ejc/rec

The Electronic Journal of Communication/ La Revue Electronic de Communication

The First Peer Reviewed Electronically Distributed Journal in the Social Sciences

"Putting on a Happy Face," "Getting Back to Work," and "Letting It Go": Traditional and Restorative Justice Understandings of Emotions at Work

Gregory D. Paul
Sarah E. Riforgiate

Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS, USA

Abstract: Coping with the emotional consequences of hurtful situations in the workplace can be problematic for organizational members. Traditional approaches depending on rationality and professionalism come with expectations that employees suppress or minimize emotion by focusing on their work and maintaining composure. However, an alternative approach to justice – restorative justice – is gaining notice in organizational scholarship and appears to offer a different approach to managing painful situations and their associated emotions. This study examines how the experience and management of emotion following hurtful events are connected with traditional and restorative principles in a workplace setting. The results of the study offer insight into the consequences of restorative justice in organizational life.

Emotionally hurtful situations that occur at work can lead to problems with both task productivity and relationship maintenance (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003). They also can lead to a wide array of negative emotions, from anger to shame to embarrassment (McCullough, 2001; Waldron, 2002), which can shape how people respond to the wrongdoer (Grovier, 2002; Kellett & Dalton, 2001). Organizations attempt to manage these responses by establishing formal and informal policies and procedures designed to promote a rational resolution to the situation at hand (Kidder, 2007; Moffitt & Bordone, 2005; Sitkin & Bies, 1994).

Although relying on policy and procedural conformity has benefits, critics of this largely bureaucratic approach argue that it has led to an erosion of a sense of workplace community (Kidder, 2007; Pfeffer, 2009). Additionally, managing workplace behavior through policies can perpetuate a rather fragmented existence – both intrapersonally and interpersonally. Critics of the bureaucratic approach argue that the approach decreases a sense of community, which can be beneficial and can restore a sense of care and vitality that is lost in the focus on creating an efficient organizational machine (Kidder, 2007; Mumby & Putnam, 1992).

One approach to fostering a sense of community in the face of hurtful situations is the idea of restorative justice (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999; Fehr & Gelfand, 2012; Goodstein & Aquino, 2010; Kidder, 2007). Restorative justice promotes dialogue or dialogic communication among conflicting parties, possibly facilitated by a third party, in order to promote healing, growth, and reintegration for people, relationships, and communities (Braithwaite, 2002; Johnstone, 2002; Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008; Zehr, 2002). Restorative justice in the workplace is typically associated with communication practices such as verbal forgiveness, which are personally and relationally sensitive and can promote constructive outcomes and interaction. The sensitivity fostered via restorative justice extends to experiencing and managing emotions.

In this article we address how traditional and restorative organizational features help members cope with the relational and emotional consequences caused by hurtful situations. Because hurtful events trigger negative, potentially destructive emotions (Kelley & Waldron, 2006; Tripp, Bies, & Aquino, 2007), organizational members must find ways to cope with the emotions. Given restorative justice's emphasis on dialogue, healing, and (possibly) forgiveness, organizing on the basis of those principles – what we call *restorative organizing* – could lead to emotion management that is unifying both intrapersonally and interpersonally.

Our work offers three primary contributions to the understanding of emotion at work. First, it extends preliminary theoretical work on the constructive potential for restorative justice to improve the workplace, by demonstrating the consequences of putting restorative principles into practice. Second, following bounded emotionality's argument that emotion can foster perceptions of community (Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Putnam & Mumby, 1993), our work demonstrates how restorative practices that communicate mutual concern relate to workplace community. Third, we explore how negotiating traditional and restorative expectations and ideals affect participants' emotion management. We begin by discussing literature on the experience and management of emotion in the workplace. We then review restorative justice research and analyze employees' experiences of emotion in an organization characterized by restorative and traditional climate features. We conclude by examining restorative organizing and emotion management implications for individuals, relationships, and organizations.

Managing Emotions in the Workplace

The dominant expectation for employees in Western workplaces is to behave "professionally" (Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007; Lammers & Garcia, 2009), an ambiguous but powerful idea at work. To behave professionally, organizational members practice self-control and maintain rationality, which generally means masking emotions not prescribed by the organization while on the job (Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007; Lammers & Garcia, 2009; Trice & Beyer, 1993; Waldron, 1994). The guiding assumption of rational behavior is that emotions interfere with rational task accomplishment because they are opposed to and incompatible with rationality (Dougherty & Drumheller, 2006; Putnam & Mumby, 1993). This assumption reflects a disease model of emotions (akin to the disease model of revenge, McCullough, 2008), which positions emotions as communicable diseases threatening the health of the workplace mind but which can be cured through training on appropriate emotion work.

The framing of emotion-as-disease applies to negative experiences in the workplace following a hurtful event, especially experiencing and managing anger, a topic of considerable interest to researchers (e.g., Booth & Mann, 2005; Domagalski & Steelman, 2005, 2007; Geddes & Callister, 2007; Gibson & Callister, 2010; Kramer & Hess, 2002). The dominant picture emerging from this research is that members are expected to "control" their anger or at least avoid expressing it in public, instead, they are advised to "keep a level head," "think things through," and possibly vent elsewhere. As such, members learn that negative emotions are inappropriate, both to feel and to express, which can lead to a fragmentation of self and other.

Other researchers critique the disease-orientation of emotion, arguing that emotion is a normal and unifying force that can strengthen workplace ties (Lutgen-Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011; Mumby & Putnam, 1992). People experience a range of emotions with work, usually due to workplace interactions and relationships (Miller, Considine, & Garner, 2007; Waldron, 1994, 2002). Relationships are frequent sources of positive and negative emotions (Malone & Hayes, 2012; Waldron, 2002), such as in cases of employee emotional abuse (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003), social support (Miller, Birkholt, Scott, & Stage, 1995), and co-rumination (Boren, 2014).

Emotion management is rooted in both organizational and relational frameworks. Members typically manage their reactions according to relational, organizational, and cultural expectations carried into the organization or prescribed during organizational socialization practices (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998; Domagalski & Steelman, 2007; Scott & Myers, 2005). For example, although anger and fear are common reactions to perceived injustice (Harlos & Pinder, 2000; Sandelands & Boudens, 2000), organizational norms for emotion management promote suppressing or eliminating anger to limit its spreading or contagion (Kramer & Hess, 2002). Thus, members are encouraged to use practices such as calming down rather than yelling (Domagalski & Steelman, 2007). Members also consider relational constraints or "intersubjective limitations" (Mumby & Putnam, 1992, p. 474) when managing their emotions. They get to know which relationships are safer or freer than others are for expressing particular emotions.

Relational and organizational constraints are rooted in a governing morality that identifies acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Values, beliefs, and norms that structure workplace activity and interaction guide this morality. Values are the preferences, goals, and ideals (Trice & Beyer, 1993) that underlie behavioral expectations or norms. For example, organizational values such as efficiency, rationality, and productivity (Trice & Beyer, 1993) support normative behaviors of "thinking things through" and "getting back to work," based on the prioritization of productivity in the workplace. Emotions and emotion work are also inherently moral

(Geddes & Callister, 2009; Jones, 2001), rooted in understandings of right and wrong, fair and unfair (Waldron, 2002). Thus, members' moralities guide evaluations of behavior, emotions springing from those evaluations, and management of those emotions. In cases of behavior seen as hurtful or inappropriate, the concept of justice becomes a particularly salient moral component that guides how people experience and manage their emotions.

Justice and the Management of Emotions at Work

Justice is a multi-faceted construct, varying by orientation (i.e., self and other), approach, and outcome. Assumptions and definitions of justice vary by person, situation, and organization (Warnke, 1992; Winslade, 2006). Associated with justice is a set of values, norms, beliefs, and assumptions about appropriate outcomes, procedures, and interaction behaviors that provide a basis on which to evaluate selves, relationships, and actions.

Traditionally, organizations have adopted features of the traditional justice system. Such legalization, which involves the adaptation of legalistic-appearing rationality and procedures (Scott, 1994), is evident in the emphasis on due process, hierarchical governance, rationality, impartiality, and evidence or observation (Sitkin & Bies, 1993, 1994). Outgrowths of this legalization include the development of comprehensive employee handbooks outlining appropriate behavior and sanctions for inappropriate behavior, the continued support for formal hierarchies, and the utilization of legalistic dispute management systems.

