Voices Of Virtue: Teachers' Reflections on Past Experiences of Addressing Harms Between Peers at School

Ricardo Andrés Salas Dorado

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts (Child Studies) at

Concordia University

Montréal, Québec, Canada

August 2024

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Ricardo Andrés Salas Dorado

Entitled: Voices of Virtue: Teachers' reflections on past experiences of addressing harms between peers at school

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Child Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Internal Examiner
Dr. Sandra Chang-Kredl

_____ External Examiner
Dr. Ana Maria Velasquez Niño

_____ Thesis Supervisor
Dr. Holly Recchia

Approved by: _____
Dr. Kim McDonough
Graduate Program Director

_____
Dr. Pascale Sicotte, Dean
Faculty of Arts and Science

Abstract

Voices Of Virtue: Teachers' Reflections on Past Experiences of Addressing Harms Between Peers at School

Ricardo Andrés Salas Dorado

This thesis explores teachers' perspectives and approaches to addressing peer harm incidents in educational settings through a qualitative analysis of their narratives. Employing thematic analysis of in-depth individual interviews and a focus group with eight teachers from a public school in Bogotá, Colombia, two overarching themes were identified: 1) Teachers' philosophies: Reflecting on navigating tensions between different concerns while centering students' needs, and 2) Teachers recognize that harms occur in complex social contexts thus requiring collaboration with the larger community. The first theme highlighted teachers' tensions between following protocols and adapting to individual circumstances when addressing peer harm. They prioritized proactive strategies, restorative approaches, and considered students' perspectives to support their development. The second theme revealed teachers' understanding that students' behavior is shaped by family dynamics and sociocultural factors such as socioeconomics and peer pressure, necessitating a holistic and contextualized approach to address peer harm and promote positive relationships. In this complex educational landscape, the virtue of prudence was identified as a valuable lens for understanding teachers' interventions. This approach offers both structure and flexibility, aligning well with the teachers' student-centered philosophies. These findings provide deeper insights into the challenges of managing student conflicts and underscore the human element of the teaching profession.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Holly Recchia, for her invaluable guidance and support throughout my academic journey. Dr. Recchia I am especially grateful to you for accepting my application to start the Master's program and for believing in me even when we had time against us. Your capacity to balance rigorous academic standards with kindness and empathy has been a source of inspiration. Thank you for the valuable, detailed, and rich feedback, which has significantly enhanced my work. Your dedication to fostering a supportive learning environment was evident in the classes, discussions, and your patience in bearing with my numerous questions and mistakes. Additionally, I am honoured to have been invited to be part of the RAD lab, an opportunity that has enriched my academic experience. Your exceptional expertise has made this journey not only possible but also deeply rewarding. I am honoured to have had the opportunity to work with such a caring, supportive, and brilliant supervisor.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Drs. Sandra Chang-Kredl and Ana Maria Velasquez Niño, for their invaluable support with my thesis. Dr. Chang-Kredl, I am particularly grateful for your suggestion to shift the focus from identity to narratives, which helped refine my research question. Your detailed and rich feedback significantly enriched the thesis I am presenting. Dr. Velasquez Niño, thank you for your comments and suggestions on the different approaches to addressing peer harm. Your insights, drawn from your extensive work in promoting coexistence and preventing violence at schools, have been invaluable. Your expertise has greatly contributed to the depth and rigour of my research.

A special thanks to Vilma Escorcia Vera for her meticulous transcriptions, thorough first-level coding, and interesting and enlightening dialogues which laid the groundwork for my

analysis. I am also grateful to Wilson Hernandez Varona for his expertise in qualitative research and his assistance with second- and third-level coding. Your insights, feedback and comments were invaluable in helping me understand and analyze my data.

I am deeply grateful to Laura Pareja Conto for her invaluable contributions to my research. Her meticulous work in conducting interviews and collecting data was foundational to my thesis. You generously offered your collected data for my use, which significantly advanced my research. Laura, your thoughtful and profound comments on my drafts and coding were very helpful, providing depth and clarity to my work. Additionally, you helped proofread translations, provided insightful feedback during our conversations and meetings, and you were always available to discuss and refine ideas. Your dedication and support have been instrumental in the successful completion of my thesis.

To my son, Gabriel, and my daughter, Juliana, I extend my deepest gratitude for their unconditional love and understanding throughout this journey. Their ability to bear with a father pursuing a Master's is a testament to their incredible patience and support. Truth be said, Gabriel and Juliana, you are my real mastery in Child Studies. Your patience, playfulness, and development have been the most profound lessons I could ever receive. Your unconditional love, manifested in warm hugs when I came home late and sweet kisses and laughter during our playtime, has been my constant source of strength and motivation. Gabriel, your philosophical questions have challenged and inspired me, pushing the boundaries of my understanding in ways no textbook ever could. Juliana, watching you crawl, stand, and fill our home with your beautiful laughter has been a daily reminder of the wonder and joy of child development. You both are the force, light, and strength that have guided me through this academic journey and beyond. Your love and growth have illuminated the practical significance of my studies, making every late

night and challenging assignment worthwhile. Thank you for being my greatest teachers and the heart of my education in child studies.

I am extremely grateful to my wife, Priscila Gomes Azara, you were my rock throughout this entire journey. Your unwavering support and encouragement were the fuel that motivated me to pursue this Master's. I am incredibly fortunate to have you by my side. Pri, you are the foundation of our household, a teacher of patience, and my grounding force. In moments of distress and anxiety, you are my calm harbour. You are both pilot and co-pilot in our life journey together. This project exists solely because of you. Your continuous, generous, and fulfilling support has made this achievement possible. You have brought happiness to every single second we've shared. I could not have managed to start or complete this Master's without your steadfast support. Your love and dedication have been the cornerstone of this accomplishment. You've supported my academic pursuits but have also enriched our life together with your kindness, understanding, and unwavering belief in me. Obrigado for being my partner in every sense of the word, for your sacrifices, and for your boundless love. This achievement is as much yours as it is mine. Esta é uma parte nova, uma nova conquista, um arranjo muito importante do nosso jardim.

Finally, I extend my heartfelt gratitude to my parents, Dianny and Ricardo, and my in-laws, Marta and Sebastião. Their support and willingness to travel from Colombia and Brazil to visit us in different times. Their presence provided much-needed strength and encouragement. Their dedication to our family's well-being, demonstrated through their long journeys and extended stays, has been a testament to their love and commitment. Their presence not only eased our daily responsibilities but also brought warmth, comfort, and a sense of home to our lives in Montréal. I am profoundly grateful for their sacrifices and the strength they've provided throughout this academic journey.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the participants in this study and all the teachers I have worked with during the last 15 years, whose voices are also woven into this exploration of “Voices of Virtue”.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to God the Holy Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; to the Blessed Virgin Mary and Saint Joseph; to my wife, Priscila Gomes Azara; to my children, Gabriel and Juliana, and those to come; to my parents, siblings, sisters-in-law, nieces, and nephews; and to all teachers, whose service and mission are invaluable to the world.

Table of Contents

Voices Of Virtue: Teachers' Reflections on Past Experiences of Addressing Harms Between Peers at School

When students engage in actions that harm their peers, teachers face the complex decision of how to respond. The landscape of school discipline has transformed, with traditional punitive approaches facing scrutiny due to limited effectiveness and potential negative consequences (Welsh & Little, 2018; Zehr, 2002). Restorative justice models, emphasizing accountability, dialogue, and positive relationships, have emerged as a promising alternative (Welsh & Little, 2018; Zehr, 2002). However, there is a need to understand the reflections and experiences that shape how teachers reason and respond when intervening in situations of peer harm. Peer harm refers to situations in which students are hurt or upset by the words or actions of their peers (Wainryb et al., 2005). This study examines teachers' narratives about their approaches to addressing specific incidents of peer harm in schools. Set in the context of a public school in Bogotá, Colombia, the research analyzes how teachers reflect on their experiences and decision-making processes when confronted with peer harm situations. By exploring the personal, professional, and contextual factors that influence teachers' responses, as revealed through their narratives, this study aims to provide insights that can better support educators in creating and maintaining positive and safe school environments.

The virtue of prudence, as elucidated by philosophers such as Pieper (1990), Aristotle (350 B.C.E./2019), and Aquinas (1274/1981), offers a valuable framework for understanding teachers' interventions in peer harm situations. Prudence, often called practical wisdom, involves the ability to discern the appropriate course of action in each situation, considering the specific circumstances and potential consequences (Aristotle., 350 B.C.E./2019). By examining teachers' responses through the lens of prudence, we can gain insights into the reflective processes and

decision-making strategies employed by educators. In these challenging scenarios, judgments fall within the special domain of practical wisdom, which allows reasoning amidst the particularities of our moral, interpersonal, and emotional life circumstances, ultimately aiming toward human flourishing (Pieper, 1990).

From an educational and psychological perspective, exploring teachers' perceptions and beliefs about their interventions in response to peer harm is also profoundly worthy of study. Such interventions can impact classroom dynamics, student well-being, and the overall school environment (Campbell, 2014; Fenstermacher et al., 2009). In educational settings, fostering positive relationships among students and between students and teachers is crucial for effective learning and social development (Pantić & Wubbels, 2012; Welsh & Little, 2018). Despite extensive research on classroom management, we still lack a comprehensive understanding of how teachers perceive, interpret, and act upon their roles when addressing conflicts between students (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Hernandez Varona, 2023).

With these issues in mind, this thesis aims to address the following research question: What do teachers' reflections on past experiences teach us about how they navigate peer harm in their schools? Teachers' beliefs, values, and relational approaches meaningfully impact how they perceive and respond to peer conflict incidents (Brophy, 2006; Hamre et al., 2008). Furthermore, in their role as moral educators, teachers employ diverse strategies rooted in empathy, kindness, and respect, potentially fostering a positive learning environment where students can navigate conflicts and develop essential social-emotional skills (Goldstein & Freeman, 2003; Velasquez et al., 2013). By exploring the intricate factors that shape how teachers navigate peer harm incidents—their perspectives on moral education, grasp of student dynamics, employed

strategies, contextual influences, and guiding principles—an opportunity arises to offer a framework for understanding the delicate discernment required in such multifaceted situations.

Teachers' Narratives

"The universe is made of stories, not atoms." — (Rukeyser, 1968, p. 111)

In the realm of narrative analysis, the concept of "small stories" has gained significant traction and importance to explore the intricate interplay between identity construction and everyday interactions (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2015). Small stories refer to underrepresented, everyday narrative activities that occur in ongoing interactions and conversations, contrasting with the canonical, fully fledged narratives that have traditionally been the focus of narrative analysis. These small stories offer valuable insights into how individuals construct and negotiate their identities through everyday, yet consequential, discursive practices (Georgakopoulou, 2006). In the context of educational settings, teachers' small stories about handling peer harm situations can reveal their underlying beliefs, values, and strategies for addressing these complex issues (Clandinin & Connelly, 2004).

Georgakopoulou (2006) argues that small stories are not merely fragmentary or insignificant narratives; rather, they are "rich, dense, and coherent" accounts that serve important functions in social interaction. By analyzing teachers' small stories about peer harm incidents, it is possible to gain insights into how they position themselves as authority figures, navigate power dynamics, and negotiate their professional identities (Bamberg, 2006). These small stories may also shed light on the implicit theories and assumptions that guide teachers' responses to peer harm, as well as the challenges and dilemmas they face in these situations (Clandinin & Connelly, 2004).

Bamberg (2006) emphasizes the importance of considering the interactional context in which small stories are produced and the ways in which they are co-constructed by participants.

In the case of teachers narrating their experiences addressing peer harm, the audience (e.g., researchers, colleagues, or students) and the purpose of the storytelling event can shape the content and form of the narratives (Georgakopoulou, 2006). By attending to interactional and contextual factors, researchers can better understand the situated meanings and functions of teachers' small stories, as well as the broader discourses and ideologies that inform their narratives (Bamberg, 2006).

Scholars have argued that these situated stories, embedded within specific contexts, provide a rich backdrop for self-development (Pasupathi et al., 2009). These narratives, like mirrors, reflect the evolution of identities, offering profound insights into personal interpretations and choices (Goodson, 2013). Within the complex web of identity construction, situated stories also function as bridges, connecting personal experiences with evolving self-perceptions (Pasupathi et al., 2006). They represent facets of self-concept and are indispensable in shaping, refining, and internalizing identity within the school context; for the purpose of the present study, I was particularly interested in how educators make sense of their roles in addressing disciplinary matters involving harms between students.

Teachers' reflections on their past experiences and the narratives they construct about those experiences can provide valuable insights into how they approach and navigate situations of peer harm in their schools. Rather than viewing narratives as mere assessments of internal states, they can be understood as emergent products that interplay personal representations with contextual features (Bamberg, 2004; Thorne, 2004). By examining the stories teachers tell about navigating interpersonal conflicts among students, we may gain a window into the dynamic process of how they develop their approaches to fostering positive peer relationships and addressing harmful behaviours. As posited by narrative theorists (McAdams et al., 2001)

narrative accounts are shaped by individuals' lived experiences, interactions, and societal expectations. These situated narratives can thus shed light on how teachers' past experiences inform their present roles as guides and mentors in peer conflict situations.

Teachers' personal experiences and professional narratives may also influence their approach to handling student conflicts. These factors shape how teachers position themselves as moral guides, ultimately affecting how they address peer harm and promote positive student relationships (Watson, 2006). By embodying ethical principles and engaging students in discussions about moral dilemmas, teachers can promote ethical decision-making and help students attune their moral compass (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Pishghadam et al., 2022). More specifically, teachers play a crucial role in building inclusive and supportive classroom environments where students feel a sense of belonging and are encouraged to uplift one another (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Miller, 2009; Watson, 2006). Through their interactions and facilitation of group activities, teachers can model healthy communication, conflict resolution, and respect for diversity, thereby fostering positive peer relationships (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Varghese et al., 2005). Their ability to cultivate empathy and understanding through self-reflection and sharing relevant stories creates a safe space for students to open up about interpersonal challenges (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Voight et al., 2013; Watson, 2006). In these ways, teachers can serve as powerful agents of change, guiding students through the complexities of peer relationships and equipping them with the tools to navigate potential harm. Their narratives and experiences shape their ability to create supportive environments, promote ethical decision-making, and inspire students to build positive connections with their peers (Day et al., 2006).

Teachers' narratives and experiences are also shaped by the institutional contexts they operate within, particularly schools. Schools provide resources and platforms for teachers to articulate their personal beliefs, perspectives, and approaches to their roles (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). However, teachers are not solely determined by these discourses; they exercise agency in shaping their unique philosophies and stances within these structures (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). When addressing peer harm, teachers draw from their lived wisdom, ethical groundings, and visions for their professional identities as moral mentors.

Crucially, teachers' responses to interpersonal conflicts among students are also influenced by the dynamics of their relationships within the school community (Zhang, 2022). A relational perspective highlights how teachers' interactions, connections, and social bonds with students, colleagues, and administrators shape their self-conception and approaches to fostering positive peer relationships (McLean et al., 2007). By examining their narratives bearing on these relational dynamics, we gain insights into the ongoing process of how teachers develop their roles as guides against peer mistreatment, beyond solely enacting prescribed discourses (Watson, 2006).

The Role of Teachers as Moral Educators

Educational scholarship emphasizes that teaching is inherently rooted in morality (Hansen, 2001; Joseph & Efron, 1993). Teachers, in their decisions and actions, are understood as moral actors; educators' ethical frameworks guide their choices and approaches to resolving conflicts as they enact their roles, shaping the moral landscape of classrooms (Brophy, 2006; Joseph & Efron, 2005; Pantić & Wubbels, 2012). The teacher-student relationship, it is argued, is inherently moral, influencing students' self-worth and values (Hansen, 2001; Pantić & Wubbels, 2012). This perspective on teaching extends beyond mere curricular considerations, exploring

the intricate fabric of educators' ethical decision-making (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Hansen, 2001). Joseph and Efron (1993) underline that although teachers are often reluctant to directly teach values, they nevertheless impart their ethos when considering their classroom environments and interactions with individual students. Fenstermacher and colleagues (2009) discuss the concept of teaching morally, which refers to teaching in a manner that accords with notions of what is good or right. They argue that teachers engage in moral conduct through their manner of teaching, even when not explicitly addressing moral topics.

The narratives and lived experiences that shape teachers' professional identities are deeply intertwined with their roles as moral educators in the classroom. The stories teachers tell about themselves and the wisdom they've gained from navigating life's challenges become powerful resources for guiding students through ethical dilemmas and interpersonal conflicts. As Joseph and Efron (1993, 2005) and Hansen (2001) highlight, teaching is an inherently moral endeavour, with educators serving as moral actors whose ethical frameworks influence their approaches to resolving issues and shaping the moral landscape of their classrooms.

Teachers' narratives and personal philosophies, cultivated through self-reflection on their experiences, provide the foundation for how they embody and impart moral values to students (Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). Whether through implicit modelling of empathy, kindness, and respect in their daily interactions or explicit lessons on moral principles, teachers' beliefs about their roles as moral guides are shaped by their unique stories and ethical groundings (Campbell, 2014; Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2015). These narratives inform teachers' stances on navigating moral conflicts, such as balancing honesty and understanding when addressing student misconduct. As moral mentors, teachers draw from their lived wisdom

to navigate the complexities of ethical decision-making while considering societal expectations and cultural influences on individual values (Sanger, 2001; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003).

By exploring how teachers' narratives of their experiences may elucidate their viewpoints on their roles as moral educators, we gain a deeper understanding of how they develop their approaches to fostering positive peer relationships and addressing interpersonal harm among students. Their personal stories and ethical groundings shape the moral landscape they create in their classrooms, influencing students' moral development and decision-making abilities (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Goldstein & Freeman, 2003; Noddings, 2013; Velasquez et al., 2013). Teachers' reflections on their interventions reveal the complexities of balancing disciplinary actions with the need to nurture empathy, respect, and social responsibility among students (Campbell, 2014; Pantić & Wubbels, 2012; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). This understanding underscores the importance of supporting teachers in their dual roles as educators and moral guides, as they navigate the complex dynamics of peer harm and strive to create a positive and inclusive school environment (Hernandez Varona, 2023; Pantić & Wubbels, 2012; Welsh & Little, 2018).

Moral education is inherently complex and far from being simple or neutral, as it involves dealing with moral conflicts (Fenstermacher et al., 2009). Educators must navigate these complexities to help students make ethical decisions when faced with conflicting values (Joseph & Efron, 1993). Unlike merely analyzing ethical problems intellectually, this approach delves into the emotions involved in moral decision-making. Teachers, acting as moral guides, must traverse this intricate landscape, balancing conflicting values and societal expectations.

Teachers often face complex ethical dilemmas that require them to navigate conflicting values and societal expectations. For instance, when a teacher discovers a student cheating on a

test, they may seek to balance the need to uphold academic integrity with the responsibility to support the student and take their circumstances into account. This situation exemplifies how teachers act as moral guides, making decisions that reflect their ethical stance while considering multiple perspectives (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Pantić & Wubbels, 2012). In such scenarios, teachers must weigh the value of honesty against the importance of empathy and support. They need to consider whether to confront the student immediately, emphasizing the importance of academic integrity, or to approach the situation with sensitivity, exploring potential underlying issues that may have led to the cheating behaviour. This decision-making process is further complicated by societal expectations for teachers to both maintain classroom standards and provide support for students' overall well-being (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Joseph & Efron, 2005). Similar value-laden considerations apply when teachers respond to conflicts or harmful behaviours between students. These situations require teachers to balance various ethical principles, such as fairness, compassion, and responsibility, while also considering the broader impact on the classroom environment (Veugelers & Vedder, 2010).

