Planning and Changing
Vol. 51, No. 3/4, 2024, pp. 94–111

UTILIZING QUANTITATIVE INSTRUMENTS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND SOCIAL JUSTICE LEADERSHIP

There are a limited number of quantitative tools intended to interrogate social justice leadership. The ones that do exist tend to focus on the attitudes, awareness, or perceptions of school leaders related to theorized facets of social justice. However, awareness of social (in)justice does not automatically equate with realized behavior on the behalf of school leaders (Brown & Shaked, 2018). The development of quantitative tools that investigate the behaviors that school leaders engage in to create socially just outcomes and the contextual factors that they encounter in such pursuits would aid practitioners and scholars alike. Such tools would aid in improving the collective understanding of social justice leadership and its enactment within diverse contexts (Tackett, 2021; Zhang et al., 2018). This paper explores two instruments, the Social Justice Behavior Scale (SJBS) and the Social Justice – Barriers and Supports Instrument (SJ-BAS), that can support future investigations of leadership for social justice. The SJBS measures the behaviors that principals engage in to lead for social justice (Flood, 2019). The scale has three components that disentangle these behaviors. The three components of the SJBS indicate where the behavior is intended to most directly effect. The three components are: School-Specific, Community-Minded, and Self-Focused. The SJ-BAS measures the contextual elements that principals encounter within the complex environments where they find themselves as actors (Angelle & Flood, 2021). The SJ-BAS measures both macro and meso level constructs that support principals in their work as socially just school leaders as well as those constructs that act as barriers to social justice in schools. The SJ-BAS is composed of two scales, the Barriers Scale and the Supports Scale.

Introduction

The ability to lead for social justice is an essential skill for school leaders. As schools have become increasingly diverse over the past few decades, it has been imperative for school leaders to demonstrate a commitment to equity and inclusion through socially just practices. However, how to develop a school-wide, student-centric culture of equity has not often been given significance in the literature.

Socially just principals understand that students trust more in what they see in adults, rather than what they hear from adults. Their values are linked to their daily behavior including their (un)conscious awareness and biases. Values define situations, prompt goals, and influence action (Verplanken & Holland, 2002). According to Schwartz (1999; 2005; 2006),

when we encounter situations, we look at them in light of the values we hold. We decide what action is most desirable to take, based on the priority we assign to the values pertinent to the situation at hand. The higher priority we give to the value, the more likely we will act and behave to express those values. When values are activated by a situation, alternative actions and consequences of these actions are internally judged by whether they support or obstruct valued goals.

Bardi and Swartz (2003) inform us that the ways in which we behave express our values to others, even though, subconsciously, we may not be aware of the link between values and behaviors. Values are stable and motivational and rarely change throughout our lifetime. Behaviors more strongly correspond to values that are personally important to the individual (Bardi & Swartz, 2003; Pappas & Pappas, 2015). Values serve as motivation for behavior; however, the values that motivate said behavior differ from person to person (Arieli, Sagiv, & Roccas, 2020). Thus, behavior is a way to express the values that are important to them through their actions. As posited by Arieli, Sagiv, and Roccas (2020):

> People in leadership roles seek to act on their values. Their position in the organisation, however, allows them to infuse their values into the organisation, influencing the organisation and their employees. Several studies have demonstrated how managers'values penetrate other organisational levels, influencing strategic decisions, organisational culture, and subordinate behaviour. (p. 253)

Thus, tools that investigate the behaviors in which school leaders engage to promote socially just outcomes and the contextual factors that they encounter in those pursuits would aid practitioners and scholars alike in improving their understanding of social justice leadership and its enactment within diverse contexts (Tackett, 2021; Zhang et al., 2018). There are a limited number of quantitative tools intended to interrogate social justice leadership. The ones that do exist tend to focus on the attitudes, awareness, or perceptions of school leaders related to theorized facets of social justice. However, awareness of social (in)justice does not automatically equate with realized behavior on the behalf of school leaders (Brown & Shaked, 2018).