Critics of the traditional approach argue that it fails to obtain justice because it prioritizes sanctions over correction, fails to care for or meaningfully involve the victim, and neglects the community (Bazemore, O'Brien, & Carey, 2005; Morris, 2002; Zehr, 2002). Instead, they advocate for restorative justice, which is a theory of justice that emphasizes individual, relational, and communal growth and healing through facilitated dialogue among stakeholders (Borton, 2009; Braithwaite, 1999, 2002; Pavlich, 2005; Wenzel, Okimoto, & Cameron, 2012; Zehr, 2002). Central to restorative justice are values such as accountability, community, and empowerment (Braithwaite, 2002; Umbreit, 2001; Zehr, 2002). Based on these values, restorative justice prioritizes practices such as material and emotional reparation, community reintegration, and relationship repair (Parkinson & Roche, 2004; Raye & Roberts, 2007).

Although restorative justice typically has been confined to situations of criminal wrongdoing, researchers are exploring its potential in the workplace. Kidder (2007), for example, theorizes that people can implement restorative justice in the workplace by encouraging participation in dialogic practices, reparation for the offense through practices such as apology, and reintegration of the offender into the workplace community. Tripp et al.'s (2007) vigilante model invokes the ideal of restorative justice as a foundational principle for reacting with forgiveness to workplace injustice. Likewise, both Bradfield and Aquino (1999) and Fehr and Gelfand (2012) argue that restorative justice can promote forgiveness in the workplace. Together, these studies suggest that restorative justice has a place in the workplace.

Restorative justice differs from the legalism of traditional justice in the workplace in a number of ways (see Table 1). For example, traditional legalism is typically individualist, hierarchical, and impersonal, characterized by a bias toward rationality, neutrality, evidence, and competition. Restorative justice, however, tends to lean toward the communitarian, egalitarian, and personal, emphasizing personal mutual accountability, joint dialogue, and collaboration. Walgrave (2002) asserts that restorative communities are characterized by the recognition of each other's inherent value (respect), the commitment to each other (solidarity), and ownership of one's actions (responsibility).

Table 1

Traditional and Restorative Organizational Characteristics

Characteristics	Traditional	Restorative
Behavior governed by:	Rules and procedures	Relationships and context
Primary focus on:	Task accomplishment	Community solidarity
Good organizational members as:	Professional	Community citizen
Individuals as:	Independent	Interdependent
Manage conflict through:	Avoidance and hierarchy	Participation
Communication as:	Argumentative and task-focused	Dialogic and maintenance
Concerned with:	The working person	The whole person
Emotions viewed as:	Distraction	Valuable
Organization structured as:	Hierarchy	Democracy
Wrongdoing results in:	Consequences	Reparation and reintegration

Adopting restorative justice in an organizational setting should lead to differing organizational characteristics and experiences. For example, Fehr and Gelfand's (2012) model of the forgiving organization suggests that members are more likely to practice forgiveness, which involves at least the elimination of negative emotions, cognitions, and behaviors (Fehr & Gelfand, 2012; Kelley & Waldron, 1996; McCullough, 2001), when working in an organizational climate characterized by the values of mindfulness, compassion, and restorative justice. The results of the paradigm differences should be apparent in individual and organizational goals and practices. With particular regard to emotion, whereas traditional justice attempts to minimize the influence and prevalence of emotion, restorative justice makes room for emotions as products of the relational experience shaped by dialogue and empathy. Additionally, restorative justice has been associated with the practice of forgiveness fostered by apologizing and dialoguing together (Armour & Umbreit, 2006; Braithwaite, 2002; Fehr & Gelfand, 2012; Tripp et al., 2007; Wenzel et al., 2012).

The question, then, is how the adoption of traditional and restorative justice principles as features of members' relational morality and the organization's climate is associated with experiences and management of emotion. The research reviewed above suggests that traditional legalization may promote more avoidant and disengaged conflict practices, which could spur heightened and prolonged negativity. However, restorative practices may heighten perceptions of process and interactional fairness, leading to decreased negativity (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Colquitt et al., 2001) and retaliation likelihood (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Tripp et al., 2007). Thus, we asked the following questions:

RQ1: How is the experience of emotion tied to traditional and restorative features in the workplace?

RQ2: How is the management of emotion tied to traditional and restorative features in the workplace?

Methods

We selected qualitative data collection methods for this study to "gain insight into the [subjective] obligations, constraints, motivations, and emotions" of participants (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 4). Semi-structured open interviews allowed participants opportunities to discuss experiences of conflict intertwined with emotions and practices, which in turn indicated how they enacted traditional and restorative understandings of conflict at work. Specifics of the organizational setting, participant demographics, data collection, and analysis follow.

Organizational Setting

We selected a private school for grades pre-kindergarten through high school in the southwest United States to explore emotions related to traditional and restorative justice practices. The school provided a unique setting in which to explore the connection of

traditional and restorative features to the experience of emotion. Teachers experience a wide range of positive and negative emotions that spring from several relationship sources, including students, parents, administrators, and especially other teachers (Hargreaves, 2001a, 2001b). These emotions constitute what Hargreaves (2001a) calls emotional geographies, which "consist of spatial and experiential patterns of closeness and/or distance in human interactions and relationships that help create, configure and color the feelings and emotions we experience about ourselves, our world and each other" (p. 1061). Geographies pertaining to issues of professionalism, space, and power, in turn, are tied in with other organizing features associated with traditional and restorative workplace features, including expectations regarding relationship closeness and definitions of professionalism. Together, the emotionality of teaching and the variability of emotional geographies made the school setting an appropriate place in which to explore our research questions.

This particular private school was appealing because of divergent workplace norms, practices, and relationship histories that coincided with a natural division in grade levels (which we discuss later). The school had three sections: Lower Division, Middle Division, and Upper Division. The Lower Division (LD; kindergarten – 6th grades), with its own director, functioned rather independently of the other two divisions, in part because it was physically separated onto one side of the main building from the other grade levels. The Middle and Upper Divisions (M&UD; 7th - 8th grades and 9th – 12th grades respectively), though, were integrated in terms of space and administration. Along with differences in space and administration, as we note below, there was a significant difference in terms of members' relationship histories across the divisions, with LD participants having worked at the school for an average of approximately seven years and participants in the M&UD having been at the school on average for less than one year.

The physical, administrative, and relational divisions and differences provided a naturally occurring comparison group to examine the connections among organizing features and the experience of emotion. Additionally, the nature of elementary and secondary education provided another grounds for comparison. Elementary (LD) and secondary (M&UD) schools generally appear to differ in terms of their social atmosphere and task characteristics. Secondary schools, for example, may be more likely to take on the feel of a classical bureaucratic organization characterized by "detachment, fragmentation, and isolation promoted by the departmentalization of teaching and the specialization of other services" (Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989, p. 222). Even though secondary educators may collaborate and plan together, they tend to specialize in particular subjects and work generally on their own and in their own classroom. In elementary schools, such departmentalization and specialization are less likely, with educators teaching multiple subject areas to their students and working with other grade-level colleagues more closely to ensure lesson and calendar coordination. However, Hargreaves (2001b) observed "no important variations in collegial relations among elementary and secondary sectors" (p. 509) in his analysis of teachers' emotions across a number of schools. He argues that desires for recognition, connection, and experiences of conflict and difference, all of which are evident in both elementary and secondary settings, are common sources of emotion. Thus, even though the two sections of the school may have diverged in terms of task characteristics, teachers' desires for collegiality remained constant, thereby allowing us to examine differences in participants' relationship experiences and the connection of those differences to organizing features and emotions.

In terms of structure, employees were organized into a hierarchy of administration (n = 7) and teachers (n = 44). The Head of School and Dean of Students for the M&UD was a new organizational member (2 months employment) and oversaw all school activities, the Lower Division Director (LD Director), and faculty for grades seven through high school senior. The LD Director (11 years employment) supervised kindergarten through sixth grade. The remaining employees were administrators (n = 5) (i.e. athletic director, administrative assistant).