From an anthropological perspective, individual moral values are deeply ingrained due to cultural and family influences. This can lead to discomfort or internal conflict when these personal values clash with professional expectations or situational demands (Sanger, 2001). As a result, teachers must often engage in critical self-reflection to navigate these complex moral landscapes effectively. Teachers' beliefs about their roles in moral education vary, influenced by factors such as ethnicity, religion, and societal pressures (Joseph & Efron, 1993; Sanger, 2001). Teacher identity, intertwined with their role as moral actors, emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between personal and professional ethics (Pantić & Wubbels, 2012; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2015).

At the core of teaching are teachers' relationships with students, with caring as a fundamental aspect of these relationships (Noddings, 2013; Velasquez et al., 2013). Care goes beyond mere empathy; it embodies the teacher's genuine concern for the well-being and growth of their students. When teachers consistently demonstrate care and understanding, students feel valued and supported, fostering a positive environment for learning (Noddings, 2013; Velasquez et al., 2013). This positive atmosphere is conducive to moral development, as students internalize the empathy and kindness they experience (Goldstein & Freeman, 2003). However, teachers' understanding of what it means to exhibit care is likely to vary across individuals and contexts (Veugelers & Vedder, 2003).

In sum, teachers, as moral role models, play a pivotal role in shaping students' ethical beliefs and behaviours. When teachers exhibit ethical conduct such as fairness, honesty, and respect, they not only influence students' actions but also impart valuable lessons about integrity and moral decision-making (Pantić & Wubbels, 2012; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2015). However, as moral guides, teachers must navigate complex ethical dilemmas and societal expectations, particularly in disciplinary encounters (Campbell, 2003; Joseph & Efron, 1993). This complexity is further nuanced by the fundamental role of teacher-student relationships, where caring and supportive interactions foster an environment conducive to moral growth (Noddings, 2013). Teachers' own moral values and beliefs significantly influence their approach to moral education and their interactions with students, extending to how they handle ethical dilemmas in the classroom (Fenstermacher et al., 2009). Understanding this complexity is crucial to grasp how teachers view their roles in shaping their students' moral values in disciplinary encounters (Campbell, 2003; Joseph & Efron, 1993).

Teachers' Interventions to Address Peer Harm

Teachers play a multifaceted role as educators, socialization agents, and classroom managers, with a legal obligation to protect students from harm (Byers et al., 2011; De Luca et al., 2019). Their proximity to students provides them with an advantageous position to assess and monitor social interactions, enabling them to detect and address peer conflicts (Fung, 2012). However, teachers' responses to peer harm are varied, and influenced by a number of factors, including their personal beliefs, professional training, and the school's culture and policies (Bradshaw, 2015; Burger et al., 2015).

Teachers' decision-making processes, in addressing peer harm, are influenced by their emotional experiences and responses. Hargreaves (1998) argues that teaching is fundamentally an emotional practice, where teachers' emotions are inextricably linked to their moral purposes and ability to achieve desired changes in students. These emotions shape how teachers interpret and respond to classroom situations, including incidents of peer harm. Zembylas (2003) further elaborates on this concept, suggesting that emotions play a key role in the formation and transformation of teacher identity. He posits that teachers' emotional responses to classroom events, including conflicts between students, are not merely personal reactions but are shaped by broader social, cultural, and political contexts. Recognizing the emotional aspect of teaching is crucial for understanding how teachers navigate the terrain of peer harm interventions and how their approaches may evolve over time through reflection and experience.

Interventions implemented by teachers are crucial in addressing and facilitating the resolution of peer conflict incidents within the classroom. Students involved in peer conflict frequently endure social isolation, underscoring the importance of teachers and schools in providing support and fostering a culture of empathy and restoration in response to such

challenges (Paluck et al., 2016). Rather than focusing solely on control or taking a punitive stance, scholars have argued that reactive approaches to peer conflict resolution should focus on promoting student learning, growth, and the potential for repair and restoration in the face of interpersonal conflicts (Boulton et al., 2014).

Resolving peer conflicts among students is a complex challenge that demands a comprehensive and diverse set of strategies. While reactive strategies are necessary to address conflicts as they arise, research emphasizes the importance of complementing these with proactive measures that nurture positive relationships and develop students' social-emotional skills (Bradshaw, 2015). Building positive teacher-student relationships and "knowing their students" is also a key strategy employed by teachers to manage peer aggression and harm (McCormack et al., 2023). Prior studies have demonstrated that interventions characterized by balance and adaptability contribute positively to student-teacher relationships and foster a constructive school environment (Way, 2011).

Teachers employ a range of active responses when addressing peer harm situations (Kollerová et al., 2021). Research indicates that teachers often favour authority-based disciplinary interventions, characterized by moderate sanctions administered in a warm, non-hostile manner (Burger et al., 2015; Gee et al., 2021). These authoritative intervention styles have been linked to reduced levels of peer harm in school settings (Cornell & Huang, 2016). By implementing such interventions, teachers convey a clear message of disapproval toward harmful behaviours. This approach may contribute to a reduction in peer harm by fostering increased moral engagement among students (Campaert et al., 2017; Saarento et al., 2013).

Considering the social nature of peer harm (Espelage & Swearer, 2003), teacher-facilitated discussions can be an effective collaborative approach to prevention. These

discussions can raise awareness of the consequences of peer harm, explore the role of bystanders, and foster moral responsibility while lowering the social acceptability of harmful behaviours (Burger et al., 2022). However, such discussions are most effective when insights are gained naturally by students, rather than imposed by teachers (Gaffney et al., 2021).

In summary, teachers employ a range of interventions, from authority-based disciplinary measures to facilitated discussions and victim support, in addressing peer harm situations. Their specific perspectives and chosen approaches are likely influenced by their narratives, lived experiences, professional identities as moral guides, and the nuances of each peer harm situation (Watson, 2006). As discussed in the next section, teachers may also navigate different philosophical orientations when intervening, ranging from more punitive, control-focused stances to restorative, relationship-based approaches aimed at repairing harm and fostering positive peer dynamics (McCold & Wachtel, 2003; Vaandering, 2014; Welsh & Little, 2018).

Considering Different Approaches to Addressing Peer Harms

In considering teachers' varied responses to peer harm, it is necessary to acknowledge the historical prevalence of punitive disciplinary models in schools. Traditionally, schools have relied on punitive discipline, imposing sanctions to address student misconduct (Welsh & Little, 2018). However, educational scholarship has criticized these punitive strategies for their limited efficacy, failure to address the root causes of misbehaviour, and tendency to exacerbate disciplinary disparities for minoritized students (Welsh & Little, 2018).

The Social Discipline Window, proposed by McCold and Wachtel (2003), offers a framework for understanding different approaches to addressing student misbehaviour. It highlights four potential responses: punitive (high control, low support), permissive (low control, high support), neglectful (low control, low support), and restorative (high control, high support).

The punitive approach involves harsh disciplinary measures with little support or understanding provided to the student, relying heavily on punishment and consequences without addressing underlying issues (e.g., detentions, suspensions). The permissive approach lacks clear boundaries, rules, and expectations, providing support but minimal accountability for misbehaviour. The neglectful approach is characterized by a lack of engagement, support, and control from both teachers and students, resulting in disengagement and ineffective management of misbehaviour. In contrast, the restorative approach combines setting clear expectations and boundaries with providing high levels of support and understanding for the student. It aims to address the root causes of misbehaviour while holding students accountable through a supportive and collaborative process. The restorative approach, emphasizing accountability and a supportive environment for personal growth and learning, is often considered the most effective in addressing student misbehaviour (Recchia et al., in press), as the punitive, permissive, and neglectful approaches may lead to negative outcomes such as resentment, disengagement, or a lack of personal responsibility.

Vaandering (2013) proposes a reformulation of the Social Discipline Window, emphasizing the importance of nurturing relationships and fostering a sense of belonging within the school community. Vaandering (2013) reformulates the social discipline window by shifting the focus from behaviour management to nurturing relationships. She reframes the four quadrants as varying on “support for being human” and “expectations for being human,” emphasizing the importance of creating a school environment that fosters belonging and connection rather than control and punishment. This reformulation encourages educators to view students holistically as active agents deserving of respect and care, rather than simply as subjects of discipline or behaviour modification (Vaandering, 2013). Related to this, it is worth

considering the distinction between relationships based on control and those founded on engagement (Reimer, 2019). In relationships of control, teachers may focus on asserting authority and managing student behaviour, while relationships of engagement involve educators actively involving students in understanding conflict complexities and fostering conflict resolution skills. Drewery (2014) highlights the importance of empowering students to take an active role in addressing conflicts rather than solely relying on authority-driven control measures.

This relational perspective enriches our understanding of restorative practices in education by prioritizing building and repairing relationships among all members of the school community over solely enforcing rules. It creates spaces for those harmed and those responsible for harm to share their experiences, needs, and perspectives, fostering empathy and accountability (Kelly & Peters-Golden, 2020; Vaandering, 2014; Zehr, 2002). Additionally, Vaandering's reformulation emphasizes collaborative problem-solving processes that engage students in addressing the underlying causes of harm and finding mutually agreeable solutions, rather than imposing punitive consequences (Vaandering, 2013; Wachtel, 2013). By emphasizing relationships, belonging, and collaborative problem-solving, restorative practices aim to create a supportive learning environment that nurtures the well-being and growth of both students and teachers (Vaandering, 2014; Winslade & Williams, 2012).

In contrast to punitive models that focus on assigning blame and administering aversive consequences, reflecting retributive understandings of justice (Calhoun & Daniels, 2008; Thompson et al., 2020), restorative justice models offer a comprehensive perspective on discipline, emphasizing social engagement, individual and community responsibility, and positive relationships among students and educators (Reimer, 2019). Restorative justice

recognizes harm, fosters accountability, and encourages agency (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2013; Kelly & Peters-Golden, 2020). It prioritizes meeting the needs of all individuals involved, as well as the larger community, by recognizing personal and systemic contributions to harm, understanding impacts, making reparations, and preventing future similar harms (Zehr, 2002). By taking a relational approach to accountability, restorative justice offers a framework that promotes empathy, responsibility, and restoration of relationships within the school community.

Restorative justice models focus on dialogue-based practices that allow all parties involved to articulate their viewpoints, understand others' perspectives, and reach shared understandings for moving forward (Hendry, 2009; Hopkins, 2011). Thus, restorative approaches address immediate conflicts and contribute to students' moral development by fostering empathy, self-reflection, and a sense of communal responsibility (Christie et al., 2008). While restorative justice programs have rapidly expanded in U.S. schools with some promising initial findings, Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) caution that the research evidence supporting restorative justice in schools is still emerging. Nevertheless, preliminary studies suggest restorative justice may positively impact school discipline, attendance, graduation rates, school climate, and academic achievement (see Darling-Hammond et al., 2020, for a review).

The Current Study

The current thesis is based on portions of a larger qualitative study, conducted in 2022, involving teachers in a public K-11 school in Bogotá (Colombia). This thesis was based on teachers' narratives about their responses to instances of peer harm. I sought to learn more about the concerns and considerations that guide teachers' approaches to navigating peer harm situations at school. Through personal interviews with eight teachers and a subsequent focus group, I delved into the intricacies of educators' decision-making processes. More specifically, I

sought to investigate the thought processes and decision-making pathways teachers describe in their narratives of responding to incidents of peer harm among students. I also considered broader concerns informing teachers' responses, such as maintaining a safe learning environment and promoting students' well-being. This study contributes valuable insights into how teachers navigate their complex and multifaceted roles in managing peer harm incidents and fostering a supportive classroom and school environment.

Method

Researcher Positionality

Methodologically, my approach to this study is influenced by my positionality as an outsider to the specific educational context being examined. However, as a Colombian from Bogotá, I bring extensive and highly relevant experience in education spanning 14 years. During that time, I served as a middle and high school teacher, gaining first-hand experience in dealing with student discipline issues, including incidents of peer harm. I was directly involved in making decisions and implementing interventions to address harmful behaviours and promote a positive school environment.

Subsequently, I transitioned into leadership roles, serving as a guidance coordinator for five years and as a high school principal for two years in Lima, Peru. In these positions, I led teams of teachers and oversaw school-wide initiatives aimed at improving student conduct, fostering a culture of respect, and implementing restorative practices in response to peer conflicts and harmful incidents.

Through these experiences, I have developed a deep understanding of the complexities involved in promoting justice and making ethical decisions when addressing peer harm within educational settings. I have first-hand knowledge of the challenges teachers face in balancing multiple considerations, such as school policies, student needs, and broader community impacts.

Moreover, my identities as a father, a Catholic, and someone with conservative leanings have shaped my perspectives on moral education, discipline, and the role of authority figures in guiding students' ethical development. While my religious and political beliefs may have initially aligned me with more punitive or authoritarian approaches, my extensive experiences in the field have exposed me to alternative philosophies, such as restorative justice, which has influenced my views on effective disciplinary practices.

While I did not personally conduct the interviews or focus groups for this study, my extensive background in education, particularly in roles that required navigating disciplinary issues and peer harm, provides me with a valuable contextual understanding. This insider perspective, combined with my current outsider status, allows me to approach the analysis with both sensitivity and critical distance.

My deep-seated interest in the topics of safe environments, ethical decision-making, and teacher responses to peer harm drives my commitment to approaching this research with rigour and a genuine desire to draw meaningful insights from the available data. I aim to contribute to the broader discourse on the role of the different school stakeholders, by bringing the voices of teachers as they narrate their decision-making processes.

Participants

The current thesis is based on a dataset collected in a public K-11 school in Bogotá (Colombia) in 2022. Data were collected as part of a larger project examining students' and teachers' perspectives on justice and ethical decision-making in response to peer harm within the school environment. The study received ethics approval from Concordia University as well as the school administration. Previous analyses have focused only on students' responses. Educators' interviews and the focus group had not been previously examined. Specifically, the

current thesis is based on a sample of eight teachers. The study's recruitment process, involved voluntary participation following an information session and distribution of consent forms.

The school in which the data were collected serves students in an estrato[1] 2 (i.e., lower-SES) neighbourhood. It is a relatively new school (it had been open for only a few years at the time of data collection) and forms part of a partnership led by a non-profit organization formed by four leading educational institutions in the education sector in Bogotá. The goal of the partnership is to contribute to the strengthening of public education through the transfer of their experience, knowledge, and best practices. Its mission is to provide an education that fosters democracy, with a vision of educating competent graduates who exercise their abilities for society's benefit, instilling values of responsibility, respect, and rectitude. They run a school-wide program to foster social and emotional competencies in students from K-11 grades. The school's overarching goal is to ensure that all students learn and achieve their full potential. They have approximately 500 students enrolled, with a range of grades between kindergarten and eleventh grade.

In terms of employment at this school (which, as noted above, was relatively new), participating teachers reported being part of the school team for an average of 2.5 years (range =

---

[1] According to Uribe-Mallarino (2008), the socioeconomic stratification (estrato) system in Colombia, implemented nationwide in 1994, emerged from the need to address urbanization challenges and socio-economic disparities prevalent in major cities like Bogotá during the 1970s. With rapid urbanization fueled by rural migration and internal displacement due to conflict, informal settlements proliferated, characterized by substandard housing, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to basic services like water and electricity. Policymakers sought a mechanism to fund improvements in these areas, leading to the development of the social stratification system, which categorized residents based on the quality of their housing due to the absence of reliable income and taxation records.

This system, introduced in major cities in 1983 and formalized nationally in 1994, divides urban areas into six socioeconomic levels. Levels one to three qualify for subsidies funded by higher-income groups, while the fourth level neither pays nor receives subsidies. This stratification aims to redistribute resources, with higher-income households subsidizing services for lower-income counterparts, fostering a more equitable distribution of resources and addressing socio-economic disparities in urban areas (Uribe-Mallarino, 2008).

1 to 4). Most of the participating teachers (62.5%) were born in Bogotá, with the remaining teachers originating from various regions across the country. The average age of the participants was approximately 38.5 years (range = 27 to 54 years), showcasing a broad range of generational perspectives. The gender distribution was well balanced, with 50% of educators self-identifying as men and 50% as women. In terms of racial backgrounds, most participants identified as White (62.5%), with smaller representations of Mestizo/a (12.5%), and Afro-Colombian (12.5%) teachers; one teacher (12.5%) did not identify their racial background. Within the participants there was a wide range of teaching experience; the average time as a teacher was 13 years; Twenty-five percent of participants reported having 5 years of teaching experience, 50% between 10 and 15 years, and 25% having 20 years or more of experience. In terms of grade levels taught, 37.5% taught only high school students, 37.5% across elementary to high school, and 25% from middle school to high school. Regarding subjects taught, 37.5% of participants taught in Science, Technology or Mathematics, 25% Languages, 25% Social Sciences, and 12.5% Arts.

Procedure

After providing written informed consent and completing a series of questionnaires (these data did not form the focus of the current project), each participant was individually interviewed in a private location at their school by a native Spanish-speaking graduate student. The complete interview script is presented in Appendix A. Participants were first asked about their teaching philosophy. They were prompted to briefly describe their values, beliefs, and goals as a teacher, and to explain how they put these into practice. Additionally, they were asked to describe their perception of ideal student-teacher relationships.

Subsequently, inspired by the literature on the significance of "small stories" (Bamberg, 2006), teachers were asked to narrate three specific past experiences in which they responded to peer harm: (1) a specific incident when they punished a student for causing harm to another student at their school, and they think they made the right call, (2) a specific incident when they punished a student for causing harm but would respond differently if it happened again, and (3) a specific incident when they chose not to punish a student for causing harm, and they think they made the right call. They were encouraged to recall each event in detail, describing everything they remembered about it. Follow-up questions aimed to delve deeper into their thoughts, feelings, and actions during the incident, including their interventions, perceptions of fairness, and ideas for preventing similar harms in the future. The length of these interviews ranged from 45 to 65 minutes.

Following the individual interviews, one focus group session was conducted to encourage dynamic discussions among all participating educators. The focus group session spanned approximately 65 minutes, commencing with a 15-minute informal gathering where participants were offered refreshments such as empanadas, aji sauce, and juice. This pre-session period fostered a relaxed atmosphere, encouraging rapport among participants. The provision of refreshments continued throughout the session. The formal 50-minute group discussion was guided by a series of open-ended questions asking participants about their perceived roles in addressing student conflicts. The questions were:

1. What do you think is your role in addressing conflicts between students?
2. What is the fairest way to respond when conflicts occur between classmates at school and someone gets hurt?
3. How could these ways of handling conflicts be implemented in your school?

4. What changes would need to occur for this to be possible?

These questions aimed to encourage teachers to share their perspectives on various aspects of their roles in addressing student conflicts. Specifically, participants explored their roles as mediators, guides, and initial responders in managing conflicts within the school environment. They also discussed what they perceived as the fairest approach when students were involved in conflicts resulting in harm, and considered how this approach would manifest within the context of their school environment. By triangulating data from both individual interviews and the focus group, I aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences, perspectives, and aspirations related to student conflicts and disciplinary actions.

Data Analysis

All interviews and the focus group were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis by two native Spanish-speaking research assistants, one of whom later supported the coding process. This experience provided her with comprehensive knowledge of the data and allowed for deep immersion in the research material. The accuracy of the transcripts was verified by the Colombian graduate student who originally collected the data.