Practitioners and researchers should have access to an instrument that accurately measures leadership behaviors that support social justice goals and, therefore, improve schools to meet those goals. Furthermore, the ability to understand how school leaders perceive the extent to which current context supports or inhibits leadership for social justice is equally important (Tackett, 2021; Zhang et al., 2018). Context and behavior cannot be examined separately but should be understood in tandem as context inevitably influences the agency of the school leader (Arar, 2019; Oldham et al., 2020). Context can also play a role in decisions that are made as principals may be influenced by colleagues, parents, students, and the "specific educational circumstances in which they find themselves" (Dempster, et al., 2004,

p. 165). DeMatthews and colleagues (2015) echoed the need for deeper understandings of principal actions framed within their own unique context. They noted that the "relevance and applicability of social justice leadership will remain limited without a more robust understanding of context and contradictions" (p. 29).

In that same spirit, this paper will explore two instruments, the Social Justice Behavior Scale (SJBS) and the Social Justice – Barriers and Supports Instrument (SJ-BAS), that can support future investigations of leadership for social justice. By interrogating and communicating the use of instruments that measure aspects of social justice, practitioners and researchers alike can benefit. Fietzer and Ponterotto (2015) keenly noted that this type of pursuit should be of interest and benefit to researchers and practitioners alike:

> By critically examining these instruments, practitioners maintaining a social justice agenda will have access to tools which can identify allies, stimulate introspective approaches to self-knowledge about social justice, and identify new ways to encourage engagement in advocacy in others. Researchers would be able to identify psychometrically sound instruments in social justice, leading to more complex theoretical development about social justice engagement, a better understanding of the factors contributing to social justice, and a way to demonstrate how engagement in advocacy and social justice directly benefit communities. (p. 20).

The following sections will situate the instruments in the relevant socially just leadership literature, provide an overview of the SJBS and SJ-BAS, examine opportunities for both practitioners and researchers to use these instruments, and discuss the implications for both practice and research.

Socially Just Leadership

The construct of socially just leadership has been central to educational leadership research, framed as both a concept and an enactment. The importance of studying the practices principals employ to create equitable educational opportunities for marginalized students is underscored in the literature, primarily with qualitative studies. As such, the lack of quantitative perspectives on the phenomenon become apparent. As we introduce two instruments which may allow for greater breadth in understanding socially just leadership, we first offer this overview of social justice through an operational lens and as a practice in schools. We conclude this section by placing social justice as a representation of principal agency.

Difficulties arise when attempting to narrow social justice to a singular definition, particularly in school settings. Social justice, as an action, as part of a school culture, or as a philosophy held by those within the school organization, is shaped by the context of the school. Equity for marginalized children may refer to abilities, culture, gender, identity, or race and the

extent of the social, economic, or educational needs of marginalized children. Moreover, as Hayes and Angelle (2020) pointed out, views of social justice are often articulated through the lens of western culture, views that may be contrary to cultures in other parts of the world. Hatfield and colleagues (2011) provide the example of American and Chinese cultures. As a capitalist society, Americans value hard work and individualism. Chinese society, on the other hand, value deference and approaching society as a collective whole. The lens through which cultures view the idea of social justice is markedly different across the globe. Thus, values play a role in the importance of "citizens' ideas of what makes one a worthwhile person and their views of social justice" (p.113).

While social justice in schools may be viewed as providing "the conditions to improve one's position or social mobility" (Blackmore, 2013, p. 1007), others have written about social justice in terms of "academic achievement, critical consciousness, and inclusive practices" (Grant & Sleeter, 2007, p. 116). A wider view of justice (and injustice) was furthered by Cribb and Gerwirtz (2003) who discussed the concept in terms of distributive, associational, and cultural justice. They explained the idea of distributive justice as the "absence of exploitation and deprivation" (p.18), cultural justices as the absence of "domination, non-recognition, and disrespect" (p. 19), and associational justice as the inclusion of voices. While these three forms of social justice provide an understanding through a larger sociological perspective, the ideas may be placed in schools as guides to actions and behaviors meant to counteract injustice. White and Cooper (2012) remind us that social justice "can devolve to nothing more than a politically correct term that really only identifies those who are excluded, as if those who are marginalized require further marginalization in order for false prophets to introduce personal agendas that the authors refer to as 'social justice for me'" (p. 519). Brown (2006) looks to educators as the "frontline civil rights workers in a long-term struggle to increase equity" (p. 701). As such, oppression must be faced head on by the adults in the school building. When racism, classism, and other forms of social injustice infect an organization, not only students but adults are infected as well. This leads to limiting points of view which then allows differences to sabotage learning and collaboration (Osta & Perrow, 2008). The struggle for equity is lost when educators embrace a deficit theory of social justice.