Participants

Participants were Caucasian (n = 21; 84%), African American (n = 2, 8%) and Hispanic American (n = 2, 8%). Eighteen females (72%) and seven males (18%) participated, which was representative of the school's demographic composition. Employee tenure ranged from 2 months to 19 years (M = 3.95 years); 12 participants were in their first year of employment. There was a wide difference between the tenure of faculty in the LD (n = 8; M = 7.78 years) compared to the M&UD (n = 13; M = .88 years). Four participants taught or interacted with all grades.

Interview Protocol

After receiving institutional review board approval to conduct the study, the first author contacted the Head of School to obtain permission and email contact information for all administration and faculty members. Volunteers were recruited via email, with 25 individuals participating in semi-structured interviews, representing 49% of the administration and faculty in the school. Interviews

began by asking participants to describe their tenure at the school, responsibilities, and general impressions of the school. In order to explore emotions and experiences of traditional or restorative justice practices, participants were asked to describe experiences of conflict and hurtful events and how they addressed those experiences. Interviews ranged from 22 to 54 minutes (M = 34.32 minutes) and a majority of the interviews (n = 15) were recorded and transcribed; ten participants elected to not record the interview, but allowed interview notes to be taken. Transcribed interviews and notes totaled 197 pages of typed single-spaced data.

Analysis

We conducted line-by-line coding to identify naturally occurring themes, including in vivo codes (Charmaz, 2006; Saldana, 2013). Coded pieces of data were also mapped to better conceptualize relationships between themes (Clarke, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Each coded piece of data was then carefully considered and categorized to create a thematic analysis of the transcripts (Aronson, 1994; Braun & Clarke, 2006). Although we present the process a linear way, our actual analysis involved more reflexive steps, where codes were considered and re-considered, categorized and re-categorized, contextualized and re-contextualized to facilitate an emergent process for data analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Constant reflection took place throughout the analysis process to consider themes represented by the responses and how themes related to the entire data set. This reflection included discussing ideas and observations and returning to the transcripts multiple times to fine-tune descriptions and categories.

Organizing Traditionally and Restoratively

Traditional and restorative organizing features were apparent in both official and unofficial expectations for behavior throughout the school. Traditional expectations prompted employees to respect organizational procedures, bureaucratic authority, and concern for individual rights. Simultaneously, restorative organizing expectations were present with member expectations to communicate directly with one another, listen empathically, and work together to come to an agreement in order to strengthen members' relationships and promote reconciliation.

Although both traditional and restorative organizing features were evident across the school as a whole, the degree to which members enacted traditional and restorative practices varied by division within the school. Whereas members of the M&UD tended to take a more traditional approach to managing work and relationships, LD members' practices reflected a greater tendency to use restorative organizing practices with regard to their work and relationships. These climate features, which were supported by divisional differences in relationship history, administrative style, and task characteristics, became evident in members' management of problematic situations and concomitant emotions. Together, these features pointed to a fundamental tension occurring between segmentation and interconnection associated with work, relationships, conflict management, and emotions (see Table 2). In the following analysis, we unpack traditional and restorative climate features pertaining to work and relationships and their connection to experiences and management of emotion.

Work and Workplace Relationships

Members in both divisions negotiated the tension between connection and autonomy. However, M&UD members' gravitation toward segmentation and LD members' tendency toward interconnection were evident in their orientation to work, authority figures' approaches to management, and understandings of relationships in the workplace.

In terms of orientation to work, members of the divisions diverged in terms of how closely they identified with their work and their approaches to accomplishing work. M&UD participants tended to see work as their primary focus as demonstrated in comments about "duty and a lot of meetings," need to "enforce the announcements," do "a lot of email," be "very serious about work," and be "overburdened" with responsibilities. One participant commented, "whether you like it or not, this is a business, and we're here to provide a service." Participants frequently spoke about the busyness of their schedules, which kept them focused on work and limited co-worker interactions, explaining "most teachers when they have a minute they're working so they don't socialize a whole lot." Another M&UD teacher commented, "I find that if I have time off, I'm not going visiting anyway. I'm working, and so is everybody else." Work was equated with being "busy," "hectic," and feeling "stress from administration" which was associated with emotions of "apprehension," "unsureness," "frustration," and even "resentment."

Additionally, M&UD participants took a largely individualist approach to their work, assuming that one of their rights was to do as they saw fit in their own classrooms. One teacher indicated, "I think that if I am the teacher, I have the freedom, the responsibility, and the decision making [power] of certain subjects I'm going to teach." That teacher recounted a situation in which he was told what to teach, saying, "I didn't like to be imposed [on]." Another teacher shared "I can teach them however which way I want as

long as by the time they get out of [my class] they've learned everything they were supposed to." Still another teacher explained, "I took this job because I thought I could have the freedom to teach what I really wanted to teach." Not only did teachers expect autonomy, they specifically noted when these expectations were violated. Challenges to autonomy in teaching, such as criticism from other teachers or vetoed field trips, were paired with emotional explanations that the teachers were "frustrated" or the issue was "upsetting." The M&UD teachers characterized themselves as autonomous work-oriented individuals with limited connection to co-workers and expectations that others would respect their work-place decisions.

Table 2

Work, Conflict Management, and Emotion Management by Division

Features	Lower Division	Middle & Upper Divisions
Work		
Work as:	Responsibility	Duty
Approach to doing work:	Collaborative	Individual
Relationship importance:	Integral	Incidental
Relationship depth:	Close, open, and supportive	Superficial
Connection as:	Personal and supportive	Professional and regulated
Management style:	Democratic	Bureaucratic
Conflict Management		
Length of conflict:	Short conflict	Lingering conflict
View of conflict:	Natural occurrence that is part of the job	Inappropriate occurrence that should be suppressed
Conflict communication:	Perspective-taking	Perspective-reinforcing
Conflict management:	Avoidance followed by direct communication marked by listening and sharing	Continued avoidance and suppression, elevate to superior
Role of supervisor:	Facilitator	Referee
Conflict consequence:	Repair relational strain and reinforce personal responsibility	Move on and focus on work
Emotion Management		
Management of emotion:	Shared together	Stuffed until vented
Emotion consequences:	Dissipated negativity	Pent up negativity
Emotion norm:	Be open	Don't be the killjoy

In contrast, LD members tended to take an interconnected approach to work, not only seeing work as an integral part of their selves but also as something which all members needed to collaborate on in order to effectively teach. Teachers worked as "partners" in the same grade to coordinate their schedules and lesson plans. The LD faculty was "like a family" or a "community" full of "good-natured, warm-hearted people" who were "kind," "warm and friendly," where one could "trust everybody." A teacher noted that LD members were "very supportive of each other. They have their partners that they communicate with and [are] supportive. So, on that front with the students, it's a very unified and very positive." The same teacher explained how communication led to feeling connected, remarking:

> When we do get to sit down and visit and share about students whether we're struggling with or doing well or improving we really leave those conversations feeling like . . . we kind of connected as teachers and that we feel like we're doing better for the students which is always exciting and I enjoy those times.

"Listening" and "give and take" was necessary to "emotionally connect with others" and "breath success" into work with faculty and students. Another faculty member talked about "getting people to unite together," which demonstrates how LD teachers saw partnerships and connections throughout the school.

Further, LD members connected both professionally and personally, describing, "We talk about everything. You know, when it is lunchtime we all know about everyone's kids and what's going on." In other words, M&UD members' approach to work aligned with fairly traditional understandings of professionalism as autonomous, individualized, and separated from their "non-work" selves, whereas LD members gravitated to an integrated, holistic approach to work, self, and one another.

Participants' approaches to work were associated with their division leaders' approaches to authority. In the M&UD, the director (Head of School) tended to take a bureaucratic, authority-driven management approach. The administrator "laid down the law" and a participant noted, "those in administration . . . just *are* the conversation with the person who did the wrong." The Head of School would tell employees at faculty meetings "don't do this, don't talk this way" resulting in one employee who described "walking on eggshells" to avoid being "punished." If employees had an issue that they could not resolve, they would "need to go get an administrator involved," indicating the administration was the most important authority. "Just go to [the Head of School] and he'll step in and take care of it." Further, if faculty could not agree, participants described that the Head of School would "say well this is what we should do then" and "then he makes decisions." At times he was reported to have "said things that were not exactly sensitive" highlighting a rational approach over honoring emotions.