For the data analysis a thematic analysis approach was used, to analyze the qualitative data collected from teachers' responses during interviews and focus groups. Thematic analysis allows researchers to identify, analyze, and report patterns or themes within the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this thesis, I adopted a latent or interpretive approach to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This approach aligns with the study's aim to reveal the beliefs and meaning-making processes that shape teachers' narrated responses to peer harm incidents. By taking an interpretive stance, I explored the implicit and conceptual foundations of teachers'

narratives, rather than merely describing their explicit statements. Additionally, I embraced a constructivist epistemological position, recognizing that meanings and experiences are socially constructed and that the researcher plays an active role in interpreting and theorizing patterns within the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The first level of coding involved systematically categorizing the data into initial codes, which were directly connected to the participants' responses. To facilitate this process, I used Nvivo, a qualitative data analysis software, which enhanced the efficiency and organization of the analysis. An undergraduate, native Spanish speaking research assistant, who was experienced in thematic analysis, also coded all of the data. We discussed the codes to maximize the trustworthiness of the findings and deepen the analysis through conversations. This first level of coding resulted in 226 codes.

Once the first level of coding was complete, second and third rounds of coding were undertaken to explore relationships between codes and identify overarching themes. This phase involved a more interpretative approach, as codes were grouped based on commonalities and patterns, corresponding to Braun and Clarke's (2006) third step of "searching for themes". The second- and third-level coding was done in collaboration with a PhD candidate, who is also a native Spanish speaker and educator originating from Colombia. From the initial 226 codes, we consolidated them into 23second-level codes and eventually identified two overarching themes (see Codebook in Appendix C). Initial second-level codes and themes were also discussed with my thesis supervisor and the graduate student who originally collected the data, providing opportunities to refine and clarify patterns, ideas, and codes based on returning iteratively to the data, reflecting the "recursive process" described by Braun and Clarke (2006). These steps aimed to provide a rigorous and comprehensive exploration of teachers' perspectives on student

conflicts and disciplinary interventions. Findings are illustrated below by drawing on translated quotes from participants' interviews and focus group interventions (see Appendix B for original texts in Spanish for all quotes presented below). In all cases, pseudonyms are used to protect participants' identities.

Findings and Discussion

Teachers' Perspectives on Balancing Discipline, Students' Needs, and Moral Education

The first theme encapsulates how teachers navigate complex situations when addressing peer harm incidents with an eye towards their understandings of their roles as moral educators. This theme encompassed teachers' philosophical approaches to education, their strategies for intervention in conflicts, and their navigation of school policies and personal judgments. Their reflections and stories revealed a consistent effort to balance various concerns: the need for accountability, the desire to promote student growth and learning, the importance of open communication and understanding, and the challenge of adhering to school protocols while maintaining flexibility. Central to this theme is the teachers' commitment to prioritizing students' needs, even when faced with challenging situations. This overarching idea reflects how teachers see themselves not just as academic instructors, but as influencing students' character and contributions to society, constantly adapting their approaches to best serve their students' holistic development.

Teachers sharing their thoughts on approaches to education reflect their roles and decisions as moral educators, illuminating their perspectives on addressing peer harm and their teaching profession. Within their expressed beliefs and concerns, teachers described education as a mean to transform society, a way of making the world a better place. For example, as Edith notes:

> The little that can be done here at school is to try to instill those values in these young people in a healthy and pleasant way… They no longer give importance to [such values]. That would be a way to try to rescue and avoid so many problems and circumstances because they arise, why? Due to the ignorance of so many values and because we do not put them into practice.

As reflected in Edith's quote, teachers appear to see their roles as those who can help students to become a better version of themselves, and with that in mind, anticipate that the values taught at school will be shown outside.

In this matter, teachers view their role as extending beyond academic instruction to fostering positive societal change and moral development in their students. For instance, Beatriz mentioned:

> I tell them yes here you can fill out the workbook, and that's it, and here everything can be perfect. But you're going to go out into life, you're going to go out to a job, to a university, and there you're going to face a lot of people, each one totally different, and if you don't have that ability to be tolerant, to say the things you don't like in a good way, everything you learned here will be useless because then at the first job, they'll fire you for being quarrelsome.

The interviews also revealed a profound sentiment among teachers regarding their role in shaping a better society and providing education for life. One participant, Idaly, expressed this notion:

> I think that as teachers, as educators, we have […] the obligation or the role to also form people, in addition to teaching them, whether it's a subject, it's also important to teach them how they should behave in society. At this stage of my career, I've realized that

> students live or coexist at school and it's like a small circle, a small society, and, well, they must learn to respect each other, empathy that others also have feelings, that they must also respect each other […] All those values so that, when they go out into life, they can also behave, in the correct way.

Underlying teachers' philosophies is a broader vision of education as a catalyst for social transformation. Esteban reflected on this issue as follows:

> I really believe that we must help them so that in their complex and critical thinking they arrive at certainty about their own realities and become motivated to commit to transforming that very reality. I imagine them transforming their home, right? That education helps them transform their home. It helps them transform their social environment. It helps them transform their neighbourhood, their city, right?

In reflecting on the primary goal of education and what teachers are working towards, Beatriz added:

> For them [the students] to become well-rounded individuals, to really understand that they don't just come here to learn a bunch of knowledge, but to be people… And that they will go out into a society to face, well, a lot of beings totally different from them, and that they have to learn to respect.

In examining the philosophical underpinnings of teachers' approaches to education, a complex tapestry of beliefs and concerns emerges, centered on the transformative power of education and the holistic development of students. The educators interviewed consistently articulate a vision that extends far beyond mere academic instruction, positioning themselves as moral guides and societal change agents. Their reflections reveal a nuanced understanding of education as a microcosm of society, where students can develop crucial life skills and values in

a controlled environment. Their shared philosophy envisions education as a catalyst for broader societal transformation, with students emerging not just as repositories of knowledge, but as well-rounded individuals capable of effecting positive change in their communities. This multifaceted approach to education underscores the delicate balance teachers must strike in fulfilling their roles as both instructors and moral educators, always with the ultimate goal of centering and addressing the diverse needs of their students.

Furthermore, teachers expressed commitment to a variety of values in informing their practice either as personal beliefs or because they are reflected in the school's values. Most often, teachers referred to the importance of respect and described it as integral between all members of the school community. As described by Edith:

> Yes, we must foster respect in the classroom. And, if we have a workbook here to bring it into our context, and we work on responsibility with oneself, with others […] it's obvious that we have to put that into practice.

Augusto also pointed out: "When it is an effective education where students at home have worked on strengthening values, like obviously responsibility, respect… That becomes evident in the school."

In this sense, teachers' responses underscore the moral dimensions of teaching, where educators see themselves as responsible for instilling values and promoting a culture of mutual respect within the school environment. This perspective is supported by the literature, which highlights that teachers, as moral guides, play a pivotal role in shaping students' ethical beliefs and behaviours (Velasquez et al., 2013). That is, teachers expressed how education should not merely focus on imparting knowledge but also on nurturing ethical values and fostering a sense of social responsibility. In this sense, educators appeared to believe that they played a role in

shaping students' moral compasses, equipping them with the tools to navigate complex situations and contribute positively to society. As Esteban eloquently states:

> To stop at the traffic light, calmly, waiting for time to simply pass because it is a social pact… Because we know that this is what we do to avoid accidents… In other words, truly because it is an autonomous ethic, right? I believe that this is where we should aim. To prevent the sanction from becoming a means of coercion, towards heteronomous ethics.

Also related to their understanding of their roles as moral educators, the interviews suggested various goals and approaches that teachers are pursuing as they intervene in peer conflicts. Most of the teachers prioritized fostering open communication, understanding, and reflection among students involved in harmful incidents. For example, Jose Alejandro described intervening in a situation, after two students had a fistfight due to a history of tensions involving romantic interests and past conflicts within their families:

> Afterward we sat down, the three of us, and we had a small reflection around what happened, which was to critically situate ourselves in our context. Are we going to solve everything with blows? We talked… We came to an understanding.

Teachers described seeking to understand the underlying motivations and perspectives of all parties involved before determining appropriate interventions. Edith described taking this approach:

> For example, I'm not much for forceful punishments anymore… more than anything I try to talk with them and listen to their perspectives… At another time, I had already spoken with the two of them and asked them what was happening. I listened to their versions together, simultaneously.

Similarly, Esteban described the key aspects of effective dialogue with students:

> Where we are perhaps stuck is in the fact of arriving at a dialogue. An assertive dialogue. When I say assertive dialogue, it's not about sitting down and listening to each other, and then making a decision… But rather, let's weigh it out. Let's way out what everyone's feelings are.

Overall, then, teachers' perspectives highlight the distinct considerations that teachers navigate when addressing peer harm, balancing the need for accountability with the desire to promote learning, growth, and restoration among students, as suggested by the literature (Calhoun & Daniels, 2008; Fung, 2012; Kelly & Peters-Golden, 2020). They prioritize dialogue and empathy, seeking to understand the underlying motivations and perspectives of all parties before intervening. This approach reflects the broader theme in that it involves balancing various educational concerns while centering students' needs. The teachers' strategies underscore the importance that they place on developing conflict resolution skills, promoting emotional intelligence, and preparing students for constructive societal engagement, thus reflecting a holistic vision of education that integrates moral and emotional growth with academic learning.

Teachers' narratives reveal a nuanced perspective on the role of the school's disciplinary code in addressing peer harm situations. While the "Manual de Convivencia[2]" serves as a guiding framework, some teachers recognize the need for flexibility and adaptation to meet the unique needs of their students and support their agency. As Idaly notes: "I don't always immediately resort to the manual. Because one way or another, what I tell them is, you're grown-

---

[2] We will be retaining the Spanish term Manual de Convivencia in the translated quotes. As explained by the Colombian Regulations: The Manual de Convivencia is an integral part of the Institutional Educational Project (PEI) in accordance with the provisions of Article 87 of Law 115 of 1994 and Article 2.3.3.1.4.4 of Decree 1075 of 2015. This document sets the guidelines to ensure peaceful coexistence. Likewise, this document is connected with the work regulations that apply within the school.

ups now, and I can't be telling you or punishing you as if you were five-year-old children." Augusto echoes this sentiment, suggesting that the manual's rigidity may present weaknesses, stating:

> Perhaps the Manual de Convivencia is a bit more rigid… The kids notice those weaknesses that the manual has, and that perhaps it doesn't provide those necessary tools for the behaviour at school to be more… More… Let's be more respectful, right?

While teachers navigate their own personal experiences, various philosophical orientations, and student-centered considerations, the findings also reveal the influence of school protocols and policies. Teachers may adhere to established disciplinary procedures, particularly in cases of severe or egregious harm. Augusto shared these other ideas about the Manual:

> It is assumed that the Manual de Convivencia is based on rights and duties, and one of those duties is precisely to guarantee the well-being of all students, children and adolescents. And in accordance with what is established and the way in which a punishment should be carried out, well, the proper channels must be followed. The established channels.

These reflections indicate that while protocols exist, teachers may in some cases opt for alternative, more student-centered approaches that move beyond a strict adherence to disciplinary policies. The findings also reveal that teachers may employ proactive strategies that involve students in or mitigate peer harm incidents. Beatriz's approach highlights this idea:

> The agreements must be very clear. The first classes that one handles with a new group, for example, the first thing that should be done before starting to delve into course materials is to have clear agreements. Let [students] be the ones who propose the agreements. So, from them comes respect for taking turns, asking for the floor by raising

> their hand, engaging in active listening, right? So, let's say that from the beginning of the school year the agreements must be clear. And, well, respect is very important.

Teachers may seek assistance from colleagues or administrators, recognizing the complexities involved in addressing peer harm and the value of collective decision-making. Seeking help and collaboration provides teachers with additional perspectives and resources but also reinforces the notion that addressing peer harm is a shared responsibility within the school community (Ahtola et al., 2012; Watson, 2006). For example, Teresa, working at another school, noticed a student behaving strangely at the back of the classroom. Upon closer inspection, she saw the student holding something suspicious but chose not to confront him immediately. It was a challenging situation, and she deemed that support was needed:

> The coordinator's office was right in front of me… Fortunately, the coordinator was available, "Could you please come to the classroom? I witnessed something, I don't know if it's true… With John Doe… I don't know if you can help me with that." So, I returned to the classroom, continued the class… The coordinator was at the classroom door for a while with an agenda […] After class, he told me: "The student in question is going through a situation as he had already struggled with drug use, so probably [what you thought was going on] is happening… I'm going to stay here, don't worry, I'll handle the process." At that point he dedicated himself to managing the process.

Nevertheless, sometimes seeking the help of colleagues was seen by the teachers as abdicating the problem to someone else (Kollerová et al., 2021), as Sebastian shares: "I think that sending them to the coordinator's office is like I saw the situation and left the responsibility of handling the conflict to someone else, even though I was the one directly involved there." Some of the participants recognize the limitations of rigid protocols and opted for strategies that prioritize

students' growth and agency. The narrative also emphasizes the importance of proactive measures, collaboration with colleagues, and the challenges of balancing personal judgment with institutional guidelines, all while striving to address students' unique needs and foster a positive school environment.

Furthermore, the interviews reveal an inclination towards more student-centered and learning-focused approaches that reflected a more restorative orientation. For example, Teresa distinguishes between “sanctions” and “correctives,” emphasizing the importance of helping students reflect on their actions and develop a sense of accountability:

> The sanction is sometimes received as: “They punished me, or they made me do something unfair, or they made me do something that perhaps I did to get it over with and to comply.” But for me, the correction is perhaps to make the student see that they acted badly and that it’s important that they reflect on it and don’t do it again.

Sebastian echoes this sentiment, expressing a desire to understand students’ perspectives and reasons behind their actions:

> It’s like they [the students] give their reasons. Because I don’t know… Perhaps we are missing understanding many things about them. Perhaps their age or their generation is a little different from ours. So, I was like, why? … In fact, I still ask myself that. I don’t understand why they do that type of thing and I’d like to listen to them.

These narratives suggest that while established school protocols provide a framework for teachers that guides their responses, their responses also reflect their personal commitments to dialogue, empathy, and addressing the root causes of harmful behaviour.

The findings reveal a spectrum of disciplinary approaches that teachers may adopt. Indeed, alongside some of the more restorative concerns described above, some teachers also

express that sanctions should be proportional to the harm and that their response should ensure that the students understand that there are consequences for their actions. This approach reflects a more retributive understanding of justice, where individuals should receive what they deserve in proportion to their actions, as discussed in the literature (Ball et al., 2021; Thompson et al., 2020). Sebastian tells a story about two students that were "playing" by sticking a pen in each other's hands, until one of them walked to the teacher with blood coming out of the hand:

> There were some consequences that are congruent with the action that the kid did, right? So, if there are consequences when there is a very serious action, where he'll realize I'm doing this at this moment and I can't be with my peers in class because I committed a very serious offence.

Conversely, Esteban suggests an ongoing process of shaping a school environment that moves away from punitive measures and towards a more restorative philosophy. He states: "We are creating culture. And we are just starting, barely creating the culture…" He emphasizes the value of "speaking clearly" to students, without euphemisms or taboos and using language that resonates with them. However, Esteban also acknowledges the challenges in maintaining consistency and avoiding double standards, stating:

> But when we do things like… For example, for X grades, yes we apply the rule, and for X other grades we perhaps leave it a little more flexible […] because it's the first grade, because perhaps they are the oldest ones, or perhaps because I like them… So then, perhaps […] the discourse loses strength.

This reflection highlights the importance of applying restorative approaches consistently and avoiding arbitrary distinctions based on factors like grade level or personal biases. Esteban recognizes that inconsistencies can undermine the effectiveness of the overall school culture they

are trying to create. Overall, this tension between punitive and restorative approaches highlights the philosophical divide teachers are navigating as they strive to uphold accountability while also prioritizing students' holistic development and the restoration of positive relationships within the school community, as discussed in the literature (Vaandering, 2014; Winslade & Williams, 2012).

A general trend is that teachers' philosophies were typically undergirded by a commitment to a student-centered approach. Teachers recognized the importance of understanding individual students' perspectives, needs, and circumstances when responding to peer harm incidents. This approach aligns with the literature, which emphasizes the significance of fostering positive teacher-student relationships and being attuned to the challenges and difficulties students may face, as these relationships can shape students' perceptions, behaviours, and receptiveness to interventions (Noddings, 2013; Watson, 2006). Teresa shared these thoughts:

> You are the example to follow, but you have to get involved with the students because you have to know them. If you know the student, you will be able to act accordingly. If you know the student, you will be able to perhaps make decisions that won't affect them… And, well, obviously regarding situations in which one has to make decisions regarding punishments or rewards, when one doesn't know the student, one sometimes acts unjustly…

Additionally, the teachers described the significance of fostering positive teacher-student relationships and being attuned to the challenges and difficulties students may face, which could contribute to harmful behaviours. Jose Alejandro mentioned a challenging experience with a student that happened at another school:

> Precisely at that school there was a student who started to become more and more detached from the school. I had to practically go look for him, in a thousand [different] ways, but I found him. I told him, "You're going to go back to studying, you're going to go back to your role as a student, which is what you have to do at this moment. And we're going to start over from scratch. A clean slate. You're in your final year, I need you to concentrate and project yourself, of course, towards your immediate future."

The quality of teacher-student relationships emerges as a significant factor influencing teachers' approaches to addressing peer harm. As Augusto notes: "I believe that, above all, a relationship between a student and a teacher should be one of great respect, of great closeness, of great empathy, and camaraderie." Fostering positive and supportive relationships with students is seen as important in that these relationships can shape students' perceptions, behaviours, and receptiveness to interventions. Yet while teachers recognize the importance of good relationships, they note the importance of acknowledging and respecting the inherent power dynamics in the student-teacher roles, as Beatriz describes:

> They know that we don't cross a limit. That invisible barrier is not for them to be over there and me here because I am better, no. It [the invisible barrier] cannot be lost because obviously one is an adult and one cannot start fighting with a kid, right? Or we are super friends and then I have you on Facebook and we go out to eat ice cream, no. I see that boundary of you as a child, I am your teacher, you come here to be educated by me, as something that cannot be lost. And obviously respect and discipline.

By adopting a student-centered approach, teachers aim to tailor their interventions and disciplinary responses in ways that reflect concern for students' humanity. This approach aligns with an emphasis on nurturing relationships that respect students' agency and fostering a sense of

belonging within the school community (Drewery, 2014; Reimer, 2019; Vaandering, 2013). Jose Alejandro shared a situation in which students had been lying to him and he believed them, but he nevertheless believed that it was the right approach[3]:

> [My role] is to take them beyond, to give them that leading role that they are the ones who really solve their problems and not others, that they should be the protagonists […] I bought into the story, and I take full responsibility for it […] We work with human beings. We must be willing to believe, to listen, to value. In a certain way, to do that is something that is transforming, not only in academics but also in the configuration of the human being. Of the human being who laughs, who cries, who screams, who fights… And whether [my intervention] was fair, I would say yes. […] Everyone deserves to have someone to listen to them.

Alongside recognition of students' own humanity and fallibility, the narratives shared by the teachers provide insights into the human dimension that shape their own responses to peer harm incidents. While they often strove to be student-centered, the findings revealed that negative emotions, preconceptions, personal struggles, and the inherent complexities of human interactions could influence their decision-making processes and interactions with students, as developed by Hargreaves (1998) and Zembylas (2003).