Leaders who work for socially just schools reject a deficit theory of social justice and embrace a value and vision for equity. Osta and Perrow (2008) describe three related aspects of equity:

> 1) Equity in our educational system entails removing the predictability of academic success or failure based on social, economic, or cultural factors. 2) Equity thus entails interrupting inequitable practices, eliminating biases and oppression, and creating inclusive school environments for adults and children. 3) Ultimately, equity means discovering and cultivating the unique gifts, talents, and interests that each human being possesses (p. 3).

Moreover, Osta and Perrow (2008) reiterate the need for leaders to create schools that are dedicated to the teaching and learning of all students, regardless of their race, class, gender, or culture. Modeling equity practices and demonstrating skills are ways in which leaders can reveal to adults in the school the importance of a socially just school. DeMatthews, (2015) views socially just leadership as a balancing act, noting that a socially just leader "identifies, focuses, and acts to address marginalization in schools and communities, but also an ongoing struggle complicated by personal, cultural, societal, and organizational dimensions associated with the leader, school, community, and society as a whole" (p. 19). Placing principals at the center of social justice practices establishes a focus on equity as an unspoken norm in the school culture. This holds true for establishing ways of being as well as dismantling harmful practices and behavior. Ross and Berger (2009) provide examples of ways in which principal behavior can eliminate barriers and promote support for socially just school cultures for students with special needs. Principals can establish partnerships between general education and special education teachers. These partners can work to create interventions and dual teaching situations to support learning for special needs students. Furthermore, principals can coordinate teacher planning time to promote collaboration. Ross and Berger (2009) posit that:

> The unifying theme of these strategies is that principals' influence equity indirectly, by increasing the technical skills of staff, transforming their beliefs about equity, and strengthening school partnerships with parents and the community (p. 472).

Thus, principals who work for social justice are called upon to follow mandates and policy, while also ensuring that no child is marginalized as policy is implemented. These same leaders must adhere to the parameters of mandates while remaining true to their innate values and beliefs. Socially just leaders serve as role models for school and community stakeholders as they continue to shape the culture and attitudes of the school organization. This underscores the importance of examining and measuring the behaviors and practices of socially just leaders as well as the organizational supports and barriers that promote or impede the work of social justice.

Social Justice Behavior Scale (SJBS)

The SJBS measures the behaviors that principals engage in to lead for social justice (Flood, 2019). The SJBS was constructed in a number of strategic phases including: meta-analysis, Delphi Process, principal components analysis, and components analysis, and convergent/divergent validity analysis. A comprehensive meta-analysis was conducted across the literreature on social justice leadership behaviors to conceptualize a theoretical construct of social justice behaviors and develop survey items that measure these behaviors (Flood, 2019). This meta-analysis included 18 published articles from 2007-2019 that exclusively focused on behaviors principals

utilized to support social justice. These articles were open coded according to action words that support social justice and in total, 335 codes were constructed and sorted into 15 categories (Flood, 2019). From these categories, three themes emerged: Self-Focused, School-Specific, and Community-Minded components (Flood, 2019).

Survey items were created to measure aspects of each theme. To aid in their development, survey items were created with special attention to the verbiage and definitions within the literature to help reduce researcher bias and provide clarity (Flood, 2019). Initially, 39 items were constructed: 10 for Self-Focused, 18 for School-Specific, and 11 for Community-Minded. Once these survey items were developed, a Delphi Process was utilized to gain multiple rounds of feedback from a panel of experts. This instrument was sent to six content experts on school leadership/and or social justice and based on their extensive feedback; 11 items were revised to improve the precision and scope of the instrument (Flood, 2019). Following the first round of revisions, the instrument went through two more rounds of feedback and revisions until the final 38 items were remaining. These 38 items were then sent to 230 participating principles from 27 states: 72.69% (White), 58.1% (Female), held a master's degree (51.5%), and 37.9% from suburban schools (Flood, 2019b).