Sometimes teachers were not even informed about decisions made by the Head of School until students later told them. One teacher who had been informed by a student that the Head of School had allowed several students to drop her class without talking with her explained "I was really mad because to me that is saying 'I'm making executive decisions about your class without getting any information from you as the teacher.'" Throughout the interview responses, M&UD teachers were well aware that authority for decisions was hierarchical and bureaucratic.

The LD Director, however, tended to take a more democratic approach that relied on facilitating and acting as a sounding board rather than commanding. She explained, "I just happen to be the person that maybe kind of mediating it [conflict] and working helping you work through it . . . It just may be a matter of just miscommunication." Teachers under the LD Director confirmed that she wanted to give space to express emotions and frustrations and then help faculty work through difficult issues, explaining that they "trust" her. For example, when an LD teacher approached the LD Director about a curriculum dispute, the LD Director listened and then encouraged the participant to go to "the other . . . teacher and . . . to have a talk and come to a decision that maybe would be fair." Further, a participant contrasted the LD Director with the Head of School and described the LD Director as someone who would "communicate" openly to discuss problems and solutions. The way the LD Director solved problems served as "a really good role model" who "sees the value in all of us" and "respects us." This participant shared that with the LD Director, "I don't feel like I'm being talked down to." That is, the head of the LD seemed to focus more on *process* whereas the head of the M&UD was characterized as focusing more on *outcomes*. These different approaches to management created divergent workplace climates in which M&UD members were accountable to the Head of School whereas LD members were accountable primarily to each other.

Additionally, these segmented and interconnected approaches to work were evident in how people approached their workplace relationships. Members in the two divisions had quite different relationship histories. Whereas most M&UD members were relatively new to the school following the high turnover those divisions witnessed the preceding year, most LD members we spoke to had worked at the school for at least two years and some as many as 16 years. As a result, M&UD members were still working on developing relationships with one another and negotiating how best to manage those relationships. These differences, along with members' approaches to work, likely contributed to differences in how members perceived the importance of workplace relationships and how close they felt to each other.

In terms of relationship importance, members across the divisions appreciated their fellow teachers' support and reflected positively on the conversations they had about students and life outside of the workplace. However, they differed in terms of whether relationships to each other were tangential or central to their work. M&UD members tended to see co-worker relationships as nice, but not necessary to perform their work, as noted in the above discussion about the busyness of their schedules. For example, a teacher explained, "We don't do stuff, there's not been really any functions that's for faculty." Another teacher indicated that M&UD faculty members were cordial, saying, "every time we pass by the corridor we always say hi and then you smile . . . but no time to stop and talk." Still another shared that the faculty socialized over lunch "because we're kind of forced to" since teachers were not allowed to eat in their classrooms. When faculty did see each other outside of the school day, it was to work at a school event as one teacher explained "we all chaperone the events or working at the fall fest or hanging out at football games." Work was central to the M&UD teachers' relationships.

LD members, however, described how relationships lay at the heart of their work, with communication as a central component. One

LD teacher explained, "As long as you're communicating I think everything just runs smoothly, and that's kind of the way we do things." LD faculty indicated that they needed to work with one another to accomplish tasks ranging from curriculum planning to leading children to the next classroom. Faculty also helped each other with advice and resources; one participant shared, "there's a lot of mentoring going on between teaching . . . the younger teachers how to teach and to balance and have high expectations but make sure the kids are feeling supported, encouraged, and feeling successful." LD teachers emphasized that the very nature of their work depended on maintaining healthy relationships with one another, which extended outside the workplace to include time spent together with faculty members who had similar age children, attending events in groups, or even attending the same church. A teacher explained, "sometimes we talk about what we did over the weekend or big things coming up – like we had a teacher last year, she was planning her wedding all year, so we got to hear about that." As a result, LD members perceived their workplace relationships with one another as being more important and often extending outside of work than did M&UD members.

Along with seeing relationships as more important, LD members also described their relationships as being relatively closer than did M&UD members. M&UD members described workplace relationships as "collegial" and focused on maintaining at least the appearance of happiness. One participant shared, "I don't know how many people have deep friendships with each other. I don't sense too much of that going on." Often when M&UD faculty did talk, the discussion revolved around frustrations or dissatisfaction with work. For example, a teacher discussed workplace relationships and confided:

> Well it [conversations] brewed negativity within even positive groups. You tend to seek out people who identify with your negative perception of something and once you have that bond you grow it and it becomes more than what it began and you just keep adding and adding new people, new parties onto that and it becomes a thing that wasn't spoken. It just became this un-communicated frustration. That definitely happened quite a bit in the upper school and middle school last year.

Furthermore, many M&UD participants felt their relationship with the Head of School was tenuous. One teacher lamented that she did not think the Head of School believed in her as she explained, "Well if he doesn't believe in me I don't have much to lose if I don't impress him."

LD members' relationships tended to be closer, resulting from increased self-disclosure and emotion sharing vital to the accomplishing of their responsibilities. One participant described her school as "laid back . . . [and] more of a close-knit family." Another teacher indicated, "it's like a family. I mean people will help you out. There's no competition, no contention." Still another explained, "Everybody is so real that I feel like I have maybe made some real friends." The family metaphors and explanations of friendship across LD members indicated deeper relationships beyond those of co-workers focusing on tasks.

Altogether, the climates and practices of the two divisions were disparate from one another. In the M&UD, relationships were collegial but tangential as participants took an individualized approach grounded in the value of autonomy to accomplishing their primary responsibility of teaching effectiveness. In the LD, relationships were closer and more central to the participants as members saw their work as interdependent. These distinctively different climate features were indicative of traditional and restorative approaches to work and workplace relationships. Within these workplace climates, members managed situations of conflict or wrongdoing, reinforcing these climate features by enacting traditional and restorative practices that influenced how members managed both conflict and emotion.

Managing the Emotions from Hurtful Behavior

Participants identified a number of problematic events that elicited negative emotions. The majority (12) related to work, including interference by another teacher, problems with administrators, and general work-related issues. Interestingly, all administration-related problems occurred in the M&UD. Along with work-related situations, seven were grounded in problematic interaction, including issues of public confrontation, poor communication, being undermined, and feeling judged. Participants declined to elaborate on or describe two additional situations. Within both divisions, the numbers of work-related and interaction-related conflicts were about equal. However, the work- and interaction-related conflicts varied. For example, one work-related conflict in the LD involved a teacher bringing children back early, thereby limiting the other teacher's ability to prepare fully for class, and another one not following the directions from the LD director. Several M&UD work-related conflicts pertained to interference with one's teaching or comments about students' performance that reflected poorly on the teacher. Across both divisions, workplace conflicts were associated with negative emotions, including "anger," "frustration," and feeling "humiliated," "upset," "mad," "undermined," lacking "respect" and "offended."

Participants' management of conflict and emotions were rooted in their understanding of work and relationships; these understandings affected how participants interpreted precipitating events and subsequently managed conflict. Whereas M&UD members tended to take a traditional approach characterized by avoidance and elevation to authority, LD members generally took a restorative approach based on direct communication, empathic understanding, and apology for wrongdoing. Consider, for example, two participants' explanations of what the school wanted them to do when faced with a conflict situation. The M&UD member indicated, "the expectation is to *be professional* and address it" [emphasis added]. The LD member, however, indicated, "I think the expectation is, if you have a problem with a teacher, with a coworker, *then you are part of that relationship*, so you need to approach that and take care of that" [emphasis added]. Together, these explanations point to underlying differences that reflected traditional and restorative work climates, reinforcing a segmentation-interconnection tension.