Sebastian's reflection highlights the frustration and sense of inefficacy that can arise when traditional disciplinary measures, such as scolding or summoning parents, fail to elicit the desired behavioural changes in students. He expressed:

---

[3] This quote was also cited in Recchia et al., in press, as an illustrative example of the forms of social engagement that reflect a restorative orientation.

> Because I feel that scolding them, and having summoned their legal guardians didn't serve any purpose. In other words, I feel that they continue behaving the same way […] Like [if] it doesn't shake that foundation for them, they're going to continue behaving the same way. It's possible that from here until eleventh grade they'll continue the same.

This sentiment suggests that teachers may grapple with emotional responses when their efforts to address peer harm seem futile (Fenstermacher et al., 2009). Esteban's narrative further illustrates how emotions can shape teachers' in-the-moment reactions, potentially leading to unintended consequences. He recounted:

> I brought him [the student] to the front [of the class], I called him out […] since this was against a girl, my speech centered on the necessity to respect women, it doesn't matter how they dress […] we must respect them and so on. But I had him at the front [of the class] for a long time. So, when I realized it, I was subjecting him to public scrutiny. So, this kid, yes, even though he had messed up and so on, he was up there in the front facing 80 pairs of eyes.

Augusto's experience further exemplifies the human condition of teachers, as he acknowledges losing his composure in response to a student's behaviour. He stated:

> He decided at one point to start kicking the volleyball balls. And I told him, "Hey Brother, you're going to damage them." He responded in not the best way and, well, I also got upset. I said, "Brother what happens is that here what people don't damage" they steal." Then, he told me, "but, teacher, don't yell at me either." So, when he said that to me, I said I shouldn't have said what I said to him in the tone I said it. Perhaps [saying] the same thing, but in a different tone. But I also got upset.

This candid admission highlights how teachers, like any human being, can react emotionally to challenging situations (Fenstermacher et al. 2009), potentially leading to regrettable actions or words.

Beatriz also touches on the human dimension, as she recounts her reaction to a physical altercation between students. She shared:

> They were hitting each other in the head, but roughly. I remember it was the time to leave [the school], and then what I did was to scold them. "Oh, don't be annoying! […] What's wrong with you? You look like babies, go home." And that's it.

While her response was perhaps provoked by the circumstances and the end-of-day rush, it might not address the underlying issues. However, later Beatriz reflected: "Yes, I should have inquired into what happened. What was that trigger that made them hurt each other?" The findings underscore the importance of recognizing the human condition of teachers and providing them with the necessary support, training, and resources to navigate the complexities of peer harm incidents effectively while maintaining a restorative, student-centered approach. Additionally, and as illustrated in Beatriz's response, teachers indicated that they engage in self-reflection, evaluating the effectiveness of their interventions and considering potential adjustments or alternative approaches.

Sometimes, teachers noted that emotions could get in the way, and the regret would come later when analyzing the situation, as illustrated in Edith's account:

> Because I told them to be quiet and I got upset. And I shouted. I remember that I let out a shout. […] I think I told them they looked like dummies, or something like that […] I let myself be led by emotions. The comments they were making seemed… stupid. […] They

made me lose my temper. […] I should have kept my composure, my serenity. I am the teacher, I am the instructor, I am the adult in the classroom, I am their role model…

These insights highlight the inherently human nature of teachers' responses, where emotions, personal reflections, and a willingness to adapt and learn from experiences play a crucial role in shaping their approaches to addressing peer harm.

In sum, then, this theme illustrates the tension between following prescribed protocols and adapting to individual circumstances. This finding underscores the complex decision-making processes teachers navigate when addressing peer harm incidents, as highlighted in the literature (Ahtola et al., 2012; Watson, 2006). This theme also illustrates how teachers often prioritize proactive strategies to prevent or mitigate peer harm incidents. They emphasize establishing clear agreements and fostering respect from the outset, allowing students to propose guidelines for positive interactions. Teachers recognize the inherent morality in teaching, shaping the ethical landscape through their decisions and actions (Joseph & Efron, 2005).

Moreover, the findings revealed an inclination towards restorative and student-centered approaches to addressing peer harm. Teachers aimed to facilitate students' reflection on their actions and develop a sense of responsibility, rather than solely imposing punitive measures. This approach aligns with the literature, which emphasizes the importance of recognizing key aspects of peer conflict for effective intervention (Fung, 2012), as well as the role of care and understanding in teacher-student relationships for fostering moral development (Goldstein & Freeman, 2003; Noddings, 2013).

The teachers described education as a catalyst for positive social transformation and shaping students' moral development. Teachers viewed building strong relationships with students and considering their perspectives as crucial for creating an environment conducive to

effective interventions. Their narratives underscored the human dimension, acknowledging how emotions, preconceptions, and personal experiences shape their approaches as moral guides (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Sanger, 2001; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2015; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003).

Alongside this first theme, the findings revealed that teachers also recognized the importance of understanding the broader social contexts and collaborating with various stakeholders to effectively address peer harm incidents. Hence, the second theme acknowledges the influence of external factors and the need for a collaborative, community-based approach to mitigate harm and foster a culture of respect and inclusion within the school setting, as discussed in the next section.

Teachers Recognize That Harms Occur in Complex Social Contexts Thus Requiring Collaboration with the Larger Community

The second theme addressed the ways in which teachers acknowledged and considered the complex social contexts in which peer harm incidents occur. This understanding underscored the need to adapt their approaches across contexts, as well as the necessity of a collaborative approach that extends beyond the classroom and involves the broader school community, families, and external resources.

By centring students' narratives and personal experiences, teachers sought to develop a nuanced understanding of the meaning-making processes that shape how harm is perceived and interpreted in specific situations. Teachers considered their students' individual circumstances, perspectives, and motivations when responding to peer harm incidents. In the following quote, Idaly emphasized how it is important to understand students' backgrounds and experiences to see how they are shaping their perceptions and behaviours:

> There are times when I enter, let's say, tenth grade, ninth grade, or eighth grade… And there's a kid who doesn't want to do anything that day. And you know that something is happening to them. I don't start to pressure him like "Hey, you have to work. I don't care how you feel." No. But rather, I tell him, "Okay, fine; today you're feeling indisposed…" I look at them and pass by them two or three times. "You're feeling really bad, right?" "Yes, teacher." So I say, "Okay. Fine, then stay there, calm down, and later you can catch up."

By recognizing the group dynamics and social nature of peer harm, teachers acknowledge the complexity of these situations and the need for interventions that address the broader aspects of the peer group contexts in which they occur. After stopping two students from slapping each other, Sebastian said:

> Sometimes that happens a lot. "Why were you fighting?" "Teacher, the game was to slap each other." "And, why do you play at slapping each other?" "He told me to play." Or they're like "They told me they would give us $1,000 [pesos]." That's how they are. "They would give $2,000 [pesos] to the winner." And they're like that. So, it's like there's a deeper problem, and it's more about behaving like my classmates behave.

The teachers also took into account that there is a component of peers and social pressure involved in students' actions (Laursen & Veenstra, 2021), as Esteban noted: "[The student] starts to become friends with guys that like start to influence him badly, and during class that boy […] [Starts to display certain behaviours] for social recognition."

Indeed, teachers' experiences and previous knowledge led them to take into consideration other developmental considerations as well, such as the struggles and challenges of certain ages. Beatriz shared:

> The problem is that the kids are at very complicated ages […] I have a very, very difficult group because of their age, that is, the 8th graders. That change from being children to entering preadolescence comes at their age. We no longer see ourselves as little kids, but rather we see ourselves as big shots, so that respect goes hand in hand with 100 percent pushing them. If they see that you give in a little to that discipline, they get out of control and start generating different difficulties.

Teachers also acknowledged students' cultural backgrounds and social environments outside of school as shaping their behaviours and how they perceive and experience harm. Esteban expressed it in these terms:

> I was talking about the more external causes, like deeper underlying causes beyond the circumstances because we get stuck on the circumstantial. And sometimes there is a greater phenomenological cause, right? I don't know… The home, the social situation, you know?

In this respect, teachers also expressed the importance of understanding and knowing the other socializing influences in students' lives and how they also influence the education of the students. About this, Idaly described:

> Because in many ways students are not only formed here at school. Students have the influence of their family and of the [social] context. So, the three play an important role in [students'] formation and in their behaviour. At school, they act and behave according to what they see in their context and according to what their families teach them.

Families are viewed as playing a quintessential role in students' education, and so teachers strove in different ways to take these key players into account. Teresa reflected on the complexities of supporting families who are struggling:

> It's difficult because how do you get involved [with the families]? In these two years, we got very involved with the families to the point that we were obviously negatively impacted because we ended up resolving many situations or conflicts that were not our responsibility. Because there was a family fight and the mother would write to you to tell you, right? […] These were circumstances that you had to start resolving about the home, the family, and you would get too involved.

Educators also noted that since family influences start early in life, sometimes the school and the teachers are already late to offer new ways or ideas. It becomes a challenge that teachers seek to tackle as expressed by Jose Alejandro:

> In that upbringing, in those first behavioural and upbringing guidelines, I always tell students that we are educated with authoritarian phrases that in a certain way can become even like very marked categorical imperatives for life. "The day someone hits you, does something to you at school, you respond the same way. If they punch you, you punch back twice." Unfortunately, those first upbringing guidelines are what will determine who you are […] But, of course, I can't tell the student, "Come on, please think about your actions" when they have these dynamics at home where the father does nothing but constantly hurt the mother verbally, physically… In those cases, we have to work in a different way.

In the focus group discussion, Edith further elaborated on the unique role of the school, but also the magnitude of the challenges in working with families across the whole school community:

> So, where is the limit? How far can we go in educating them here at school? And how far do they go educating them at home? […] Here we can teach values, those things which we work on in the socio-emotional domain. But then, going deeper into virtues. What

> would that look like? […] [We have] around [500 students] and families that would need to be educated. When do we have time for that?

Nevertheless, families are described as an important ally, and teachers recognize the need to work along with them, as shared by Beatriz:

> Fully involving the families. When parents' workshops are held at the school, or when they are called in response to specific issues. In that specific case, when the parents were called to the school, when both parents got to hear what happened I told [the students], "Share this at home. Share what your classmate did to you, but you also say what you did to them." It involves the parents so from home they can also pressure them a little so they don't have those attitudes […] We are all responsible for it happening, and responsible for preventing it.

And in this working together, the goal is to work towards the same end; that is, supporting the students' well-being and knowing their needs and struggles, as expressed by Teresa:

> Perhaps involving the parents too, because there are parents who don't even know what their child has in their pencil case. They never check a pencil case, they never check a little backpack… There's a saying that goes "you not only have to look at their little brain, but also at their little heart and their little backpack to see what's in there," right? And, well, obviously look if there's something different or strange that they have in that backpack, something that perhaps you haven't bought or given them.

Alongside the importance of collaborating with families, teachers recognized the influence of school-based programs and initiatives on students' experiences and behaviours related to peer harm. Teachers were in favour of proactive measures that nurture positive relationships and skill development among students. Beatriz prized the "Caminos" (pseudonym)

program running at the school: “To prevent this from happening. If we, with our Caminos sessions, for example, foster in them that respect for others. It’s not just filling out a workbook, but that we really take ownership of this which is important.” Idaly also mentioned her positive views of the program:

> I have found the Caminos program to be very good here. It has helped [students], first to regulate their emotions and always speak from their emotions… And also in Caminos they are given hypothetical situations of how they should behave in a situation. And let’s say that they have learned about win-win strategies.

Within their own classroom contexts, the teachers also noted the importance of creating a safe and supportive environment to address peer harm effectively. Augusto mentioned, during the focus group:

> I believe that the role of us as teachers in the face of any problem is as a first step to act as mediators, conciliators, and to guarantee a space where justice is prioritized. There should also be a lot of empathy and always trying to reach a solution where everyone is satisfied.

To which Jose Alejandro added:

> Within the classroom, the teacher must be that guarantor of rights. […] I also go a bit further, [teachers] must guarantee spaces for democratization of the agreements that are made at the beginning and that dynamics occur. If a type of event, situation, or incident occurs that violates rights, [teachers] must also be guarantors of that.

In sum, this theme revolves around the multifaceted influences on students’ behaviour and the collaborative efforts required to address peer harm and promote positive development.

Teachers acknowledged the pivotal role of family and sociocultural context in shaping students' attitudes and conduct, sometimes superseding the school's influence.

Teachers recognized that students' behaviour stems from their upbringing and the dynamics witnessed at home, which can instill harmful patterns that persist throughout life. Exposure to domestic violence, verbal abuse, or parental modelling of aggression is described by teachers as potentially normalizing such behaviours, making it challenging for students to act differently at school.

Beyond the family, the broader sociocultural environment was also understood as exerting a significant influence on students' behaviour and perceptions of harm. Teachers highlighted the impact of socioeconomic factors, peer pressure, and cultural norms on students' conduct and their understanding of what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable behaviour.

In navigating these intricate social dynamics and individual circumstances, teachers adopted a holistic approach that considered the multifaceted factors influencing students' behaviour. By acknowledging the powerful role of peer pressure, external incentives, and individual differences, educators strove for more effective strategies to address peer harm, foster positive relationships, and create a supportive learning environment that promotes students' overall well-being.

Summary of Findings

The findings from this study illuminate the complex landscape teachers navigate when addressing peer harm incidents. The teachers' narratives revealed a delicate balance between adhering to school protocols and centring students' unique needs, underscoring the complexities inherent in these situations. This tension aligns with research highlighting the challenges of

implementing standardized disciplinary policies in diverse educational contexts (Ahtola et al., 2012; Watson, 2006).

The two themes identified in the teachers' responses provide valuable insights into how educators navigate the complexities of peer harm incidents in schools. These themes not only reflect the practical realities faced by teachers but also connect to and build upon existing psychological and educational literature, offering a nuanced understanding of the decision-making processes involved in addressing peer harm.

The first theme highlights the tension between adhering to prescribed protocols and adapting to individual circumstances when addressing peer harm. Teachers often found themselves navigating the fine line between following school rules and addressing the unique needs of each student involved in peer harm incidents. This tension underscores the importance of flexibility and context-sensitive approaches in disciplinary practices.

The inclination towards proactive and restorative approaches among teachers resonates with the growing body of literature advocating for more student-centered and relationship-based interventions in schools (Vaandering, 2014; Winslade & Williams, 2012). Establishing clear agreements and fostering respect from the outset are crucial for creating a positive classroom climate, as emphasized in educational psychology research (Joseph & Efron, 2005). Moreover, facilitating student reflection and developing a sense of responsibility aligns with theories of moral development and social-emotional learning (Velasquez et al., 2013).

The second theme underscores the significance of understanding broader social contexts and collaborating with various stakeholders to address peer harm effectively. This theme is consistent with ecological systems theory in education, which emphasize the interconnectedness of various environmental factors influencing student behaviour and development (Espelage &

Swearer, 2003). Teachers' recognition of family and sociocultural influences on student behaviour aligns with research on the impact of home environments and community factors on school climate and student outcomes (Paluck et al., 2016).

The holistic approach adopted by teachers, considering multifaceted factors influencing students' behaviour, reflects the growing emphasis on restorative practices in education (Bradshaw, 2015; McCormarck et al.,2023). This approach acknowledges the complex interplay of individual, family, and societal factors that shape student behaviour and the need for comprehensive interventions. By recognizing that peer harm occurs within complex social contexts, teachers can develop more effective strategies for prevention and intervention.

The findings are also consistent with a shift towards more restorative and student-centered approaches, aligning with current trends in educational research and practice. This shift is reflected in Vaandering's (2013) reformulation of the social discipline window, which emphasizes nurturing relationships and fostering a sense of belonging within the school community. The restorative approach, combining clear expectations with high levels of support, aims to address the root causes of misbehaviour while holding students accountable through a supportive and collaborative process (Vaandering, 2014; Wachtel, 2013).

Teachers' also highlighted the importance of collaboration with the larger community, including families and school authorities. This collaborative approach is supported by research showing that teacher-facilitated discussions and interventions can significantly improve student behaviour and reduce harmful peer interactions (Burger et al., 2022; Gaffney et al., 2021). By engaging with families and community partners, teachers can gain valuable insights into students' backgrounds, cultural contexts, and potential risk factors that may contribute to peer harm.

Furthermore, the results in both themes underscore the importance of relational approaches in addressing peer harm. Teachers who understand and respect the diverse backgrounds of their students are better equipped to implement interventions that focus on repairing relationships and fostering a more inclusive school environment (Reimer, 2019; Winslade & Williams, 2012). This relational awareness can help educators identify and address underlying factors that may contribute to peer harm, such as social isolation or lack of empathy (Paluck et al., 2016).

Both themes highlight the human dimension of teaching, acknowledging how teachers' emotions, preconceptions, and personal experiences shape their approaches as moral guides. This aspect connects to research on teacher identity and the role of emotions in educational settings (Hargreaves, 1998; Zembylas, 2003), emphasizing the importance of supporting teachers' emotional well-being and professional development.

The findings provide a foundation for understanding the complex decision-making processes teachers engage in when addressing peer harm. They highlight the need for flexible, context-sensitive approaches that consider individual student needs, broader social influences, and the human aspects of teaching. This understanding sets the stage for exploring how the concept of prudence, or practical wisdom, can offer a valuable framework for analyzing and supporting teachers' interventions in peer harm situations. This framework is outlined in the next section.

The Virtue of Prudence as a Spiral Staircase: A Framework for Teachers' Decision-Making in Peer Harm Interventions

The virtue of prudence emerges as a compelling framework through which to interpret teachers' interventions, offering a structured yet flexible approach that aligns with their student-

centered philosophies. This framework may provide insights into how teachers navigate the complexities of peer harm situations, balancing various factors and considerations to make ethical and effective decisions.

Prudence is conceptualized by philosophers such as Aristotle (350 B.C.E./2019), Aquinas (1274/1981), and Pieper (1990), as a virtue that cultivates practical wisdom and sound judgment in navigating complex moral situations. It is a bridge virtue (Pieper, 1990) that connects reason and moral activity, enabling individuals to discern the appropriate course of action while considering potential consequences. As Pieper (1990) states, prudence allows us to "reason thoroughly and with finesse amidst the particularities of our moral, interpersonal, emotional, political, and various other life circumstances, toward the end of human flourishing" (Pieper, 1990, p. 19).

In the context of peer harm interventions, prudence can be envisioned as a spiral staircase, with each step representing a sequential aspect in the exercise of practical wisdom acquired through professional experiences. This metaphor captures the iterative and cumulative nature of prudence, and other virtues, as teachers continuously refine their judgment and decision-making abilities through encounters with diverse situations and reflections on their actions.

Seeing

The first step on this spiral staircase aligns with the "see" phase, when teachers gather information and perspectives, akin to Aquinas' (1274/1981) notion of "counsel" (II-II, Q.49, a.5). This step bears on how teachers perceive and understand the situation at hand. This aligns with Aristotle's concept of perception (aisthesis) as a crucial component of practical wisdom

(phronesis). For Aristotle, perception in ethical matters involves not just sensory awareness, but a nuanced understanding of the particulars of a situation (Aristotle., 350 B.C.E./2019).

Teachers' reflections on their roles as moral educators, within the first theme, exemplify this expanded notion of seeing. Teachers, as moral educators, develop a keen sense of their students' typical behaviours and interactions, allowing them to detect subtle changes that might indicate underlying issues. This aligns with Aquinas' understanding of prudence as involving not just knowledge, but also memory and understanding (Aquinas, 1274/1981).

