins, S. S. (1962). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. I. The positive affects*. New York: Springer.
Tompkin, S. S. (1987). Shame. In D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), *The many faces of shame*. New York: Guildford Press.
Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 115–191.
Williams, K. D., Forgas, J. P., & von Hippel, W. (Eds.). (2005). *The social outcast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying*. New York: The Psychology Press.
Zehr, H. (2002). Journey to belonging. In E. G. M. Weitekamp & H. J. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative Justice: Theoretical foundations*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

BRENDA MORRISON is a research fellow at the Centre for Restorative Justice at the Australian National University, currently seconded to the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology, University of Pennsylvania. The theory and practice of restorative justice and responsive regulation in schools is her primary interest, including the study of schools as a crime reduction mechanism.