One area where members diverged was in their understanding of the nature of conflict. In the M&UD divisions, conflict was an inappropriate occurrence that interfered with one's ability to carry out teaching duties. An M&UD teacher noted that the Head of Schools actively tried to eliminate outward conflict occurrences, explaining "We had a meeting just a couple of weeks ago and it was sort of mentioned as an aside [by the Head of School], 'You guys have to be nice to each other. I've heard three things this year about teachers not being nice to each other and I don't want to hear a fourth.'" In this case, conflict was certainly viewed as unwanted, unprofessional, and to be avoided at all costs. Employees were expected to suppress the conflicts as explained by one participant who experienced conflict with a co-worker. She shared "I talked to my supervisors . . . We [participant and co-worker] never got together to talk about the way I felt . . . It was like I have a problem myself I had to solve it myself and never confronted that person." In the interview with the Head of School, he noted that failing to manage emotion was unprofessional and shared an example of a teacher who "blew up" during a conflict. He explained that the teacher was no longer at the school, which he believed was due to her emotional outburst.

In the LD, however, conflict was a natural outgrowth of work that, while uncomfortable and negative, needed to be managed together. For example, an LD teacher explained that she works on perspective-taking to "help them see the big picture." Another teacher who experienced a conflict "waited a couple of days, . . . processed what I was going to say" and then talked with her co-worker directly to explain how she would like similar situations handled in the future. On a separate occasion, the Head of School made some policy decisions without consulting the LD Director causing problems for the faculty and students. As described by a teacher, the LD Director:

> . . . handled it well. She was upset but she wasn't screaming or anything. I think she made it clear that look this has been an issue and this is a perfect example of how communication is not working. She was right and . . . I think it was handled professionally.

Based on the examples of the LD teachers and the LD Director, conflict in this orientation is primarily a result of a misunderstanding, so communication enables both parties to better understand each other and the larger community.

Springing from members' understandings of conflict were their conflict management practices. M&UD members tended to take a self-oriented, impersonal approach characterized by avoidance, elevation to superiors who acted as referees, and perspective-reinforcement. M&UD members described how they would "stew," "avoid," and transfer conflict to the Head of School. As one participant said, "If conflict happens, go to the head." Another teacher described going straight to the administrator when offended by another teacher. In addition, organizational members hid or silenced conflict. One participant recalled:

> It was interesting to find out one day just this person was not going to work any longer here, but we were not told anything. It was just a written message saying this person is no longer going to be here. . . . I never heard, you know, my colleagues speaking bad about the teacher or about the situation everything was very, it was quite interesting because I kind of wanted to hear more and nobody talked about it.

Throughout interviews, M&UD members indicated a negative perception of conflicts and were aware that conflicts, and especially emotional expressions of conflicts, were seen as "unprofessional." Participants reported doing their best to avoid confrontations and enlist the Head of School if needed.

In contrast to the M&UD, LD members engaged in more relationally constructive practices such as direct communication after a period of avoidance, advice seeking from a superior who acted as a facilitator, and perspective taking. Several LD members described situations where one teacher, who had been upset by another LD teacher, eventually communicated directly with that other teacher, "giving her the benefit of the doubt," after initially avoiding that person and asking the administrator for advice.

Another participant explained that it was necessary for her to "share feelings" with her co-worker to resolve a conflict. Communication was necessary to repair relationships, as demonstrated by one participant who shared "repairing a relationship doesn't necessarily mean that you're friends but it means that you can speak to that person without malice . . . making it a respectful working relationship again." The need to repair relationships highlights how LD faculty honored co-worker relationships and saw the need to function collectively as a community. LD members unanimously indicated that the practice of directly engaging with the other person, listening, sharing feelings and information, and working through the conflict was the appropriate way to manage conflict and restore relationships. Therefore, among LD members, acknowledging emotions after calming down to address conflicts was "professional." In contrast, in the M&UD, suppressing emotions was considered to be "professional."

Together, the employee's understandings and practices during conflict affected the degree to which problematic events lingered in their minds. For M&UD members, conflict often stayed in their minds as they tried to simply move on and let their superior manage the situation. Several participants expressed continued "frustration," "resentment," and "lack of trust" with the administrator and faculty for how their situations were handled. For LD members, though, the conflict consequences tended to be relatively short-lived as they attempted to work through situations together to repair their relationship.

The divergent approaches to conflict management reflected differing assumptions about work and relationships. M&UD members' practices pointed to a largely traditional understanding of conflict privileging authority, rights, and concern for one's appearance in the midst of conflict. LD members' practices suggested a preference for a restorative approach that foregrounded community, responsibility, and concern for relationships. These practices, in turn, influenced how participants experienced and managed the emotions resulting from problematic situations.

Emotion in the Workplace

Although emotion is an integral part of work, the traditional workplace expectation, which we also found for teachers in this study, is that employees control their emotions so that emotion does not affect their performance. Conflicts make such control more challenging, given the emotionality inherent in coping with hurts or disagreements. Both members of the M&UD and LD experienced negative emotions associated with managing conflict, from general "stress" and "anger" to sharp feelings of being "humiliated" and "undermined." However, management of those emotions was grounded in traditional and restorative organizing principles associated with work, relationships, and conflict management.

Relationship depth and history was linked to normative expectations for emotion management. In the M&UD, where relationships were still in their formative stages due to the influx of new members, the general expectation was to suppress negativity so as not to threaten positive feelings among group members or be "the killjoy." M&UD participants noted that "there was a big emphasis on being calm" and people needed to "put on a happy face" and "get back to work," stuffing negative emotions behind a mask. The norm focused on presentation of *self* rather than maintenance of *relationships.*

In the LD, where relationships had been developing over time and through members' collaborative work, participants expressed being more open to the expression of emotion, while still limiting some negative emotion practices such as gossip. The LD Director described how through listening, she encouraged emotional expression based on teacher personalities. She shared:

> I have found it the best when you're dealing with conflict to listen more and talk less. So when someone comes in …
> if they are [a] feeler, you know they're going to emote they're going to let it go . . . if they're an extrovert, you know
> it's typical that they're going to be more animated . . . and if they're introverted, they're going to be more quiet and
> they're going to think.

Emotions in the LD were characterized as normal and something to share so that conflicts could be constructively worked through to restore relationships. This norm helped to maintain relationships rather than to ensure a particular presentation of self.

When conflicts occurred, participants across the school tended to cope similarly with the initial feelings of negativity by suppressing emotions until out of sight, where they could release them. "Venting" to other teachers and to spouses at home was a popular practice, as it allowed participants to manage the immediate negativity aroused through the problematic event. What distinguished the divisions was how members responded after that. In the M&UD, members tended to suppress their emotions while avoiding the other person or going straight to an administrator. One teacher described, "I just ignore it [the conflict]." When the Head of School was the offender, teachers sought out the LD Director for advice on how to work around him or complained to each other privately, creating co-rumination and intensifying "resentment" without resolving problems. One teacher shared:

Another big thing that people have vented about is the administration and this is something I've had vents about . . . you can't build a strong team unless the people that work for you know that you have a hundred percent confidence in them and some of us have gotten just vibes from some different things that he's done probably completely unconsciously but have made us feel like, I've definitely felt sometimes that he doesn't believe in us and I know that another faculty member has initially had trouble with that.

Because M&UD faculty reported venting and then avoiding interactions with the other party, their negative emotions tended to linger, fostering continued avoidance and relationship strain.

In contrast, the LD members were more open about their emotions to their director and one another while being careful not to cross a line demarcating appropriate from inappropriate emotional expression. Although members still vented to one another, they also described being more open to sharing, as illustrated by a participant who talked about crying when talking with another teacher to work through a problem and another who talked about tears and frayed nerves exposed in the conversation. Interestingly, in both these situations, the outpouring of emotion did not evoke empathy and the relationships were not restored. Instead, the parties demonstrating emotion ended up leaving the organization, suggesting a lack of closeness with the other teachers and the organization as a whole. Overall though, in other cases of conflict described by LD members, participants indicated that their negative emotions dissipated rather quickly after talking either with their administrator or the other teacher and coming to a better understanding of their emotions and the emotions of the other party. In these cases, negative emotions dissipated and they were able to "let go" of the conflict.