Also, across both themes, teachers' efforts to take a student-centered approach further illustrate this concept. By focusing on individual students' needs and circumstances, teachers cultivate a deeper understanding that enables them to perceive cues indicating distress or conflict. This reflects Pieper's (1990) emphasis on the importance of objectivity in prudence, where one sees reality as it is, not as one wishes it to be.

Further, based on the second theme, teachers also took into account cultural and social influences on students' actions; this underscores the importance of contextual awareness in this seeing process. Teachers' perceptions focused not just on individual behaviours, but also the broader social dynamics and cultural factors that influence student interactions. This aligns with Aristotle's emphasis on the particular nature of practical wisdom, which requires understanding the specific context of each situation (Aristotle., 350 B.C.E./2019). Teachers' consideration of power dynamics within the first theme is also particularly relevant to this expanded notion of seeing. Teachers strove to be attuned to the complex interplay of relationships and authority within the classroom, perceiving how these dynamics might contribute to or exacerbate peer harm situations. This reflects Aquinas' understanding of prudence as involving not just perception, but also foresight (Aquinas., 1274/1981).

Judging

The second step in the prudential process corresponds to the "judge" phase, when teachers evaluate the situation and weigh potential consequences. This stage aligns with Aquinas' concept of judging of what has been counselled (Aquinas., 1274/1981). In this phase, teachers engage in what Aristotle termed "deliberation" (bouleusis), a careful weighing of alternatives to determine the best course of action (Aristotle., 350 B.C.E./2019).

Findings from this study underline that teachers carefully evaluated situations and weighed potential consequences. To do so, as outlined in the first theme, the teachers were particularly concerned with promoting each student's well-being. This involved considering not only the immediate incident but also the broader social context, family situations, and individual student histories, as discussed in the second theme. Such comprehensive evaluation reflects Pieper's (1990) description of prudence as a virtue that involves careful deliberation and judgment, considering the full reality of the situation.

Teachers also navigated the complex interplay of relationships and authority within the classroom, considering how their interventions might affect these dynamics and the long-term implications for student relationships and the classroom environment, as seen in the first theme. This aligns with Aristotle's emphasis on the importance of experience in practical wisdom, as understanding these dynamics requires a deep familiarity with the social fabric of the classroom (Aristotle, 350 B.C.E./2019).

In assessing the nature and severity of the harm, teachers strove to judge not only the immediate effects but also the potential long-term consequences on the students involved and the broader classroom community. This process, which requires what Aquinas termed "circumspection," involves a careful consideration of circumstances (Aquinas, 1274/1981). This

aligns with the second theme, which focuses on the broader social influences on behaviour. Teachers sought to consider not only how to respond to the immediate situation but also how their judgment might contribute to preventing future incidents. This forward-thinking aspect of judgment aligns with what Aquinas termed "foresight" (providentia), a key part of prudence that involves ordering present actions toward future goals (Aquinas., 1274/1981).

Ensuring that judgments and potential actions align with ethical principles is crucial, as this helps prevent the perpetuation of biases or inequalities. This reflects Aristotle's concept of equity (epieikeia), which involves judging not merely by the letter of the law but by its spirit, considering the particularities of each situation (Aristotle, 350 B.C.E./2019). This aspect is directly related to the first theme, which emphasizes how teachers sought to balance and navigate between adhering to established protocols and adapting to individual circumstances.

Lastly, as seen in the second theme, the teachers understood themselves as part of a team that can be trusted to rely on them for help in given circumstances, highlighting the importance of seeking counsel in the judging process. Aristotle emphasized that we deliberate about important matters with others, acknowledging our limitations (Aristotle., 350 B.C.E./2019). In complex situations, teachers described consulting with colleagues or administrators to gain additional perspectives and ensure a well-rounded judgment.

Acting

The third step of the prudential spiral involves "acting" and intervening in the peer harm situation. This stage corresponds to Aquinas' notion of "command," where the decision is executed (Aquinas, 1274/1981). The findings revealed a spectrum of approaches, ranging from restorative and student-centered interventions to more retributive responses, as reflected in the first theme.

Teachers employed a range of actions to address misconduct or harm, including creating a positive classroom climate and implementing preventive measures to address potential issues before they escalate. This proactive approach aligns with Aristotle's view that prudence involves not only responding to immediate situations but also anticipating and preventing future problems (Aristotle, 350 B.C.E./2019). This aspect is captured in the first theme, which emphasizes different strategies to handle misconduct or harm. For instance, teachers sought to promote reflection and dialogue with students to understand causes and prevent future harms.

Teachers also used a spectrum of disciplinary actions, from restorative approaches that focus on repairing relationships and fostering a sense of accountability and empathy among students, to punitive measures that assign blame and administer consequences. This reflects a balance between building and repairing relationships and enforcing rules, as emphasized by Vaandering (2013). This balance is a key aspect of the first theme, which discusses various strategies to handle misconduct or harm.

Adhering to established guidelines and procedures when addressing peer harm was also deemed important, as highlighted in the first theme. While teachers may seek alternative strategies, they navigated within the framework of school policies, balancing personal judgment with institutional requirements to ensure their actions are both effective and aligned with school expectations. Teachers often sought innovative ways to address peer harm that goes beyond prescribed protocols, tailoring their interventions to the unique needs of each situation. This reflects Aristotle's emphasis on practical wisdom adapting to specific situations (Aristotle, 350 B.C.E./2019). This flexibility is evident across both themes, highlighting the importance of context-sensitive approaches.

The emotional and personal aspects of teachers' interventions were significant, as their narratives illustrated how their actions were deeply influenced by their own experiences, emotions, and moral convictions (Fenstermacher et al., 2009; Sanger, 2001; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2015; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). This aligns with Aquinas' understanding of prudence as involving not just knowledge, but also emotional intelligence and moral character (Aquinas, 1274/1981). The human dimension of teachers' responses, as seen in the first theme, allows for empathy and nuanced understanding in addressing peer harm, while also acknowledging the challenges and personal toll such situations can have on educators.

Overall, then, findings revealed that teachers strive to navigate the complexities of peer harm interventions while maintaining a student-centered approach. I propose the virtue of prudence as a framework to understand this process, visualized as a spiral staircase. This metaphor captures the dynamic and evolving nature of practical wisdom, emphasizing its continuous refinement rather than a static state.

This framework offers a significant contribution by providing a structured yet flexible approach that resonates with teachers' narratives and aligns with their commitment to fostering positive societal change and moral development in students. It acknowledges the inherent tensions and challenges teachers face while offering a path forward that honours their roles as moral educators and their desire to prioritize students' needs.

In conclusion, the prudence framework, envisioned as a spiral staircase, presents a compelling model for understanding teachers' interventions in peer harm situations. It illuminates how educators cultivate practical wisdom, exercise sound judgment, and navigate complex incidents while prioritizing student-centered education and broader societal transformation.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite important strengths such as a focus on teachers' narratives, a comprehensive approach to qualitative coding, and thematic analysis of individuals' experiences, this study has some limitations. The perspectives and experiences captured represent a snapshot of the participants involved and may not encompass the full range of viewpoints held by teachers in other school environments. Further, it is important to acknowledge that the researcher's positionality and theoretical lens may have shaped the interpretation of data.

The storytelling context, including the audience (a Canadian graduate student of Colombian descent in the case of individual interviews; other teachers within the school community in the case of the focus group), may have influenced how the stories were told. This factor should be considered when interpreting the findings. Additionally, while interviews and a focus group provided rich data, these methods may have inherent limitations in capturing the full depth and complexity of teachers' experiences. Group dynamics and the rapport between the researcher and participants could have influenced the openness and accuracy of responses.

Furthermore, it's important to acknowledge the potential selection bias in the specific stories chosen by teachers to narrate during the interviews and focus group. Participants may have been more likely to recall and share incidents that were particularly memorable, impactful, or aligned with their personal teaching philosophies. This could result in an overrepresentation of certain types of peer harm incidents or intervention strategies in the data. Teachers might have also been inclined to present stories that portrayed their actions in a favorable light or that they felt were most relevant to the researcher's interests. Consequently, some types of events may have been underreported, potentially skewing the overall picture of how teachers typically address peer harm in their day-to-day practice. Relatedly, our protocol specifically asked about

situations in which teachers punished and did not punish students, which may have also led them to report on particular types of events. These issues underline the importance of considering these narratives as illustrative examples rather than comprehensive representations of all peer harm incidents and teacher responses within the school environment.

The study's findings are grounded in the specific cultural, social, and institutional contexts in which the research was conducted. While this contextual richness enhances the relevance and applicability of the findings within the studied setting, it may limit the transferability of the results to other educational contexts with different cultural, socioeconomic, or policy environments. The context-specific nature of the findings highlights the need for caution when attempting to generalize or apply the results to dissimilar educational settings without considering the unique contextual factors at play such as: (a) a relatively new school, (b) the cultural context of the school, in that it serves students in a lower-SES neighbourhood in Bogotá, Colombia; and (c) the educational partnership that seeks to guide and support best practices at this school.

The influence of researcher positionality on data analysis and interpretation should also be considered. As a Colombian researcher with a background in school leadership, I acknowledge that my cultural background and professional experiences may have shaped my perspective on justice, discipline, and educational approaches. Initially, I held a somewhat skeptical view of restorative practices, influenced by my cultural background and professional experiences with more traditional disciplinary approaches. However, the data collected in this study revealed that some teachers are actively working towards implementing restorative practices, challenging my preconceptions. This discovery highlighted the importance of remaining open to new insights and allowing the data to guide the analysis, rather than relying

solely on prior assumptions. My cultural bias towards retributive justice ("paying back") and my experiences with the challenges of implementing alternative approaches in the schools where I have worked required constant reflection to ensure they did not unduly influence my interpretation of teachers' narratives. This tension between my initial skepticism and the realities presented in the data was a significant aspect of my research journey, potentially affecting the lens through which I viewed and interpreted the teachers' reflections on addressing peer harm.

Additionally, my position as a former school leader may have introduced a degree of cynicism or skepticism towards certain idealistic approaches. Throughout the analysis process, I had to consciously strive to remain faithful to the data, balancing my preconceptions with the actual experiences shared by the participants. This tension between ideal scenarios and practical realities was a constant consideration during the study, potentially affecting the lens through which I viewed and interpreted the teachers' reflections on addressing peer harm. Nevertheless, it is important to underline that the coding process was conducted collaboratively to enhance the trustworthiness of the conclusions. Specifically, the coding process involved repeated discussions with the primary researcher who collected the data, as well as the involvement of two other experienced researchers who collaborated on the coding. This team approach allowed for multiple perspectives and ongoing discussions about the interpretation of the data. Regular meetings and lively debates within the research team helped to challenge individual biases, ensure consistency in coding, and deepen the analysis. These collaborative efforts were crucial in navigating the tension between ideal scenarios and practical realities, which was a constant consideration during the study. This approach helped to mitigate the potential effects of my personal lens on the interpretation of teachers' reflections on addressing peer harm.

Future research could explore how teachers' perspectives manifest in their actual everyday interventions and observable behaviours when addressing peer harm situations. Longitudinal studies could capture the dynamic and evolving nature of teachers' responses over time, influenced by factors such as professional development, policy changes, or societal shifts. Cross-cultural comparisons could illuminate how different educational contexts shape teachers' approaches to peer harm. Additionally, incorporating additional data sources, such as classroom observations and student perspectives, could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the teachers' responses and decision-making process in peer-to-peer harm situations. Investigating the impact of specific interventions or training programs on teachers' ability to address peer harm effectively could also yield valuable insights for improving educational practices.

Implications and Conclusions

The qualitative analysis conducted in this study has offered valuable insights into the reflections that inform teachers' responses to peer harm in schools, contributing to our understanding of the complex decision-making processes teachers engage in. The study adds to the literature by documenting the underlying concerns and thought processes of teachers as they reflect back on situations of peer harm that they have faced, providing a nuanced exploration of teachers' perspectives on interactions with students and disciplinary responses to harm.

A key framework that emerged from the study is the relevance of the virtue of prudence in making sense of teachers' ethical decision-making. Prudence, considered the "queen" of virtues in Aristotelian ethics, involves the ability to judge what is truly good in a situation and discern the right course of virtuous action. The study highlighted how prudence can serve as a lens to interpret teachers' reflections and decision-making processes, enabling them to assess reality accurately, set worthy goals, and determine proper means aligned with ethical principles.

This approach provides a descriptive understanding of how teachers strive to carefully and sensitively navigate the complexities of peer harm incidents, rather than prescribing specific actions they should take.

The significance of this study extends beyond the academic realm, with implications for the broader educational landscape. By representing the voices, concerns, preoccupations, and beliefs of teachers regarding approaches to discipline, the study contributes to scholarship on teachers' roles as moral educators. Specifically, the findings reveal that teachers prioritize fostering open communication, understanding, and reflection among students involved in harmful incidents. Additionally, the study underscores the importance of understanding the broader social contexts and collaborating with various stakeholders to address peer harm effectively.

While refraining from prescribing specific management strategies or making concrete policy recommendations, the study has aligned with a qualitative approach that deepens the understanding of teachers' experiences. The findings highlight the moral dimensions of educators' roles, suggesting how teachers' personal stories and ethical groundings might shape the moral landscape they create in their classrooms, influencing students' moral development and decision-making.

The findings from this study underscore the complex tensions teachers navigate between adhering to protocols and adapting to individual circumstances when addressing peer harm. This insight highlights the need for teacher education programs and professional development to focus on supporting educators' capacity for contextual decision-making and ethical reasoning. Crucially, these programs should emphasize the human aspect of teaching, acknowledging that educators, like their students, are individuals with their own experiences and emotions. Training

should prepare teachers for the various types of harm they may encounter, equipping them with strategies to address these situations effectively and compassionately. Furthermore, the development of prudence, or practical wisdom, should be a key focus, enabling teachers to discern appropriate courses of action in diverse situations. To achieve this, teacher education should incorporate opportunities for dialogue, reflection, and the formation of professional learning communities. These spaces allow educators to discuss issues with trusted colleagues, share stories and problems, and engage in moments of reflection to understand their own practice better. Building on these insights, both preservice and in-service teachers could be encouraged to take a thoughtful and nuanced approach to their roles as moral educators in the school community, guided by the framework of prudential wisdom. Professional development initiatives could include workshops that facilitate teachers' reflection on their past experiences with peer harm, prompting them to consider the orientations underlying their approaches, and discussing ethical considerations in their decision-making processes. By fostering these skills and creating supportive environments for ongoing learning and discussion, we can better prepare teachers to navigate the complexities of addressing peer harm while maintaining their own well-being and effectiveness as educators. This study has laid the groundwork for future research and professional development initiatives in education by providing a deeper understanding of teachers' decision-making processes and ethical considerations when addressing peer harm.

References

Ahtola, A., Haataja, A., Kärnä, A., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2012). For children only? Effects of the KiVa antibullying program on teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(6), 851–859. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.03.006

Akkerman, S. F., & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(2), 308–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013

Aquinas. (1981). Summa theologica/St. Thomas Aquinas; translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. (Complete English ed.). Christian Classics. (Original work published ca. 1274)

Aristotle. (2019). Nicomachean ethics (T. Irwin, Trans.; Third edition). Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.)

Bamberg, M. (2004). Considering counter narratives. In M. J. Packer & R. B. Addison (Eds.), *Entering the circle: Hermeneutic investigation in psychology* (pp. 149–174). SUNY Press.

Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small. *Narrative Inquiry*, *16*(1), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.18bam

Beauchamp C., & Thomas L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 39* (2), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640902902252

Boulton, M. J., Hardcastle, K., Down, J., Fowles, J., & Simmonds, J. A. (2014). A comparison of preservice teachers' responses to cyber versus traditional bullying scenarios: Similarities

and differences and implications for practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(2), 145–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511496

Bradshaw C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *The American psychologist*, *70*(4), 322–332. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039114

Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 17–43). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burger, C., Strohmeier, D., Spröber, N., Bauman, S., & Rigby, K. (2015). How teachers respond to school bullying: An examination of self-reported intervention strategy use, moderator effects, and concurrent use of multiple strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *51*, 191–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.07.004

Burger, C., Strohmeier, D., & Kollerová, L. (2022). Teachers can make a difference in bullying: Effects of teacher interventions on students' adoption of bully, victim, bully-victim or defender roles across time. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *51*(9), 1742-1757. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-022-01674-6

Byers, D. L., Caltabiano, N. J., & Caltabiano, M. L. (2011). Teachers' attitude towards overt and covert bullying, and perceived efficacy to intervene. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*, https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n11.1

Calhoun, A., & Daniels, G. (2008). Accountability in school responses to harmful incidents. *Journal of School Violence*, *7*(4), 21–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220801973839

Campbell, E. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Campaert, K., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2017). The efficacy of teachers' responses to incidents of bullying and victimization: the mediational role of moral disengagement for bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 43*(5), 483–492. https://doi.org/10.1002/AB.21706

Campbell, E. (2014). Teaching Ethically as a Moral Condition of Professionalism. In L. Nucci, & Krettenauer (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (2nd ed., pp. 101–117). Routledge.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2004). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. John Wiley & Sons.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999) *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. Teachers College Press.

Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2016). Authoritative school climate and high school student risk behavior: a cross-sectional multi-level analysis of student self-reports. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*(11), 2246–2259. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016- 0424-3

Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional selves of teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(4), 601–616. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920600775316

De Luca, L., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2019). The teacher's role in preventing bullying. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, Article 01830 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01830

Drewery, W. (2014). Restorative practice in New Zealand schools: Social development through relational justice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *48*(2), 191–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2014.989951

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 365–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2003.12086206

Fenstermacher, G. D., Osguthorpe, R. D., & Sanger, M. N. (2009). Teaching Morally and Teaching Morality. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(3), 7–19.

Fung, A. L. (2012). Intervention for aggressive victims of school bullying in Hong Kong: a longitudinal mixed-methods study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *53*(4), 360–367. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2012.00953.x

Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components. *Journal of School Psychology*, *85*, 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.12.002

Gee, K. A., Haghighat, M. D., Vang, T. M., & Cooc, N. (2021). In the aftermath of school victimization: Links between authoritative school climate and adolescents' perceptions of the negative effects of bullying victimization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *51*, 1273–1286. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021- 01516-x

Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative Inquiry, 16*(1), 122–130. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.16geo

Georgakopoulou, A. (2015). Small stories research: Methods—analysis—outreach. In A. De Fina & A. Georgakopoulou (Eds.), *The handbook of narrative analysis* (pp. 255–271). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118458204.ch13

Goldstein, L. S., & Freedman, D. (2003). Challenges enacting caring teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(5), 441–454. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103259114

Goodson, I. (2013). *Developing narrative theory: Life histories and personal representation.* Routledge.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., & Mashburn, A. J. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of conflict with young students: Looking beyond problem behaviors. *Social Development, 17*(1), 115–136. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00418.x

Hansen, D.T. (2001) Teaching as a moral activity. In V. Richardson (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (Washington, DC: AERA), 566–603.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(8), 835–854. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x (98) 00025-0

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools: A guide to using restorative practice*. Routledge.

Hernandez Varona, W. (2023) Listening to Emilce and Pedro: Exploring the subjective constitutions of teachers amid violence. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *132*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104260

Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (2000) *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/3089674

Hopkins, B. (2011). *The restorative classroom: Using restorative approaches to foster effective learning*. Routledge.