Factor structure and item inclusion was determined through principal components analysis including the inspection of eigenvalues, scree plots, and item loadings to guide decisions (Flood, 2019). The final solution was a three-component, 23 item solution (Table 1) that accounted for 62.16% of the total variance. The three components were: School Specific (nine items), Community Minded (seven items), and Self-Focused (seven items).

Further, these participants were also sent the Social Justice Scale (SJS) and the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS) to investigate the convergent validity between the two instruments. As outlined by Campbell and Fiske (1959), convergent validity indicates the statistical relationship between two instruments that are theorized to share or assess similar constructs (Flood, 2019). Positive relationships were determined between the three subscales (Self-Focused, School-Specific, and Community-Minded) and SJS subscales.

Divergent validity was assessed by analyzing the relationship between the SJBS and the Global Belief in a Just World (GBJWS) scale (Holton III et al., 2007). Correleations were run between SJBS subscales and the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS). The GBJWS is a 7-item Likert scale used to measure participants beliefs in a just world (Lipkus, 1991). Across all SJBS subscales and the GBJWS, negative relationships ($r = -0.05$ to -0.23) were discovered and Self-Focused and School-Specific subscales were statistically significant at $p > 0.05$, while the subscale Community-Minded, was not statistically significant (Flood, 2019b).

Lastly, group differences (i.e. age, gender, highest degree completed, and school urbanicity) were examined between participants that took

the SJBS through a series of one-way ANOVAS. No statistically significant mean differences existed between participant demographic variables at alpha level 0.05 (Flood, 2019). However, there was a statistically significant difference between individuals that self-identified as a social justice leader and those that did not on the SJBS.

The School-Specific component includes social justice behaviors that occur within the schools themselves. These include dismantling barriers that hinder achieving social justice outcomes within schools, contextualizing professional development to make sense of issues of race, ethnicity, class, and gender, and preparing students to confront the challenges that face historically marginalized communities (Cooper, 2009; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014; Jean-Marie, 2008; Kose, 2009; Rivera-McCutchen, 2014; Theoharis, 2007; Theoharis, 2009; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011; Wasonga, 2010). The Community-Minded component measured social justice behaviors that expanded out into the community such as engaging in community advocacy and organizing work (DeMatthews, 2018; Theoharis, 2009). The Self-Focused component explored social justice behaviors that emanated from and occurred within the principals themselves. Principals indicated the frequency with which they critically reflected on their work, their biases, and how they engaged with others (Bishop & McClellan, 2016; Jean-Marie, 2008; Shields, 2010; Theoharis, 2007; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011).

The SJBS provides a way to classify and, in turn, understand the extent to which principals are enacting particular behaviors (individual survey items and components with reliability information: Table 1) and the frequency of enactment within each domain (Table 2). In doing so, practitioners and scholars can understand how often principals engage in behaviors linked to social justice leadership, discern the domain where principals tend to engage in social justice behaviors, and measure changes over time related to social justice behaviors. Scholars have stressed the complexity and current limitations of investigating and understanding social justice beliefs, values, and leadership behaviors quantitatively (Flood, 2019; Jean-Marie et al., 2009; Shields, 2021). Our ability to understand social justice leadership behaviors and practices quantitatively continue to be limited and even disappointing as Jean-Marie et al. (2009) described. Many of these limitations and dissapointments may be due to lack of reliable and valid quantitative instruments that measure social justice behaviors and the overabundance of qualitative research investigating social justice leadership (Flood, 2019).

However, it may also in part be due the inherent challenges related to self-reporting and the need for multiple measures that are designed to fully situate facets of leadership practices that enable equity and societal transformation (Shields, 2021). Although the SJBS relies on the self-reporting of principals, it does offer interesting research possibilities on how principals report their engagement in social justice behaviors and can be used in tandem with other instruments to better situate and bring into focus the leadership behaviors of principals that enact social justice in educational settings.