The role of administrators in this emotion management process is worth noting as well. Participants praised contributions of the LD Director, who took an empathic approach by prioritizing listening and facilitating. Even members of the other divisions reported going to that director to vent and seek advice. A participant noted that the LD Director's approach to listening was validating, enabling the participant to "put [the conflict] in the bag" and "forget about it." This empathic listening communicated a sense of caring and a desire to help the person work through the situation constructively. In contrast, the Head of School, who wanted conflicts dealt with "professionally," without any acknowledgement of emotions, was know to admonish people who spoke negatively to or about colleagues.

In sum, participants' experience and management of emotions, while similar in many respects, were linked to traditional and restorative organizing features. Although participants across all divisions reported trying to manage their initial negativity by venting or avoiding, their next steps were associated with very different approaches to work, relationships, and resulting emotions. Expressing emotions to one another directly, listening to those emotions, and then working through the situation together was associated with an interconnected sense of workplace relationships and a greater sense of internal peace. Suppressing emotions and avoiding the other person, while eventually associated with a return to some normalcy, was related to a segmented approach to work and relationships, with participants understanding that emotions were simply detractors from their primary focus of teaching. However, rather than dissipating, negative emotions lingered as demonstrated by ongoing "resentment" and greater co-rumination with co-workers.

Traditional Organizing, Restorative Organizing, and the Experience of Emotion in the Workplace

When people believe that someone has acted unjustly or inappropriately, they are likely to feel a range of negative emotions (Okimoto, Wenzel, & Feather, 2009). Venting, avoiding, and confronting are some options individuals use for coping with and responding to hurtful workplace situations (Tripp et al., 2007). Organizational members are traditionally expected to suppress negative emotions, releasing them elsewhere to maintain composure and approach work rationally. This traditional approach is grounded in a number of communication patterns that reflect features of organizational bureaucracy and professionalism, including rationality and self-control that perpetuate fragmentation of relationships, suppression of emotion, and prioritization of task accomplishment. Such organizational features are characteristic of the adoption of workplace legalism (Sitkin & Bies, 1993, 1994).

Restorative organizing, in contrast, involves the promotion of a sense of community and connection among organizational members through dialogic communication (Braithwaite, 1999; Walgrave, 2002). Emotions play a key role in the development of this sense of community (Mumby & Putnam, 1992). For example, communicating appreciation, acknowledging colleagues' work, acting in a friendly manner, and sharing stories about life outside the workplace can give rise to positive emotions that are felt and shared (Hargreaves, 2001b). In conflict situations, practices such as empathizing, apologizing, and self-disclosure can repair and strengthen workplace relationships through the constructive and appropriate sharing of emotions (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hargreaves,

2001b, Stubbs, 2007). Although potentially risky, talking through one's emotions with the other person involved in the conflict can foster a greater awareness of self and other (Wachtel & McCold, 2001). Additionally, sharing one's story directly rather than working through administrators can promote feelings of empowerment and being heard (Umbreit, 2001). Together, the practices driving these perceptions – direct communication, self-disclosure, empathic listening, and perspective sharing – reflect a conflict management approach that prioritizes personal and relational growth and healing through dialogic engagement. These priorities and practices are reflected in the restorative justice paradigm.

In the school studied here, both traditional and restorative organizing practices were evident throughout the entire school. However, whereas M&UD members tended to enact traditional practices more frequently than restorative ones, LD members tended to gravitate more frequently to restorative practices. These organizing patterns reflected an underlying tension between connection and segmentation that emerged in approaches to work, relationships, and emotions. On the one hand, traditional organizing was characterized by segmentation between work and relationships, between individual members, and between members and their emotions. Traditional organizing prioritized task accomplishment (i.e., effective teaching) above all, viewing relationship construction and maintenance as a separate and secondary concern. Emotions, which were seen as potentially interfering with work, were to be suppressed. On the other hand, restorative organizing was associated with a view of work, relationships, and emotions as interconnected. Work effectiveness, which was the primary goal, was inextricably linked with relationship maintenance, which was connected to appropriate emotion sharing, social support, and task-related and personal information sharing. This integration of work, relationships, and emotions reflects a restorative perspective characterized by a holistic understanding of people as interwoven with their environment and as both products and producers of a complex web of personal and social forces.

Traditional and restorative organizing also shapes what counts as appropriate emotion management. Traditionally, appropriateness is defined as conforming to organizational policies that are designed to promote the efficient and rational accomplishment of work. From a restorative perspective, however, appropriateness is redefined as that which promotes healing, growth, and engagement with self and other, which are core characteristics of the restorative justice paradigm (Paul & Dunlop, 2014). Thus, practices such as venting become not about "putting on a happy face and getting back to work" by eliminating a disease-like emotion but about trying to process feelings and engage in constructive conversation with the other person that involves the expression and sharing of emotion.

An important dynamic in terms of employees' emotion management is the role of authority figures. Although traditional justice positions authority figures as final *decision-makers* and *process-managers*, restorative justice uses a more democratic approach by positioning authority figures as *facilitators* who help conversations to occur (Bazemore et al., 2005). These orientations reflect a key distinction in the role of authority figures between traditional justice and restorative justice. Though authority figures in traditional justice hold final decision-making power and play a central role in traditional justice practices, restorative justice authority figures typically focus on creating safe and respectful environments, helping participants share their stories with one another, and making sure participants stick to guidelines along which dialogue can proceed (Dignan et al., 2007; Johnstone, 2002; Presser & Hamilton, 2006; Umbreit, 2001). The focus on creating a safe and fair environment by using high levels of both control and support is designed to empower dialogue participants and model restorative justice values (Pavlich, 2005; Rossner, 2011; Wachtel & McCold, 2001). Additionally, restorative organizing involves more than simply facilitating conversations in which people can share emotions; it also involves ensuring that people conform to expectations of emotion display that are reinforced by all organizational members. In this way, restorative aims of reintegration and repair are accomplished (Kidder, 2007), as are the reinforcement of shared values constituting the professional community (Bryk, Camburn, & Lewis, 1999), the sense of procedural justice (Aquino et al., 2006), and the lessening of political distances among members (Hargreaves, 2001a, 2001b).

Importantly, although data clearly indicate patterns of behavior and associated emotions, we do not suggest a causal relationship between traditional or restorative organizing patterns and particular emotions or emotion management practices. Task and relationship features, such as amount of collaboration needed and length of relationships, can shape the likelihood and frequency with which people engage in traditional and restorative practices. Seen through the lens of Hargreaves' (2001a, 2001b) typology of emotional geographies, traditional organizing practices and expectations, such as emotion suppression and the prioritization of work over relationship maintenance, are associated with increased personal, professional, political, and spatial distances. In situations like that of the M&UD where relationship histories are short, work is paramount and autonomy and bureaucracy are valued highly, such distances are likely to lead to (and be reified by) traditional organizing practices. Avoiding (i.e., increasing spatial distance) can reduce members' self-disclosure to one another, thereby increasing both personal distance (i.e., a sense of personal commonality) and professional distance (i.e., a sense of common mission). If members are already distant, that distance can foster the continued use of avoidant strategies that also are associated with greater political distance (i.e., individual authority). Restorative practices

such as empathic dialogue and perspective-taking, however, tend to be associated with greater closeness on the emotional geographies. In the school studied here, LD members, who tended to work collaboratively (professional geography) and in close proximity to each other (physical geography), maintained closer relationships with each other (personal geography). These geographies, in turn, were associated both with an emphasis on restorative practices and with more constructive emotion sharing. In short, the picture that emerges is one of interwoven, interdependent, and mutually constitutive practices, expectations, and ideals related to both work and relationships that simultaneously shape and are shaped by experiences and management of emotion.