Johnstone, G., & Ness, D. V. (2013). *Handbook of restorative justice.* Routledge.

Joseph, P. B., & Efron, S. (1993). Moral choices/moral conflicts: Teachers' self- perceptions. *Journal of Moral Education, 22*, 201–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724930220303

Joseph, P. B., & Efron, S. (2005). Seven worlds of moral education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86* (7), 525– 533. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508600713

Kelly, E. L., & Peters-Golden, J. (2020). Philly stands up! A portrait of praxis, an anatomy of accountability. In E. Dixon & L. L. Piepzna-Samarasinha (Eds.), *Beyond survival: Strategies and stories from the transformative justice movement* (pp. 91–99). AK Press.

Kollerová, L., Soukup, P., Strohmeier, D., & Caravita, S. C. S. (2021). Teachers' active responses to bullying: does the school collegial climate make a difference? *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 18*(6), 912–927. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1865145

Laursen, B., & Veenstra, R. (2021). Toward understanding the functions of peer influence: A summary and synthesis of recent empirical research. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 31*(4), 889-907. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12606

McAdams, D. P., Reynolds, J., Lewis, M., Patten, A. H., & Bowman, P. J. (2001). When bad things turn good and good things turn bad: Sequences of redemption and contamination in life narrative, and their relation to psychosocial adaptation in midlife adults and in students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(4), 474–485. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201274008

McCold, P. & Wachtel, T. (2003). In pursuit of paradigm: A theory of restorative justice. Restorative Practices E-Forum, available at http://www.iirp.edu/article_detail.php?article_id=NDI0

McCormack, B., McCance, T., & Maben, J. (2023). A review of factors affecting teacher intervention in peer bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 22* (1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2023.2289117

McLean, K. C., Pasupathi, M., & Pals, J. L. (2007). Selves creating stories creating selves: a process model of self-development. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(3)*,* 262–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307301034

Miller, J. M. (2009). Teacher identity. In A. Burns, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 172–181). Cambridge University Press.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics & moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., & Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: a social network experiment in 56 schools. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113 (3), 566–571. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514483113

Pantić, N., & Wubbels, T. (2012). Teachers' moral values and their interpersonal relationships with students and cultural competence. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(3), 451–460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.011

Pasupathi, M., McLean, K. C., & Weeks, T. (2009). To tell or not to tell: Disclosure and the narrative self. *Journal of Personality, 77*(1), 89–123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00539.x

Pasupathi, M., Weeks, T., & Rice, C. (2006). Reflecting on life: Remembering as a major process in adult development. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 25*(3), 244–263. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X06289425

Pishghadam, R., Golzar, J., & Miri, M. A. (2022). A new conceptual framework for teacher identity development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.876395

Pieper, J. (1990). *The four cardinal virtues: Human agency, intellectual traditions, and responsible knowledge.* University of Notre Dame Press.

Reimer, K. E. (2019). Relationships of control and relationships of engagement: How educator intentions intersect with student experiences of restorative justice. *Journal of Peace Education, 16(1)*, 49–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2018.1472070

Recchia, H., Sack, J. K., & Pareja Conto, L. (in press). *Restorative justice as a context for moral education in K-12 schools.* In L. Nucci, T. Krettenauer, and W. Thompson (Eds.), Handbook of Moral and Character Education (3rd edition). Routledge.

Rukeyser, M. (1968). *The speed of darkness*. Random House.

Saarento, S., Kärnä, A., Hodges, E. V. E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Student-, classroom-, and school-level risk factors for victimization. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*(3), 421–434. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.02.002

Sanger, M. G. (2001). Talking to teachers and looking at practice in understanding the moral dimensions of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33*(6)*,* 683–704. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270110066733

Sanger, M. N., & Osguthorpe, R. D. (2015). *The moral work of teaching and teacher education: Preparing and supporting practitioners*. Teachers College Press.

Thompson, W. C., Beneke, A. J., & Mitchell, G. S. (2020). Legitimate concerns: On complications of identity in school punishment. *Theory and Research in Education, 18*(1), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878520903400

Thorne, A. (2004). Pressing issues in the study of talk and identity. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland, & D. Galasiński (Eds.), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 9–36). Mouton de Gruyter.

Uribe-Mallarino, C. (2008). Estratificación social en Bogotá: de la política pública a la dinámica de la segregación social. *Universitas Humanística, 65*(65), 139–172.

Vaandering, D. (2013). A window on relationships: Reflecting critically on a current restorative justice theory, *Restorative Justice, 1*(3), 311–333. https://doi.org/10.5235/20504721.1.3.311

Vaandering, D. (2014). Relational restorative justice pedagogy in educator professional development. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(4), 508–530. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12057

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 4*(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Velasquez, A., West, R., Graham, C., & Osguthorpe, R. (2013). Developing caring relationships in schools: A review of the research on caring and nurturing pedagogies. *Review of Education, 1* (2)*,* 162–190. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3014

Veugelers, W., & Vedder, P. (2003). Values in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9*(4), 377–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354060032000097262

Voight, A., Austin, G., & Hanson, T. (2013). *A climate for academic success: How school climate distinguishes schools that are beating the achievement odds.* San Francisco: WestEd.

Wainryb, C., Brehl, B. A., & Matwin, S. (2005). Being hurt and hurting others: children's narrative accounts and moral judgments of their own interpersonal conflicts. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *70*(3), 1–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5834.2005.00350.x

Watson, C. (2006). Narratives of practice and the construction of identity in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(5), 509–526. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600600832213

Way, S. M. (2011). School discipline and disruptive classroom behavior: The moderating effects of student perceptions. *The Sociological Quarterly, 52*(3), 346–375. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01210.x

Welsh, R. O., & Little, S. (2018). The school discipline dilemma: A comprehensive review of disparities and alternative approaches. *Review of Educational Research*, *88*(5), 752–794. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791582

Winslade, J., & Williams, M. (2012). *Safe and peaceful schools: Addressing conflict and eliminating violence.* Corwin Press.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching, 9*(3), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600309378

Zhang, Q. (2022). The role of teachers' interpersonal behaviors in learners' academic achievements. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 921832. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921832

Appendix A

Protocols of the individual interviews

Opening question:

Briefly tell us about your teaching philosophy. For example, describe some of your values, beliefs and goals as a teacher, and how you put these into practice. In addition, describe your perception of ideal student-teacher relationships.

Tell me about a time when you punished a student for doing or saying something that hurt another student at your school, and you think you made the right call. What happened? Pick a time you remember really well and tell me everything you remember about it.

Follow up questions:

1. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was thinking?
2. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was feeling?
3. How do you think the other student felt? Why?
4. What do you think each student wanted to do or was trying to do?
5. Did other students get involved in this situation in any way?
6. How did you handle this situation? Why?
7. Why do you think you made the right decision?
8. How would you intervene if a similar situation were to occur again? Why?
9. Was your way of handling the situation fair? Why?
10. What do you think should happen to prevent similar situations from occurring at school?
11. Are the students, teachers, and/or the school community in general responsible for creating an environment where situations like this occur? Why?

Tell me about a time when you punished a student for doing or saying something that hurt another student at your school, but you would respond differently if it happened again. What happened? Pick a time you remember really well and tell me everything you remember about it.

Follow up questions:

1. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was thinking?
2. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was feeling?
3. How do you think the other student felt? Why?
4. What do you think each student wanted to do or was trying to do?
5. Did other students get involved in this situation in any way?
6. How did you intervene? Why?
7. Why would you respond differently if a similar situation were to occur again?
8. How would you intervene if a similar situation happened again?
9. Was your approach fair? Why?
10. What do you think needs to happen to prevent similar incidents from occurring at your school?
11. Are students, other teachers, and the broader school community in any way responsible for creating an environment in which a situation like this could occur? Why?

Tell me about a time when you decided not to punish a student for doing or saying something that hurt another student at your school, and you think you made the right call. What happened? Pick a time you remember really well and tell me everything you remember about it.

Follow up questions:

1. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was thinking?
2. What do you think the student who hurt the other student was feeling?

3. How do you think the other student felt? Why?
4. What do you think each student wanted to do or was trying to do?
5. Did other students get involved in this situation in any way?
6. How did you intervene? Why?
7. If a similar situation were to occur again, how would you intervene? Why?
8. Why do you think you made the right call?
9. Was your approach fair? Why?
10. What do you think needs to happen to prevent similar incidents from occurring at your school?
11. Are students, other teachers, and the broader school community in any way responsible for creating an environment in which a situation like this could occur? Why?

Appendix B

Original interview transcript in Spanish and translation to English

Quotes Referenced for the First Theme

Transcript 1.1 (Edith)—Page 25

Lo poco que se puede hacer aquí en el colegio es tratar de inculcar de una manera sana y de una manera agradable esos valores a estos muchachos que… Ellos ya no le dan importancia [a esos valores]. Esa sería una manera de pronto de tratar de rescatar y de evitar tanta problemática y tanta circunstancia porque se presentan ¿por qué? Por el desconocimiento de tantos valores y porque no los llevamos a la práctica.

The little that can be done here at school is to try to instill those values in these young people in a healthy and pleasant way… They no longer give importance to [such values]. That would be a way to try to address and avoid so many problems and circumstances because they arise due to the ignorance of many values and because we do not put them into practice.

Transcript 1.2 (Beatriz)—Page 25

Yo les digo, Sí, Aquí usted puede llenar la cartilla, y listo, y aquí puede ser perfecto todo. Pero usted va a salir a una vida, va a salir a un trabajo, a una universidad, y ahí se va a enfrentar con un montón de personas, cada una totalmente diferente, y si usted no tiene esa capacidad de ser tolerante, de decir las cosas que no le parecen de… De una buena manera, todo lo que aprendió aquí de nada le va a servir porque entonces en el primer trabajo lo echan por peleón.

I tell them yes here you can fill out the workbook, and that's it, and here everything can be perfect. But you're going to go out into life, you're going to go out to a job, to a university, and there you're going to face a lot of people, each one totally different, and if you don't have

that ability to be tolerant, to say the things you don't like in a good way, everything you learned here will be useless because then at the first job they'll fire you for being quarrelsome.

Transcript 1.3 (Idaly)—Page 25

Considero que como profesores, como docentes, tenemos [...] la obligación o la función de formar también personas, adicionalmente de enseñarles bien sea una asignatura, también es importante enseñarles a ellos cómo deberían comportarse en una sociedad. En estas alturas de mi carrera me he dado cuenta que los estudiantes viven o conviven en el colegio y es como si fuera un pequeño círculo, una pequeña sociedad, y pues ellos deben aprender a respetarse, la empatía de que el otro también siente, de que deben de respetarse [...] Digamos que todos esos valores para que ellos también cuando salgan a la vida, pues ellos puedan también comportarse de la manera correcta.

I think that as teachers, as educators, we have […] the obligation or the role to also form people, in addition to teaching them, whether it's a subject, it's also important to teach them how they should behave in society. At this stage of my career, I've realized that students live or coexist at school and it's like a small circle, a small society, and, well, they must learn to respect each other, empathy that others also have feelings, that they must also respect each other […] All those values so that, when they go out into life, they can also behave, in the correct way.

Transcript 1.4 (Esteban)—Page 26

Y, pues, realmente creo que hay que ayudarlos a que – Dentro de su pensamiento complejo y su pensamiento crítico lleguen a… A certezas de las de sus realidades. Y que se motiven a comprometerse con la transformación de esa propia realidad. Entonces yo… Yo me los imagino transformando su casa, ¿sí? Que la educación los ayuda a transformar su casa, les ayuda a transformar su entorno social, les ayuda a transformar su barrio… Su ciudad, ¿ sí?

I really believe that we must help them so that in their complex and critical thinking they arrive at certainty about their own realities, and become motivated to commit to transforming that very reality. I imagine them transforming their home, right? That education helps them transform their home. It helps them transform their social environment. It helps them transform their neighborhood, their city, right?

Transcript 1.5 (Beatriz)—Page 26

De que ellos se vuelvan integrales, que realmente entiendan que aquí no vienen solo a aprender un montón de conocimientos, si no a ser personas… Y que va a salir a una sociedad a enfrentarse, pues, a un montón de seres totalmente diferentes a él, y que él tiene que aprender a respetar.

For them [students] to become well-rounded individuals, so that they really understand that they don't just come here to learn a bunch of knowledge, but to be people… And that they will go out into society to face many beings totally different from them, and that they have to learn to respect.

Transcript 1.6 (Edith)—Page 27

Sí hay que fomentar en el aula de clases respeto. Y si nosotros tenemos una cartilla aquí, trayéndola al contexto aquí, y manejamos la responsabilidad conmigo mismo, con los demás […] Es obvio que nosotros tenemos que poner en práctica eso. Y llevarlo a la práctica"

Yes, we must foster respect in the classroom. And, if we have a workbook here to bring it into our context, and we work on responsibility with oneself, with others […] it's obvious that we have to put that into practice.

Transcript 1.7 (Augusto)—Page 27

Cuando es una educación efectiva donde los estudiantes en casa les han fortalecido los valores, entre ellos obviamente la responsabilidad, el respeto… Hace que se evidencie eso en el colegio.

When it is an effective education where students at home have worked on strengthening values, like obviously responsibility, respect… That becomes evident in the school.

Transcript 1.8 (Esteban)—Page 28

De detenernos en el semáforo, tranquilos, esperando que pase el tiempo sencillamente porque es un pacto social… Porque sabemos que así evitamos accidentes… O sea, de verdad porque es una ética autónoma, ¿sí? Creo yo que… Que allá es donde debemos apuntar. A evitar que la sanción se convierta en una – En el medio de coacción, Hacia las éticas heterónomas.

To stop at the traffic light, calmly, waiting for time to simply pass because it is a social pact… Because we know that this is what we do to avoid accidents… In other words, truly because it is an autonomous ethic, right? I believe that this is where we should aim. To prevent the sanction from becoming a means of coercion, towards heteronomous ethics.

Transcript 1.9 (Jose Alejandro)—Page 28

Después nos sentamos los tres… Y… Hicimos una pequeña reflexión en torno a lo sucedido… Que era ubicarnos críticamente en nuestro contexto. Todo lo vamos a solucionar con golpes? Hablamos… Hablamos. Llegamos a un entendimiento

Afterwards we sat down, the three of us, and we had a small reflection around what happened, which was to critically situate ourselves in our context. Are we going to solve everything with blows? We talked… We came to an understanding.

Transcript 1.10 (Edith)—Page 28

Por ejemplo, yo no soy mucho de castigos de fuerza ya… más que todo trato de hablar con ellos y de escuchar las versiones…En otro momento ya hablé con los dos y les pregunté qué pasaba. Escuché la versión de los dos juntos, simultáneamente.

For example, I'm not much for forceful punishments anymore… more than anything I try to talk with them and listen to their perspectives… At another time, I had already spoken with the two of them and asked them what was happening. I listened to their versions together, simultaneously.

Transcript 1.11 (Esteban)—Page 29

En donde de pronto estamos estancados y es en el hecho de llegar al diálogo. El diálogo asertivo. Cuando digo el diálogo asertivo, no es sentarnos y escucharnos y ya vamos a tomar una decisión… Si no, sopesamos. Sopesamos que… Cuáles eran los sentimientos de todos"

Where we are perhaps stuck is in the fact of arriving at a dialogue. An assertive dialogue. When I say assertive dialogue, it's not about sitting down and listening to each other, and then making a decision… But rather, let's weigh it out. Let's weigh out what everyone's feelings are.

Transcript 1.12 (Idaly) —Page 29

Yo no siempre recurro inmediatamente al manual. Porque de una u otra forma lo que yo les digo, o sea, ustedes ya son grandes, y yo no puedo estar diciéndoles a ustedes o haciéndoles anotación como si fueran niños de cinco años..

I don't always immediately resort to the manual. Because one way or another, what I tell them is, you're grown-ups now, and I can't be telling you or punishing you as if you were five-year-old children.

Transcript 1.13 (Augusto)—Page 30

De pronto que el manual de convivencia sea un poco más rígido… Los chicos se dan cuenta, de pronto, de esos -- esos… -- De esas debilidades que presenta el mismo manual. Y que de pronto, pues, no da como esas herramientas necesarias para que el comportamiento en la escuela sea más… Más… Digamos más respetuoso, ¿sí?

Perhaps the Manual de Convivencia is a bit more rigid… The kids notice those weaknesses that the manual has, and that perhaps it doesn't provide those necessary tools for the behavior at school to be more… More… Let's be more respectful, right?

Transcript 1.14 (Augusto)—Page 30

Se supone que el manual de convivencia está basado en derechos y deberes y uno de esos deberes, pues, precisamente es el estar garantizando el bienestar de todos los estudiantes… Niños y adolescentes… Y de acuerdo a lo que está dispuesto y la manera de cómo se debe llevar un castigo, pues, se debe manejar los conductos. Conductos regulares.

It is assumed that the Manual de Convivencia is based on rights and duties, and one of those duties is precisely to guarantee the well-being of all students, children and adolescents. And in accordance with what is established and the way in which a punishment should be carried out, well, the proper channels must be followed. The established channels.

Transcript 1.15 (Beatriz)—Page 30

Los acuerdos deben ser muy claros. Mmm… Las primeras clases que uno maneja con… con un grupo nuevo, por ejemplo, lo primero que se debería hacer antes de empezar a meterse ya en el cuento de su materia es tener acuerdos claros. Que ellos sean los que propongan cuáles son los acuerdos. Entonces, de ellos sale el respeto a la palabra, el pedir la mano – pedir la palabra levantando la mano, tener una escucha activa, ¿cierto? Entonces, digamos que desde el inicio de

un año escolar – Se puede decir así, los acuerdos deben ser claros. Y, pues, digamos que el respeto es super importante

The agreements must be very clear. The first classes that one handles with a new group, for example, the first thing that should be done before starting to delve into course materials is to have clear agreements. Let [students] be the ones who propose the agreements. So, from them comes respect for taking turns, asking for the floor by raising their hand, engaging in active listening, right? So, let's say that from the beginning of the school year the agreements must be clear. And, well, respect is very important.

Transcript 1.16 (Teresa)—Page 30

La Coordinación quedaba al frente mío[…] Afortunadamente el coordinador estaba libre, "¿Su mercé se puede pasar por el salón? presencié tal cosa, no sé si sea cierto... Con Fulanito... No sé si usted me ayuda con eso." Entonces, yo ya volví al salón, continué la clase... El coordinador estuvo un rato en la puerta del salón con una agenda, [..] terminé la clase porque ya iba a terminar. Me fui y él me comentó... Dijo, pues, mmm... "El personaje que usted me dice tiene... Tiene... Tiene una situación que él ya había caído en consumo de drogas, entonces probablemente sí... Yo voy a quedarme acá, tranquila, yo voy a hacer el proceso." Ya en ese caso él se dedicó a manejar el proceso."

The coordinator's office was right in front of me… Fortunately, the coordinator was available, "Could you please come to the classroom? I witnessed something, I don't know if it's true… With John Doe… I don't know if you can help me with that." So, I returned to the classroom, continued the class… The coordinator was at the classroom door for a while with an agenda […] After class, he told me: "The student in question is going through a situation as he had already struggled with drug use, so probably [what you thought was going on] is

happening… I'm going to stay here, don't worry, I'll handle the process." At that point he dedicated himself to managing the process.