Multiple scholars have recently discussed the behavioral themes and their implications related to leadership outlined in this instrument (Angelle & Flood, 2021; Burke, 2022; Gibson, 2021; Howley et al., 2021; Khan, 2021; Phillips, 2023; Smith, 2022). Scholars have dicussed the practicality of the use of this instrument, specifically, and other quantitative instruments, generally, for investigations of social justice leadership (Angelle & Flood, 2021; Howley et al., 2021, Jean-Marie et al., 2009). Howley et al. (2021) highlighted the need for more scholarship to utilize the SJBS to understand the relationships between social justice leadership practices and other school-level measures, but few studies have done so. Much of the current contributions of the SJBS has been used by scholars to further conceptualize the theoretical aspects related to social justice leadership.

Table 1. Social Justice Behavior Scale

I pose solutions to structural injustices in education. I provide students with greater access to their culture. I dismantle barriers that hinder the practice of social justice in my school. I empower marginalized student groups through collaborative strategies. I nurture socially conscientious teacher-leaders. I enact a vision for my school focused on equity. I prepare students to confront the challenges that face historically marginalized communities. I contextualize professional development in a way that tries to make sense of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, and disability. I embed professional development in collaborative structures.	School Specific Subscale (Cronbach's Alpha = .914)
I engage in community advocacy work. I act as a catalyst for advocacy work within the community. I engage in community organizing work. I utilize parent networks to strategically recruit teachers, parents, and other community leaders with social justice agendas. I access community cultural wealth to benefit my school. I participate in political and policy-related advocacy work on behalf of marginalized student groups. I raise awareness to advance the school communities' levels of understanding about social inequities.	Community Minded Subscale (Cronbach's Alpha = .916)
I continuously reflect to avoid making unjust decisions. I engage in self-reflective, critical, and collaborative work relationships. I actively work to understand my own bias so I can better counteract inequity within my school. I am transparent about my practice as a school leader. I consciously account for and resist my personal biases. I work to develop a reflective consciousness. I extend cultural respect to individuals from diverse backgrounds.	Self-Focused Subscale (Cronbach's Alpha = .872)
23 Item Social Justice Behavior Scale Cronbach's Alpha = .933	

Table 2. SJBS Response Options and Associated Values

Value	Response Option
0	Never
1	Rarely, in less than 10% of the chances when I could have
2	Occasionally, in about 30% of the chances when I could have
3	Sometimes, in about 50% of the chances when I could have
4	Frequently, in about 70% of the chances when I could have
5	Usually, in about 90% of the chances I could have
6	Every time

Social Justice – Barriers and Supports Instrument

The SJ-BAS measures the contextual elements that principals encounter within the complex environments where they find themselves as actors (see Angelle & Flood, 2021). The SJ-BAS measures both macro and meso level constructs that support principals in their work as socially just school leaders as well as those constructs that act as barriers to social justice in schools. Simililarly to the SJBS, the SJ-BAS was constructed through a multiphase approach that integrated both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to develop a reliable and valid barrier and support scale (Angelle & Flood, 2021). For the qualitative phase, transcripts from interviews with 18 school principals from 12 different countries were intereviewed to understand leadership barriers and supports that enable social justice in educational contexts. Qualitative data from these interviews produced seven themes related to supports and six related to barriers that enable social justice:

> From that analysis, seven themes related to perceived supports for social justice and six themes related to perceived bariers were identified. The support themes were Principal Behaviours, School Culture, Teacher Characteristics, Community Involvement, Teacher-Student Interface, Policy, and Resources. The six barrier themes were: Student's Family Situation, Perceptions of the School, Lack of Resources, Policy and Politics, Staff Variables, and Organisational Culture. (Angelle & Flood, 2021, p. 127)

Initial survey items were constructed according to the themes identified from the qualitative phase. A Delphi Process was utilized to gain feedback from a panel of experts to revise items on both the Support Instrument and Barrier Instrument. Four reviewers (three male and one female) were selected to participate on this panel who possessed significant expertise in school leadership and social justice. In response to panel feedback, the survey was revised down to 50 items. Following the Delphi Process, the intital SJ-BAS was distributed to princiapls across the Univted States. In sum, 226 principals in the United States from 27 different states responded.