In sum, the enactment of restorative practices in the workplace can alter patterns of organizing. With regard to emotion, fostering and enacting restorative practices can help to legitimize situationally appropriate emotion expression as a way to build community among members. This legitimization is rooted in a workplace climate marked by an integration of work and relationships that becomes manifested in conflict situations. Restorative organizing appears to promote a more interpersonally and intrapersonally integrated approach to work. While conflict and negative emotions are present in both traditional and restorative organizing systems, the organizing behaviors to address emotions and the associated emotional outcomes diverge.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Our findings reinforce the centrality of emotions in organizing. Emotions provide distal and proximal prompts for selecting and enacting conflict communication strategies. First, restorative organizing is characterized by the use of engaged and empathic conflict communication practices that allow for the expression and validation of emotion. This expression and validation shapes (and is shaped by) the development of workplace relationships that lie at the heart of organizing. Second, emotions are connected to personal past experiences and interpretations of current organizational practices that inform "expected" communication behaviors and norms (Hargreaves, 2001a). As employees continue to enact restorative principles, they become more adept and at ease at sharing emotion with one another in future situations. Third, community and individual orientations influence how individuals interpret and implement traditional and restorative communication practices. Emotions play a central role in fostering a feeling of connection among members, and the sharing of emotion is both a product and a producer of this sense of community.

In terms of practical applications, adopting practices associated with restorative organizing approaches can shape the way organizational members experience and manage emotions. Because conflict is a natural occurrence, attempts to foster restorative conflict management approaches through training and encouragement can reverse destructive communication patterns characterized by avoidance, gossip, or revenge. However, simply folding restorative justice elements into organizational policy is not enough. Enacting restorative principles in conflict situations involves sincerely fostering those same principles in day-to-day organizing practices. While leadership in organizations may set the tone for these practices, members also need to embrace and enact the practices to create a restorative organizing culture over time. Further, mandating restorative practices through official policy could paradoxically reinforce traditional organizing principles that emphasize authority and policy conformity.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although this data set was useful for considering how emotions and conflict processes of traditional and restorative justice inform restorative organizing in an organizational setting, the study is not without limitations. Schools and school systems represent a specific context. Additional research in a range of organizational contexts is needed to enhance understandings how traditional and restorative practices intermingle with emotions to impact individuals, relationships, and organizations as a whole. Additionally, while interviews were particularly useful in uncovering conflict events and responses to allow for emergent data, this data collection method primarily relies on participant perceptions and self-reports. Observational data in organizational contexts, while time consuming, would allow for more emergent observations. Similarly, larger sampling with a survey would increase the number of contexts considered and create more generalizable data.

Further, as with any research project, choices to focus on specific features of the data were made to keep the study manageable. Highlighting research questions regarding how the experience and management of emotion tied to traditional and restorative features in the workplace caused us to look very specifically at work and workplace relationships, emotion management, conflict management, and emotions. The data provided a snapshot of an organization that practiced traditional and restorative justice behaviors simultaneously in different divisions. This snapshot does not allow for causal relationships, nor does the focus of this study reject other organizational features that mutually inform and are confounded with traditional and restorative justice practices and the related emotions. Features of this organization, such as leadership style (i.e. transactional versus transformative, authoritarian versus democratic), relational history, previous work experience, and sex and gender roles were certainly intertwined with the concepts reported and would make for excellent future studies to unpack the complicated aspects of organizational culture

in relation to restorative organizing and emotions.

What is clear is that traditional and restorative organizing features influence how individuals, relationships, and organizations as a whole generate, respond to, and perpetuate communication patterns and experiences of emotion. While practices of traditional "professionalism" edit or suppress undesired emotional displays, emotions are inherent in workplace experiences. Further, the way organizational members enact traditional and restorative justice practices informs work relationships, conflict management practices, and emotions in divergent patterns where negative emotions are likely to linger based on traditional justice or dissipate when using more restorative justice communication patterns. Considering current findings, the centrality of communication and emotion organizing patterns warrant further exploration to enhance theoretical understanding and improve workplace practices.

Conclusion

Restorative justice has been gaining in popularity both inside and outside the criminal justice system as an alternative to traditional approaches to managing harmdoing. With its emphasis on community-building and personal growth, restorative justice also appears to offer a useful framework for organizing. By encouraging an approach to work and workplace relationships that is grounded in restorative dialogue and appropriate emotion sharing, particularly following hurtful events, members may help to recover a sense of community that has been slowly eroding in the workplace.

References

Anderson, P. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Principles of communication and emotion in social interaction. In P. A. Anderson & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), **The handbook of communication and emotion** (pp. 49-97). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2003). When push doesn't come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships. **Journal of Management Inquiry, 12**, 209-216. doi: 10.1177/1056492603256337

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. **Journal of Applied Psychology, 91**, 653-668. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.653

Armour, M. P., & Umbreit, M. S. (2006). Victim forgiveness in restorative justice dialogue. **Victims & Offenders 1(2),** 123-140**.** doi: 10.1080/15564880600626080

Aronson, J. (1994). A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. **The Qualitative Report**, **2**, 1-3. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/aronson.html

Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. **Journal of Applied Psychology, 90**, 629-643. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.629

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

Bazemore, G., O'Brien, S., & Carey, M. (2005). The synergy and substance of organizational and community change in the response to crime and conflict: The emergence and potential of restorative justice. **Public Organization Review: A Global Journal, 5**, 387-314. doi: 10.1007/s11115-005-5093-8

Booth, J., & Mann, S. (2005). The experience of workplace anger. **Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 26**, 250-262. doi: 10.1108/01437730510600634

Boren, J. P. (2014). The relationships between co-rumination, social support, stress, and burnout among working adults. **Management Communication Quarterly, 28**, 3-25. doi: 10.1177/0893318913509283

Borton, I. M. (2009). Effects of race, sex, and victims' reasons for victim-offender dialogue. **Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 27**, 215-235. doi: 10.1002/crq.256

Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. **Journal of Management, 25**, 607-632. doi: 10.1177/014920639902500501

Braithwaite, J. (1999). Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. **Crime and Justice, 25**, 1-127.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). Setting standards for restorative justice. **British Journal of Criminology, 42**, 563-577. doi: 10.1093/bjc/42.3.563

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. **Qualitative Research in Psychology**, 3, 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. **Educational Administration Quarterly, 35**, 751-781. doi: 10.1177/0013161X99355004

Charmaz, K. (2006). **Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheney, G., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2007). Considering "the professional" in communication studies: Implications for theory and research within and beyond the boundaries of organizational communication. **Communication Theory, 17**, 146-175. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00290.x

Clarke, A. E. (2005). **Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. W., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. **Journal of Applied Psychology, 86**, 425-445. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Dignan, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G., Shapland, J., & Sorsby, A. (2007). Staging restorative justice encounters against a criminal justice backdrop: A dramaturgical analysis. **Criminology & Criminal Justice, 7**, 5-32. doi: 10.1177/1748895807072474

Domagalski, T. A., & Steelman, L. A. (2005). The impact of work events and disposition on the experience and expression of employee anger. **Organizational Analysis, 13**, 31-52.

Domagalski, T. A., & Steelman, L. A. (2007). The impact of gender and organizational status on workplace anger expression. **Management Communication Quarterly, 20**, 297-315. doi: 10.1177/0893318906295681

Dougherty, D. S., & Drumheller, K. (2006). Sensemaking and emotions in organizations: Accounting for emotions in a rational(ized) context. **Communication Studies, 57**, 215-238. doi: 10.1080/10510970600667030

Fehr, R., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). The forgiving organization: A multilevel model of forgiveness at work. **Academy of Management Review, 37**, 664-688. doi: 10.5465/amr.2010.0497

Geddes, D., & Callister, R. R. (2007). Crossing the line(s): A dual threshold model of anger in organizations. **Academy of Management, 32**, 721-746. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2007.25275495

Gibson, D. E., & Callister, R. R. (2010). Anger in organizations: Review and integration. **Journal of Management, 35**, 66-93. doi: 10.1177/0149206309348060

Goodstein, J., & Aquino, K. (2010). And restorative justice for all: Redemption, forgiveness, and reintegration in organizations. **Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31**, 624-628. doi: 10.1002/job.632

Grovier, T. (2002). **Forgiveness and revenge**. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hargreaves, A. (2001a). Emotional geographies of teaching. **Teaching College Record, 103**, 1056-1080. doi: 10.1111/0161-4681.00142

Hargreaves, A. (2001b). The emotional geographies of teachers' relations with colleagues. **International Journal of Educational Research, 35**, 503-527. doi: 10.1016/s0883-0355(02)00006-x

Harlos, K. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2000). Emotion and injustice in the workplace. In S. Fineman (Ed.), **Emotion in organizations** (2nd ed., pp. 255-276). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Johnstone, G. (2002). **Restorative justice: Ideas, values, debates**. Portland, OR: Willan.