Transcript 1.17 (Sebastian)—Page 31

No sé, pienso que el hecho de mandarlos a coordinación es como… Como que yo vi la situación y le dejé a otra persona la responsabilidad de manejar el conflicto, ¿sí? Aunque yo fui el directamente implicado ahí.

I think that sending them to the coordinator's office is like I saw the situation and left the responsibility of handling the conflict to someone else, even though I was the one directly involved there.

Transcript 1.18 (Teresa)—Page 32

La sanción a veces la toma uno porque… Mmm… "Me castigaron, o me pusieron a hacer algo injusto, o me pusieron a hacer algo que de pronto yo… Mmm… Bueno, lo hice por salir del paso y por cumplir." Pero para mí el correctivo es de pronto… Mmm… Hacerle ver al estudiante que no… -- Que actuó mal y que es importante que reflexione al respecto y que no lo vuelva a hacer.

The sanction is sometimes received as: "They punished me, or they made me do something unfair, or they made me do something that perhaps I did to get it over with and to comply." But for me, the correction is perhaps to make the student see that they acted badly and that it's important that they reflect on it and don't do it again.

Transcript 1.19 (Sebastian)—Page 32

Como que ellos [los alumnos] den sus razones. Porque no sé… De pronto falta conocerlos muchas cosas. De pronto la edad o ya como la generación de ellos es un poquito

diferente a la de nosotros. Entonces, yo decía como, venga, ¿por qué?... De hecho, todavía me lo pregunto. No entiendo por qué hacen ese tipo de cosas y… Y me gustaría escucharlos a ellos.

It's like they [the students] give their reasons. Because I don't know… Perhaps we are missing understanding many things about them. Perhaps their age or their generation is a little different from ours. So, I was like, why? … In fact, I still ask myself that. I don't understand why they do that type of thing andI'd like to listen to them.

Transcript 1.20 (Sebastian)—Page 33

Sí hubo unas consecuencias que son coherentes con la acción que el chico hizo, ¿sí? Entonces, si hay consecuencias cuando hay una acción muy grave donde él diga… Esto lo estoy haciendo en este momento y no puedo estar con mis compañeros en clase porque yo… Incurrió en una falta muy grave.

There were some consequences that are congruent with the action that the kid did, right? So, if there are consequences when there is a very serious action, where he'll realize I'm doing this at this moment and I can't be with my peers in class because I committed a very serious offense.

Transcript 1.21 (Esteban)—Page 33

Pero cuando generamos cosas como… Por ejemplo, mmm… Que a X grados sí le aplicamos… Mmm… La norma. Y a X otros grados de pronto les dejamos un poquito más flexibles… Porque – Más flexible, porque es el primer grado, porque de pronto son los más grandes, o porque de pronto me caen bien… Entonces de pronto ahí vamos perdiendo… Perdiendo… ¿Cómo se llama…? Va perdiendo fuerza el discurso.

But when we do things like… For example, for X grades, yes we apply the rule, and for X other grades we perhaps leave it a little more flexible […] because it's the first grade, because

perhaps they are the oldest ones, or perhaps because I like them… So then, perhaps […] the discourse loses strength.

Transcript 1.22 (Teresa)—Page 34

Pero, pues, ese papel como tal… Mmm… Debe ser… -- Usted es el ejemplo a seguir, pero usted se tiene que involucrar con los estudiantes porque tienes que conocerlos. Si tu conoces al estudiante, vas a poder actuar. Si tu conoces al estudiante vas a poder de pronto tomar decisiones… Que no los afecten… Y, pues, obviamente también aspectos en los cuales uno tenga que tomar decisiones en cuanto a castigos o a premios, ¿sí? Cuando uno no conoce al estudiante, uno actúa a veces injustamente…

You are the example to follow, but you have to get involved with the students because you have to know them. If you know the student, you will be able to act accordingly. If you know the student, you will be able to perhaps make decisions that won't affect them… And, well, obviously regarding situations in which one has to make decisions regarding punishments or rewards, when one doesn't know the student, one sometimes acts unjustly…

Transcript 1.23 (Jose Alejandro)—Page 35

Precisamente en ese colegio había un estudiante empezó a estar cada vez más alejado de… Del colegio, lo tuve que prácticamente ir a buscar... De mil maneras pero lo encontré. Le dije, bueno, "Usted va a volver a estudiar, va a volver a... A su rol de estudiante, que es lo que tiene que hacer en estos momentos. Y vamos a empezar de nuevo ese contén. Borrón y cuenta nueva, está usted en su final de año... Necesito que se concentre y que se proyecte por supuesto a su futuro inmediato.

Precisely at that school there was a student who started to become more and more detached from the school. I had to practically go look for him, in a thousand [different] ways,

but I found him. I told him, "You're going to go back to studying, you're going to go back to your role as a student, which is what you have to do at this moment. And we're going to start over from scratch. A clean slate. You're in your final year, I need you to concentrate and project yourself, of course, towards your immediate future."

Transcript 1.24 (Augusto)—Page 35

Bueno, si… Yo creo que, que una relación ante todo entre estudiante y maestro debe ser una… una relación de mucho respeto… de mucha cercanía, de mucha empatía, camaradería.

I believe that, above all, a relationship between a student and a teacher should be one of great respect, of great closeness, of great empathy, and camaraderie.

Transcript 1.25 (Beatriz)—Page 35

Pero ellos saben que no nos pasamos de un límite. Esa barrera invisible que no es para que ellos estén allá y yo soy la más, más, no. No se puede perder, pues, porque obviamente uno es adulto y uno no se puede poner a pelear con un chico, ¿sí? O tampoco, entonces, venga, soy super amigo y entonces te tengo en Facebook y salimos a… A comer helado, no. Considero que… Que esa línea de que tú eres niño, yo soy tu docente, de que tú estás en la posición… Desde que vienes a formarte por mí, no se puede perder. Y el respeto obviamente y la disciplina.

They know that we don't cross a limit. That invisible barrier is not for them to be over there and me here because I am better, no. It [the invisible barrier] cannot be lost because obviously one is an adult and one cannot start fighting with a kid, right? Or, we are super friends and then I have you on Facebook and we go out to eat ice cream, no. I see that boundary of you as a child, I am your teacher, you come here to be educated by me, as something that cannot be lost. And obviously respect and discipline.

Transcript 1.26 (Jose Alejandro)—Page 36

En este tipo de profesión… Mmm… Yo me comí el cuento y lo asumo con toda… De creer en las personas. Trabajamos con seres humanos, nosotros... Mmm… Estamos dispuestos a… A creer, a escuchar, a valorar. De cierta manera hacer eso es algo que es transformador , no solo de lo académico, si no, también de la configuración del ser humano. Del ser humano que ríe, que llora, que grita, que pelea… Y ¿Que si fue justo? … Yo diría que sí [...]Pues, hombre, todo el mundo se merece que alguien lo escuche

In this profession, I bought into the story of believing in people, and I take full responsibility for it. We work with human beings. We must be willing to believe, to listen, to value. In a certain way, to do that is something that is transforming, not only in academics, but also in the configuration of the human being. Of the human being who laughs, who cries, who screams, who fights… And whether [my intervention] was fair, I would say yes. […] Everyone deserves to have someone to listen to them.

Transcript 1.27 (Sebastian)—Page 37

Porque siento que el hecho de haberlos regañado, y el hecho de haberles hecho citación de acudientes no sirvió para nada. O sea, siento que se siguen comportando igual. Entonces, el hecho que ellos no sientan como – Sí, como que no les muevan en eso que ellos piensan – Como que no les muevan ese piso, pues, se van a seguir comportando igual. Puede que de aquí a once sigan igual.

Because I feel that scolding them, and having summoned their legal guardians didn't serve any purpose. In other words, I feel that they continue behaving the same way […] Like [if] it doesn't shake that foundation for them, they're going to continue behaving the same way. It's possible that from here until eleventh grade they'll continue the same.

Transcript 1.28 (Esteban)—Page 37

Lo que hice fue que… Lo pasé al frente, lo llamo -- Le llamé la atención, como era contra una chica, entonces, pues… Como que… Mi discurso es… Se fue hacia que debemos respetar a las mujeres, que no importa cómo se vistan, que no importa – Que debemos respetarlas y demás. Pero lo tuve mucho tiempo al frente. Entonces, cuando ya me di cuenta estaba generando un escarnio público. Entonces este muchacho sí, aunque la había embarrado y demás, estaba allá al frente en un paredón de 80 ojos…

I brought him [the student] to the front [of the class], I called him out […] since this was against a girl, my speech centered on the necessity to respect women, it doesn't matter how they dress, […] we must respect them and so on. But I had him at the front [of the class] for a long time. So, when I realized it, I was subjecting him to public scrutiny. So, this kid, yes, even though he had messed up and so on, he was up there in the front facing 80 pairs of eyes.

Transcript 1.29 (Augusto)—Page 37

Decidió en un momento coger los balones de voleibol a patadas. Y yo le dije, "oiga hermano, lo va a dañar." Me respondió pues no de la mejor manera y pues yo también me exalté. Dije "hermano es que aquí lo que usted no… -- lo que no se lo tiran, se lo roban." Entonces me dijo, "pero qué profe pues tampoco me grite". Entonces, cuando él me dijo así, dije mmm yo no debí haberle dicho lo que le dije en el tono que se lo dije. De pronto sí lo mismo, pero en otro tono. Pero yo también me exalté.

He decided at one point to start kicking the volleyball balls. And I told him, "Hey brother, you're going to damage them." He responded in not the best way and, well, I also got upset. I said "Brother what happens is that here what people don't damage" they steal." Then, he told me, "but, teacher, don't yell at me either." So, when he said that to me, I said I shouldn't

have said what I said to him in the tone I said it. Perhaps [saying] the same thing, but in a different tone. But I also got upset.

Transcript 1.30 (Beatriz)—Page 38

Golpes—Golpes en la… En la cabeza, pero duro. Entonces… Mmm… Recuerdo que ya era como la hora de la salida, y entonces… Como que lo que hice fue regañarlos… "Ay, no sean cansones" -- Los que están ahora en noveno… Dos de ellos. "¿Qué les pasa? Parecen bebés, vayan para su casa" y ya. Hasta ahí fue como el regaño

They were hitting each other in the head, but roughly. I remember it was the time to leave [the school], and then what I did was to scold them. "Oh, don't be annoying! […]What's wrong with you? You look like babies, go home." and that's it.

Transcript 1.31 (Beatriz)—Page 38

Sí debí haber… Indagado qué fue lo que pasó… Cuál fue ese detonante que hizo que ellos se lastimaran…

Yes, I should have inquired into what happened. What was that trigger that made them hurt each other?

Transcript 1.32 (Edith)—Page 38

Porque los mandé a callar y me sobresalté yo, ¿sí me entiendes? Y grité… Me acuerdo yo que pegué un grito. "Parecen bobos" algo así… Yo creo que les dije parecen bobos, o sea, algo así creo [...]. Me dejé llevar por las emociones, mmm… Los comentarios que estaban haciendo me parecieron… Estúpidos [...] y me sacaron de casillas [...] Debí haber guardado la cordura, la serenidad, de – Soy la maestra, soy la docente, soy el adulto en el aula de clases, soy el reflejo de ellos…

Because I told them to be quiet and I got upset. And I shouted. I remember that I let out a shout. […] I think I told them they looked like dummies, or something like that […] I let myself be led by emotions. The comments they were making seemed… stupid. […] They made me lose my temper. […] I should have kept my composure, my serenity. I am the teacher, I am the instructor, I am the adult in the classroom, I am their role model…

Quotes Referenced for the Second Theme

Transcript 2.1 (Idaly)—Page 41

Hay veces que yo entro digamos a décimo, al noveno, a octavo… Y hay chicos – Hay un chico que está… Ese día no quiere hacer nada. Y uno sabe que algo le está sucediendo. Entonces, pues, digamos que… Yo no entro a presionar de que "oye tienes que trabajar no me importa lo que tu sientas"… No. Sino que yo le digo, bueno, listo, hoy te sientes indispuesto… Veo y paso dos o tres veces… "Te estás sintiendo muy mal, ¿cierto?" "Si profe" Entonces yo, "Bueno. Listo, entonces quédate ahí, cálmate, y luego ya después te pones – Te adelantas.

There are times when I enter, let's say, tenth grade, ninth grade, or eighth grade… And there's a kid who doesn't want to do anything that day. And you know that something is happening to them. I don't start to pressure him like "Hey, you have to work. I don't care how you feel."No. But rather, I tell him, "okay, fine, today you're feeling indisposed…" I look at them and pass by them two or three times. "You're feeling really bad, right?" "Yes, teacher." So I say, "Okay. Fine, then stay there, calm down, and later you can catch up."

Transcript 2.2 (Sebastian)—Page 41

Porque a veces muchas veces pasa eso, ¿no? "Bueno, ¿Por qué se estaban peleando?" "Profe estábamos jugando a las cachetadas" "Y ¿por qué juegan a darse cachetadas?" "No, él me dijo que jugara" O son así, "ellos me dijeron que nos daban 1000..." -- así son -- "nos daban

2000 al que ganara" Y son así. Entonces, o sea, como que… Como que hay un problema más de fondo y es más como el comportarse como se comportan mis compañeros, ¿sí?

Sometimes that happens a lot. "Why were you fighting?" "Teacher, the game was to slap each other." "And, why do you play at slapping each other?" "He told me to play." Or, they're like: "They told me they would give us $1m000 [pesos]" That's how they are. "They would give $2,000 [pesos] to the winner." And, they're like that. So, it's like there's a deeper problem, and it's more about behaving like my classmates behave.

Transcript 2.3 (Esteban) —Page 41

[El estudiante] Pues empieza a tener una amistad con los chicos como que… Empiezan a influenciar mal, y durante la clase ese muchacho [empieza a mostrar ciertos comportamientos] Por reconocimiento social.

[The student] starts to become friends with guys that like to influence him badly, and during class that boy […] [starts to display certain behaviors] for social recognition.

Transcript 2.4 (Beatriz)—Page 42

El problema es que ahí los chicos están en unas edades muy complicadas [...] Tengo un grupo muy… Muy pesado por su edad, es decir – Los de octavo. Grado octavo. Viene ese cambio de ser niños a entrar a una preadolescencia , su edad… Mmm… Ya no nos creemos chiquitos, si no ya nos creemos grandes, entonces, digamos que… Que ese respeto va muy de la mano con una exigencia al cien por ciento. Si… Si ellos ven que uno cede un poquito a esa disciplina, se te salen de control y empiezan a generar diferentes dificultades.

The problem is that the kids are at very complicated ages […] I have a very, very difficult group because of their age, that is, the 8th graders. That change from being children to entering pre-adolescence comes at their age. We no longer see ourselves as little kids, but rather we see

ourselves as big shots, so that respect goes hand in hand with 100 percent pushing them. If they see that you give in a little to that discipline, they get out of control and start generating different difficulties.

Transcript 2.5 (Esteban)—Page 42

O sea, es que yo decía de las causas más externas – O sea, más profundas a la circunstancia, o sea… Porque nosotros nos quedamos en lo circunstancial, ¿sí? Y en ocasiones hay una causa fenomenológica mayor, ¿sí? No sé… La casa, la situación social, ¿sí?

I was talking about the more external causes, like deeper underlying causes beyond the circumstances because we get stuck on the circumstantial. And, sometimes there is a greater phenomenological cause, right? I don't know… The home, the social situation, you know?

Transcript 2.6 (Idaly)—Page 42

Porque de una u otra forma los estudiantes no solo se forman acá en el colegio. Los estudiantes tienen la influencia de su familia y de la del contexto. Entonces los tres jugamos digamos que un rol importante en su formación y en su conducta. Ellos, digamos, acá en el colegio… Mmm… Se actúan y se comportan de acuerdo a lo que ven en su contexto y de acuerdo a lo que les enseñan sus familias.

Because in many ways students are not only formed here at school. Students have the influence of their family and of the [social] context. So, the three play an important role in [students'] formation and in their behavior. At school, they act and behave according to what they see in their context and according to what their families teach them.

Transcript 2.7 (Teresa)—Page 43

A la familia, sí. Y es difícil porque ¿cómo se involucra uno? Digamos que en estos dos años nos involucramos mucho con las familias, ¿cierto? Hasta tal punto que, pues, obviamente

nosotros fuimos los perjudicados, ¿sí? Porque terminamos resolviendo muchas circunstancias o conflictos como tal que no nos correspondía. Porque había una pelea familiar y a usted le escribía la mamá para contarle, ¿cierto? [...] Pues, eran circunstancias que uno tenía que empezar a resolver desde el hogar, desde la familia, y se involucra uno demasiado… Y pues, obviamente uno lleva las de perder porque termina uno de verdad así.

It's difficult because how do you get involved [with the families]? In these two years, we got very involved with the families to the point that we were obviously negatively impacted because we ended up resolving many situations or conflicts that were not our responsibility. Because there was a family fight and the mother would write to you to tell you, right? […] These were circumstances that you had to start resolving about the home, the family, and you would get too involved.

Transcript 2.8 (Jose Alejandro)—Page 43

Digamos que, en esa formación, en esas primeras pautas de comportamiento, de crianza, mmm… Yo siempre le digo a los estudiantes que venimos formados con… con esas frases… mmm… con esas frases autoritarias que de cierta manera pueden llegar a ser… hasta… unos imperativos categóricos muy marcados de por vida. "El día que a usted le peguen, le hagan algo en el colegio, usted responda igual. Si le pegan un puño, usted pegue dos" desafortunadamente esas primeras pautas de crianza son las que lo van a determinar a usted [...] Pero por supuesto. Yo no le puedo decir al estudiante, "Venga, por favor piense en sus actos" cuando él sabe la configuración que tienen en el hogar que el papá no hace sino maltratar todo el tiempo verbal, físicamente a la mamá… Ahí nos toca trabajar de una manera diferente.

In that upbringing, in those first behavioral and upbringing guidelines, I always tell students that we are educated with authoritarian phrases that in a certain way can become even

like very marked categorical imperatives for life. "The day someone hits you or does something to you at school, you respond the same way. If they punch you, you punch back twice." Unfortunately, those first upbringing guidelines are what will determine who you are […] But, of course, I can't tell the student, "Come on, please think about your actions" when they have these dynamics at home where the father does nothing but constantly hurt the mother verbally, physically… In those cases, we have to work in a different way.

Transcript 2.9 (Edith)—Page 43

Entonces, ¿dónde está el límite? ¿hasta dónde podemos educar aquí en el colegio? Y ¿Hasta dónde educan en la casa? [...]… -- Lo socioemocional. Pero entonces… Profundizar hacia la virtud. […] [tenemos] 520 y pico familias que habría que educar. ¿En qué tiempo tenemos nosotros para eso?

So, where is the limit? How far can we go in educating them here at school? And, how far do they go educating them at home? […] Here we can teach values, those things which we work on in the socio-emotional domain. But then, going deeper into virtues. What would that look like? […] [We have] around 520 [students] and families that would need to be educated. When do we have time for that?

Transcript 2.10 (Beatriz)—Page 44

Involucrar a las familias. Con las escuelas de padres que se hacen, con las citaciones que se hacen en su momento, ¿sí? Cuando se – En este caso puntual, cuando se pudo citar a los papás, cuando los dos papás tuvieron la versión de la situación, cuando yo les dije "cuenten en su casa" … "Cuenta tú lo que te hizo tu compañero, pero tú también di lo que tú hiciste" es involucrar a los papás y desde casa también se puede hacer como un poquito de presión para que

ellos no tengan esas actitudes. [...] Es decir, Todos somos responsables de que pase, y responsables de prevenirlo.