Jones, T. (2001). Emotional communication in conflict: Essence and impact. In W. F. Eadie & P. E. Nelson (Eds.), **The language of conflict and resolution** (pp. 81-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kellett, P. M., & Dalton, D. G. (2001). **Managing conflict in a negotiated world: A narrative approach to achieving productive dialogue and change**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kelley, D. L., & Waldron, V. R. (2006). Forgiveness: communicative implications for social relationships. In C. S. Beck (Ed.), **Communication yearbook 30** (pp. 303-341). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kidder, D. L. (2007). Restorative justice: Not "rights," but the right way to heal relationships at work. **International Journal of Conflict Management, 18**, 4-22. doi: 10.1108/10444060710759291

Kramer, M. W., & Hess, J. (2002). Communication rules for the display of emotions in organizational settings. **Management Communication Quarterly, 16**, 66-80. doi: 10.1177/0893318902161003

Lammers, J. C., & Garcia, M. A. (2009). Exploring the concept of "profession" for organizational communication research. **Management Communication Quarterly, 22**, 357-384. doi: 10.1177/0893318908327007

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). **Qualitative communication research methods** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2003). The communicative cycle of employee emotional abuse: Generation and regeneration of workplace mistreatment. **Management Communication Quarterly, 16**, 471-501. doi: 10.1177/0893318903251627

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Riforgiate, S., & Fletcher, C. (2011). Work as a source of positive emotional experiences and the discourses informing positive assessment. **Western Journal of Communication, 75**, 2-27. doi: 10.1080/10570314.2010.536963

Malone, P., & Hayes, J. (2012). Backstabbing in organizations: Employees' perceptions of incidents, motives, and communicative responses. **Communication Studies, 63**, 194-219. doi: 10.1080/10510974.2011.635552

McCullough, M. E. (2001). Forgiveness: Who does it and how do they do it? **Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10**, 194-197. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.00147

McCullough, M. E. (2008). **Beyond revenge: The evolution of the forgiveness instinct**. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). **An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, K. I., Birkholt, M., Scott, C. & Stage, C. (1995). Empathy and burnout in human service work: An extension of a communication model. **Communication Research, 22**, 123-147. doi: 10.1177/009365095022002001

Miller, K. I., Considine, J., & Garner, J. (2007). "Let me tell you about my job": Exploring the terrain of emotion in the workplace. **Management Communication Quarterly, 20**, 231-260. doi: 10.1177/0893318906293589

Moffitt, M. L. & Bordone, R. C. (2005). Perspectives on dispute resolution: An introduction. In M. L. Moffitt & R. C. Bordone (Eds.), **Handbook of dispute resolution** (pp. 1-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morris, A. (2002). Critiquing the critics: A brief response to critics of restorative justice. **British Journal of Criminology, 42**, 596-615. doi: 10.1093/bjc/42.3.596

Mumby, D. K., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality. **Academy of Management Review, 17**, 465-486. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1992.4281983

Newmann, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. S. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. **Sociology of Education, 62**, 221-238. doi: 10.2307/2112828

Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Feather, N. T. (2009). Beyond retribution: Conceptualizing restorative justice and exploring its determinants. **Social Justice Research, 22**, 156-180. doi: 10.1007/s11211-009-0092-5

Parkinson, J., & Roche, D. (2004). Restorative justice: Deliberative democracy in action? **Australian Journal of Political Science, 39**, 505-518. doi: 10.1080/103614042000295101

Paul, G. D., & Dunlop, J. (2014). The other voice in the room: Restorative justice facilitators' constructions of justice. **Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 31**, 257-283. doi: 10.1002/crq.21091

Pavlich, G. (2005). **Governing paradoxes of restorative justice**. Portland, OR: Glasshouse Press.

Pfeffer, J. (2009). Working alone: What ever happened to the idea of organizations as communities? In P. Lutgen-Sandvik & B. D. Sypher (Eds.), **Destructive organizational communication: Processes, consequences, and constructive ways of organizing** (pp. 363-388). New York, NY: Routledge.

Presser, L., & Hamilton, C. A. (2006). The micropolitics of victim-offender mediation. **Sociological Inquiry, 76**, 316-342. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.2006.00158.x

Putnam, L. L., & Mumby, D. K. (1993). Organizations, emotion, and the myth of rationality. In S. Fineman (Ed.), **Emotion in organizations** (1st ed., pp. 36-57). London, UK: Sage.

Raye, B. E., & Roberts, A. W. (2007). Restorative processes. In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), **Handbook of restorative justice** (pp. 211-227). Portland, OR: Willan.

Rossner, M. (2011). Emotions and interaction rituals: A micro analysis of restorative justice. **British Journal of Criminology, 51**, 95-119. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azq075

Saldana, J. (2013). **The coding manual for qualitative researchers** (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sandelands, L. E., & Boudens, C. J. (2000). Feeling at work. In S. Fineman (Ed.), **Emotion in organizations** (2nd ed., pp. 46-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, C., & Myers, K. (2005). The socialization of emotion: Learning emotion management at the fire station. **Journal of Applied Communication Research, 33**, 67-92. doi: 10.1080/0090988042000318521

Scott, W. R. (1994). Law and organization. In S. B. Sitkin & R. J. Bies (Eds.), **The legalistic organization** (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sitkin, S. B., & Bies, R. J. (1993). The legalistic organization: Definitions, dimensions, and dilemmas. **Organization Science, 4**, 345-351. doi: 10.1287/orsc.4.3.345

Sitkin, S. B., & Bies, R. J. (1994). The legalization of organizations: A multi-theoretical perspective. In S. B. Sitkin & R. J. Bies (Eds.), **The legalistic organization** (pp. 19-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stubbs, J. (2007). Beyond apology? Domestic violence and critical questions for restorative justice. **Criminology & Criminal Justice, 7**, 169-187. doi: 10.1177/1748895807075570

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). **The cultures of work organizations.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tripp, T. M., Bies, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2007). A vigilante model of justice: Revenge, reconciliation, forgiveness, and avoidance. **Social Justice Research, 20**, 10-34. doi: 10.1007/s11211-007-0030-3

Umbreit, M. S. (2001). **The handbook of victim-offender mediation: An essential guide to practice and research**. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Wachtel, T., & McCold, P. (2001). Restorative justice in everyday life. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), **Restorative justice and civil society** (pp. 114-129). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Waldron, V. R. (1994). Once more, with feeling: Reconsidering the role of emotion in work. In S. A. Deetz (Ed.), **Communication yearbook 17** (pp. 388-416). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Waldron, V. R. (2002). Relational experiences and emotion at work. In S. Fineman (Ed.), **Emotions in organizations** (2nd ed.,

pp. 64-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walgrave, L. (2002). From community to dominion: In search of social values for restorative justice. In E. G. M. Weitekamp & H-J Kerner (Eds.), **Restorative justice: Theoretical foundations** (pp. 71-89). Portland, OR: Willan.

Warnke, G. (1992). **Justice and interpretation.** Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wenzel, M, Okimoto, T. G., & Cameron, K. (2012). Do retributive and restorative justice processes address different symbolic concerns? **Critical Criminology, 20,** 25-44. doi: 10.1007/s10612-011-9147-7

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T. G., Feather, N. T., & Platow, M. J. (2008). Retributive and restorative justice. **Law and Human Behavior, 32**, 375-389. doi: 10.1007/s10979-007-9116-6

Winslade, J. (2006). Mediation with a focus on discursive positioning. **Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 23**, 501-515. doi: 10.1002/crq.152

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

Author Notes

Gregory D. Paul (Ph.D., Texas A&M University) is an assistant professor at Kansas State University. His research examines the process of community building in the workplace and in home communities, focusing on practices of conflict management, restorative justice, forgiveness, and third party facilitation.

Sarah E. Riforgiate (Ph.D., Arizona State University) is an assistant professor at Kansas State University. Her research concentrates on organizational and interpersonal communication to improve the understanding of the intersections of paid work and private life, emotions in organizations, and practical solutions to improve conflict interactions.