Fully involving the families. When parents' workshops are held at the school, or when they are called in response to specific issues. In that specific case, when the parents were called to the school, when both parents got to hear what happened I told [the students] "share this at home. Share what your classmate did to you, but you also say what you did to them." It involves the parents so from home they can also pressure them a little so they don't have those attitudes […] We are all responsible for it happening, and responsible for preventing it.

Transcript 2.11 (Teresa)—Page 44

De pronto con los padres de familia también, porque es que hay padres de familia que no se enteran de… Qué tiene su hijo al menos en su cartuchera, ¿sí? Ellos nunca revisan una cartuchera, ellos nunca revisan una maletica… Por ahí dice un dicho que "no solamente hay que… Hay que mirarle el cerebrito, el corazoncito y su maletica también, a ver qué hay ahí," ¿no? Y, pues, obviamente mirar qué… Qué diferente o qué raro tiene en esa maleta que de pronto yo no le he comprado, yo no le he adquirido.

Perhaps involving the parents too, because there are parents who even know what their child has in their pencil case. They never check a pencil case, they never check a little backpack… There's a saying that goes "you not only have to look at their little brain, but also at their little heart and their little backpack to see what's in there," right? And, well, obviously look if there's something different or strange that they have in that backpack, something that perhaps you haven't bought or given them.

Transcript 2.12 (Beatriz)—Page 45

De prevenir que esto pase. Si nosotros con nuestras sesiones de Caminos, por ejemplo, les fomentamos a ellos ese… Ese respeto al otro, ¿sí? Que no es llenar por llenar una cartilla, si no que realmente nos apropiamos de esto que es importante.

To prevent this from happening. If we, with our Caminos sessions, for example, foster in them that respect for others. It's not just filling out a workbook, but that we really take ownership of this which is important.

Transcript 2.13 (Idaly)—Page 45

Primero, pues digamos que acá me ha parecido muy bueno el programa de Caminos. Eso les ha ayudado a ellos, pues, primero a regular sus emociones y siempre hablar desde las emociones… Y también en Caminos se les ponen situaciones hipotéticas de cómo deberían comportarse ante una situación. Y digamos que ellos tienen – saben una estrategia de gana y gana, entonces

I have found the Caminos program to be very good here. It has helped [students], first to regulate their emotions and always speak from their emotions… And also in Caminos they are given hypothetical situations of how they should behave in a situation. And let's say that they have learned about win-win strategies.

Transcript 2.14 (Augusto)—Page 45

Pues, yo creo que… El papel de… De nosotros como docentes frente a alguna problemática es uno… De primera medida… El de actuar como mediadores. Conciliadores y… Garantizar un espacio donde… Lo que más prevalezca sea la justicia… Mmm… Que también haya mucha empatía y siempre tratando de llegar a… A… Digamos que a una solución donde queden todos satisfechos.

I believe that the role of us as teachers in the face of any problem is as a first step to act as mediators, conciliators, and to guarantee a space where justice is prioritized. There should also be a lot of empathy and always trying to reach a solution where everyone is satisfied.

Transcript 2.15 (Jose Alejandro)—Page 45

Dentro del aula de clase el docente debe ser ese garante de derechos […] voy un poco más allá y es que debe garantizar con ellos los espacios de democratización de… De los pactos que se hacen al inicio hasta cómo se dan esas dinámicas. Si llega a pasar un tipo de suceso, situación, evento, que vulnere los derechos, ellos deben también ser garantes de eso.

Within the classroom, the teacher must be that guarantor of rights. […] I also go a bit further, [teachers] must guarantee spaces for democratization of the agreements that are made at the beginning and that dynamics occur. If a type of event, situation, or incident occurs that violates rights, [teachers] must also be guarantors of that.

Appendix C

Codebook

This Appendix contains the Codebook, which provides a comprehensive overview of the thematic analysis conducted in this study. The Codebook is organized into tables, each representing a major theme that emerged from the data. Within these tables, the codes are presented in two levels: First Level Codes (FLC) and Second Level Codes (SLC). The SLCs represent broader categories or concepts, while the FLCs offer more specific ideas or nuanced aspects of the SLCs. This hierarchical structure allows for a detailed understanding of the coding process and the relationships between different concepts within each theme.

Table 1

First Theme: Teachers' Perspectives on Balancing Discipline, Students' Needs, and Moral Education

Code	# of Interviews	Total # of References
FLC Student agency	3	11
FLC Teacher response—allow the students to get their own conclusions	1	4
FLC Teachers response—wait for the students to know they are wrong	1	2
SLC Alternative strategies to the code of conduct		
FLC Teacher belief—code of conduct tends to be punitive	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—no punishment or sanctions	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—something beside the code of conduct could be done	3	4
FLC Teacher belief—sometimes, afterwards, the protocol was not the best, no changes	4	5
FLC Teacher response—difference between equality and fairness	1	1
FLC Teacher response—different from the code of conduct	3	4
FLC Teacher response—prevention by looking to experts	1	1
FLC Teacher response—strategies to help students identify and regulate emotions	1	1
FLC Teachers belief—schools should not end up being law for the law	1	3

SLC Collaboration and help between staff responding to harm		
FLC One teacher looks for another for help	4	11
FLC Teacher belief—involving other school staff sometimes feels like handing off the problem for someone else to handle	1	1
FLC Teacher on a break no supervision duty	1	1
FLC Teacher response—collaborating with school administration to come up with a consequence for students who get in trouble	1	1
FLC Teacher response—threat of going to school coordination	1	1
FLC Teacher response—trusting the school authorities	1	1
FLC Teacher response—teachers are not the only ones responsible for choosing consequences for the students	1	1
SLC Education for social transformation		
FLC Education as social transformation	7	28
FLC Education to transform society	4	6
FLC Help students understand their role in society	2	3
FLC Teacher belief—Teachers can't just tell students what is right and what is wrong, students have to truly understand the reason why or they will just dismiss the teachers' comments	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—teaching transforms society	1	4
SLC Following the school protocol		
FLC Teacher answer to harm—following the due process	7	31
FLC Teacher belief—Students know the code of conduct prevents to act against it	2	3
FLC Teacher belief—trusting the code of conduct	5	24
FLC Teacher response—school protocol for suspended students	2	2
SLC Punitive and restorative approaches to discipline in schools	0	0
FLC Teacher belief—harm is solved when there is reparation	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—reparation brings justice	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—sanctions should be proportional to the harm	3	3
FLC Teacher response—help students understand that there are consequences for their actions	6	28
FLC Teacher response—Helping students take accountability for their actions	2	3
FLC Teacher response—recognizing the needs of students after harm has happened	1	1
FLC Teacher response—repairing actions instead of punishment	3	8
FLC Teacher response—the intervention doesn't mean it will repair all the parts involved	1	1

SLC Strategies for misconduct or harm		
FLC Consideration to address peer harm—teacher reflects after intervention, sees change	1	3
FLC Considerations to address peer harm—Awareness of students' difficulties.	1	1
FLC Considerations to address peer harm—Teachers reflection telling students off	1	1
FLC Teach students how to handle emotions	1	1
FLC Teacher answer to harm—separate the student to talk to students	9	36
FLC Teacher as a guide	1	1
FLC Teacher authority	1	9
FLC Teacher belief—act as mediators	1	3
FLC Teacher belief—Agreements between students for better outcomes	4	11
FLC Teacher belief—conductive doesn't work in conflict resolution	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—importance of preventive measures	1	3
FLC Teacher belief—just yelling does not work	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—students know the teacher and behave accordingly	3	4
FLC Teacher belief—students need to be heard	1	1
FLC Teacher Belief—Teacher gives the needed information for students to succeed.	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—when calling the parents the Students might think that nothing else is needed.	1	4
FLC Teacher belief in education—dialogue and reasoning	2	4
FLC Teacher belief in education—teacher joining the student's process	2	2
FLC Teacher respond—talks hard to the students	1	2
FLC Teacher response—an option that changes the attitude of students in the future	1	4
FLC Teacher response—Assigning consequences that are proportional to the severity of the behaviour, but the severity of the behaviour is subjective to every teacher	1	2
FLC Teacher response—believe in students	1	1
FLC Teacher response—considering the interventions as corrective measures, rather than consequences or punishment	2	4
FLC Teacher response—decision made can bring consequences to the Teachers	1	1
FLC Teacher response—finding a midway point of compromise to resolve a conflict	1	1
FLC Teacher response—giving responsibilities to students	1	2
FLC Teacher response—is needed for the student to know their rights and duties	1	2

FLC Teacher response—lack of teacher response makes the student stay in the behaviour	1	1
FLC Teacher response—not the best to correct in front of all the students	2	4
FLC Teacher response—not the best with all of the students involved	1	2
FLC Teacher response—open the opportunity to talk with the Students	1	2
FLC Teacher response—recognizing the fault in an intervention	1	7
FLC Teacher response—raises the voice to avoid harm	1	2
FLC Teacher response—sometimes is immediate, later they can weigh their decisions	1	1
FLC Teacher response—sometimes the intervention is without knowing the entire situation	1	6
FLC Teacher response—Teacher believes it was useless	1	4
FLC Teacher response—Teacher could be in trouble for a decision	5	6
FLC Teacher response—when students don't understand the reason why their behaviour is inappropriate, it could happen again	1	2
FLC Teacher response—when student refuting, teacher raises more the voice	2	2
FLC Teacher response to harm—was too hard, would do it differently	1	1
FLC The need of dialogue to prevent harm in the future	3	9
SLC Student centred approach		
FLC Teacher belief—lack of empathy	1	1
FLC Teacher belief in education—humanist	4	7
FLC Teacher belief—student as main character	1	1
FLC Teacher response—creating opportunities for students to showcase their skills and strengths	1	1
FLC Teacher response—difference between discipline and shaming a student	1	1
FLC Teacher response—give the students the benefit of the doubt	2	2
FLC Teacher response—keep record of other situations	1	1
FLC Teacher response—reasonable doubt if harm has happened or not	1	2
FLC Teacher response—the consequence should be assigned proportionally to the behaviour of the student—interesting the teachers contradicts himself once thinking about response.	3	4
FLC Teacher response—understand better the students why they do what they do	1	3

FLC Teacher response—all students should be treated equally	1	1
FLC Teacher understands the history behind the harm	8	61
FLC Teachers response—sometimes it is hard to follow up with students because there is not much time.	1	1
SLC Teacher student relationships		
FLC Consideration to address peer harm—type of teacher-student relationships	1	1
FLC Harm—could be prevented if teachers were there	1	1
FLC Peer harm—student does not agree with the teacher's decision	1	1
FLC Teacher belief— The relationship between teachers and students	1	2
FLC Teacher response—can be biased depending on the students involved	2	3
FLC Teacher response—different according to student involved	6	9
FLC Teacher response—other students wait to see what happens with their peers	2	3
FLC Teacher response—relation teachers and students changed	1	4
SLC Teachers' narratives and roles as moral educators		
FLC Considerations to address peer harm—Promote Students' holistic growth	1	1
FLC Critical thinking	1	1
FLC Harm—a teacher raises the voice to another teacher	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—education for life	1	5
FLC Teacher belief—education in values	2	10
FLC Teacher belief—know each student as an individual, different from each other	3	8
FLC Teacher belief—knowing the student to answer accordingly	3	7
FLC Teacher belief—respect needed between all the members of the school community	7	37
FLC Teacher belief—responsibility to guide students	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—teach by example	6	18
FLC Teacher response—Students want teacher to also show the behaviour that is asked of them	1	1
SLC Teachers' perspectives on intervening in to peer conflict		
FLC Another way, different cultures, not only punitive	1	1
FLC Promoting active listening for better dialogues	2	2
FLC Teacher belief—in a conflict with the student that gets hurt the most should receive reparations	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—unaddressed harm can escalate	1	4
FLC Teacher belief—not to be authoritarian, but sometimes teacher has to be the authority figure	2	4

FLC Teacher belief—punishment is using physical or verbal harm	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—response has to be immediate	6	32
FLC Teacher belief—the situation should be addressed, even if superficially	2	3
FLC Teacher response—an eye for an eye	3	3
FLC Teacher response—follow school code of conduct according to severity of the harm	3	12
FLC Teacher response—it should be immediate that way it won't happen again.	3	6
FLC Teacher response—listening to all parties involved	4	22
FLC Teacher response—promoting dialogue, understanding and reflection	9	124
FLC Teacher response—reflecting on a different approach	3	6
FLC Teacher response—reflections after decision, hard to evaluate	5	20
FLC Teacher response—repair by doing the same to the S harmed	1	3
FLC Teacher response—stop class to address the harm	2	13
SLC The classroom should be a safe space		
FLC Teacher belief—harm is to a person but also the community	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—Students' expected behaviours in class	1	1
FLC Teacher Belief—the classroom is a safe space	3	19
FLC Teacher response—promotion and restitution of rights	6	13
FLC Teacher response—harm could show other dynamics within the class	1	1
FLC Teacher response—help students improve their relations	1	1
FLC Teacher response—promoting empathy and tolerance	2	3
FLC Teacher response—Student's interactions that should change with boundaries	1	1
SLC The human condition of Teachers' responses		
FLC Teacher points out to the student aggression was not supposed to happen	1	1
FLC Teacher response—acting as a judge in the situation	1	1
FLC Teacher response—comes from their own personal experience	3	5
FLC Teacher response—impartial when assigning consequences	1	1
FLC Teacher response—investigate and take the time to draw a conclusion	1	2
FLC Teacher response—it has a limit	1	1
FLC Teacher response—justice depends on the definition	2	4

FLC Teacher response—learning from previous interventions	1	1
FLC Teacher response—needs to be coherent with personal stand	1	1
FLC Teacher response—needs to investigate to decide the best way of action	1	1
FLC Teacher response—negative emotions get on the way	6	16
FLC Teacher response—the intervention has an impact on the student	1	3
FLC Teacher response—the situation should be evaluated to see which student should have harsher consequences	1	4
FLC Teachers response—might be judged by others	3	3

Table 2

Second Theme: Teachers Recognize That Harms Occur in Complex Social Contexts Thus Requiring Collaboration with the Larger Community

Code	# of Interviews	Total # of References
SLC Cultural and social influences on harm and behaviour		
FLC Harm—rumours and gossip about students	1	1
FLC Peer harm—is with a group, with acolytes	2	3
FLC Student harm—considering peer pressure on the situation	1	1
FLC Students engaging in troublesome behaviours to fit in with the group	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—a clash between society values and school values	2	5
FLC Teacher belief—family and culture responsible	8	58
FLC Teacher belief—poor people cause harm out of need	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—Students with economic resources harm as a joke	3	3
FLC Teacher belief—students' behaviours shaped by the surroundings	1	3
FLC Teacher belief—students' unguided consumption of information	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—understanding culture and the surroundings	3	9
FLC Teacher response—behaviour in school should be different than outside	1	2
FLC Teacher response—the context plays a role	6	28
SLC Ensuring equity, diversity and inclusion principles		
FLC Consideration to address peer harm—Guaranteeing EDI principles in the classroom.	1	2

SLC Group dynamics in Peer harm		
FLC Harm—a culture according to age—part of the group dynamic to hit others to show power	2	6
FLC Harm—a Student will take the fall instead of the other	1	2
FLC Harm—isolation, discrimination	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—school environment plays a role in students' harm	2	5
FLC Teacher belief—Students' harm to feel that they are better or more powerful than the others	1	3
FLC Teacher belief—Students retaliate against other S that harm	1	2
SLC Types and Motivations behind peer harm		
FLC Considerations to address peer harm—Considering students' reasoning or intentions that led to harm	2	2
FLC Harm—humiliating another student	5	20
FLC Harm—physical harm seemed like a game within Students	1	5
FLC Harm—rough playing	2	10
FLC Harm—verbal abuse foul language	5	14
FLC Peer harm—the logic of the students behind harm	1	1
FLC Physical harm of peers	6	19
SLC Power Dynamics		
FLC Power dynamics	3	3
FLC Teacher belief—in their classroom you find power dynamics.	2	6
SLC School programs and the impact in students	0	0
FLC Consideration to address peer harm—if a public program doesn't have an impact, he cannot ask much (change) from students.	2	2
FLC Teacher belief—all members of the school community should know the code of conduct to act accordingly	1	4
FLC Teacher Belief—Following the same structure for workshops might cause students to lose interest in the topics	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—Group-level interventions with students that talk about situations that come up frequently in their grade	7	24
FLC Teacher belief—school program works	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—school protocol is not as beneficial as it seems	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—School-wide campaigns that help students learn socio-emotional skills	2	2

FLC Teacher belief—Students not engaging in interventions but participating in them just to go through the motions	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—that the most effective interventions would be ones that create an emotional impact on the students	1	2
FLC Teacher belief—Younger students are more involved with school-wide campaigns	1	2
FLC Teacher response—giving students real life examples to teach about conflict resolution	2	4
FLC Teacher response—group interventions to understand the code of conduct	3	3
SLC Sources of information about peer harm		
FLC Harm—the students inform the teacher about the situation	1	1
FLC Peer harm—Teacher knows because a student tells the story	4	12
FLC Teacher belief—feels the responsibility to handle harm they have witnessed	1	2
FLC Teacher perceives possibility of physical harm	1	5
FLC Teacher response—aware of weird behaviour of students	2	6
FLC Teacher response—awareness of students' behaviour	1	2
FLC Teacher response—each teacher perceives differently the severity of a harm	1	1
FLC Teacher response—ignores the harm that is happening	1	4
FLC Teacher response—sometimes teachers have to rely on the testimony of the students, not seeing the harm	1	4
SLC Types of harm between peers		
FLC Harm—Male student touching a Female student improper way	1	2
FLC Harm—name calling	3	8
FLC Harm—Students accusing other Students for stealing	2	4
FLC Harm—Student takes other students' food	1	1
FLC Harm—Student trying to sugarcoat the situation	1	1
FLC Harm—selling controlled substances	1	5
FLC Harm—Students look for others for backup, a power play to show who is stronger	1	1
FLC Harm—taking another person's possession	1	1
FLC Harm—things are being stolen	1	2
FLC Older students are part of the harm	1	1
FLC Student behaviour—foul language	1	1

FLC Student harm—aggression and answer back	1	1
FLC Student harm—discrimination of another Student	2	5
FLC Student harm—Students harming might think they are better or superior	1	1
FLC Student harm—when there are differences of opinion	1	1
SLC Working along with families		
FLC Teacher belief—family and school working together, same goals for the students	5	26
FLC Teacher response—calling the family and talking with them	6	22
FLC Teacher response—work with the families	2	5
Unused second level codes		
FLC Teacher belief—against some decision of school administration in politics involvement	1	1
SLC Student Agency		
FLC Student answers back to teacher	1	1
SLC Student self-awareness of harmful actions		
FLC Peer harm—Students sometimes act even knowing it is wrong what they are doing	2	2
FLC Teacher belief—norms should be interiorized	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—Students sometimes acts without measuring consequences	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—sanctions could be just an external shaper not interiorized	1	1
FLC Teacher belief—Students act without reflecting their actions	1	1
FLC Teacher response—asks the student to give example	1	1
FLC Teacher response—Student denies involvement	1	1
FLC Teacher response—dialogue and reflection to change behaviour	1	1