Principal components analysis was utilized on both instruments to understand factor structure and as a method for item reduction (Angelle & Flood, 2021). For the Support Instrument, eigenvalues, scree plots, and item loadings were inspected, resulting in a four factor, 24-item solution. Three items were removed due to cross loadings and another was removed as a result of independent factor loading. The final product accounted for .279% of the total variance (Angelle & Flood, 2021). The Cronbach Alpha was then utilized to determine the reliability and internal consistency of the remaining survey items. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for the Social Justice-Supports instrument and found to be .965 (Table 3).

This process was then repeated for the barrier portion of the survey. Three items of the Social Justice-Barriers Instrument were removed due to cross loading and one for not meeting the minimum loading requirement. Analysis of the principal components analysis identified a four-factor, 19-item solution that accounted for 68.989% of the total variance. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for the instrument and produced a coefficient of .923 (Table 4).

As mentioned previously, the SJ-BAS is composed of two scales, the Barriers Scale and the Supports Scale. The Barriers Scale is made up of four components: Student's Family Situation, Perceptions, Resources and Policy, and School Culture (Table 3). Student's Family Situation measured issues presented by the home environments and economic situation of their students within their context as barriers (Morrison, 2017). Perceptions measured the negative ways that various stakeholders view schooling and marginalized student groups (Miller & Martin 2015; Theoharis, 2007). Resources and Policy looked at how school bureaucracy, including policy and the lack of/limited access to resources, served as barriers to social justice work (Chiu & Walker, 2007; Morrison, 2017). School Culture measured how the culture of a school could serve as a barrier to social justice work (Chiu & Walker, 2007; Taysum & Gunter, 2008).

The Supports Scale measures four components: School Culture and Practices; Parental and Community Support; Communication, Collaboration, and Guidance; and Resources (Table 4). School Culture and Practices was comprised of items related to the supportive attitudes, processes, practices, and culture within schools (Morrison, 2017; Theoharis, 2007). Parental and Community Support addressed how parental and community support aided principals in their social justice work (DeMatthews, 2018; Normore & Blanco, 2008). Communication, Collaboration, and Guidance are indicators of the synergistic relationship between principal and stakeholders to support leadership for social justice (Sarid, 2020). Resources gauged how fiscal, information, instructional, and human resources aid leadership for social justice. Each scale utilizes a 7-point Likert response option (Table 5).

Table 3. Social Justice Supports Scale

Attitudes within my school community support social justice leadership. Within my school, processes are organized to support social justice leadership. Data available at my school are used to support social justice leadership. Reflective practice is required to be a successful socially-just school leader. The culture of my school is supportive of social justice leadership. Staff collaboration in my school supports social justice leadership.	School Culture and Practices (Cronbach's Alpha = .918)
At my school, fiscal resources are available to support social justice leadership. At my school, school information resources are available to support social justice leadership. At my school, instructional resources are available to support social justice leadership. At my school, human resources are available to support social justice leadership.	Resources (Cronbach's Alpha = .928)
Reciprocal communication between teachers and students at my school supports social justice leadership. Communication among stakeholders at my school supports social justice leadership. The level of trust between students and teachers at my school supports social justice leadership. Principal and teacher focus on students' best interest at my school supports social justice leadership. Valuing student voice in my school supports social justice leadership. School policy documents that guide decision-making are supportive of social justice leadership. School-level decision-making processes are supportive of social justice leadership. Local guidance/control of decision-making is supportive of social justice leadership. The extent of the principal's autonomy to make decisions for the school supports social justice leadership.	Communication, Collaboration, and Guidance (Cronbach's Alpha = .940)
Parents at my school support social justice leadership. Collaboration between teachers and parents in my school results in increased support of social justice leadership. Principal and parent connections at my school result in increased support of social justice leadership. Principal involvement in the community results in increased support of social justice leadership. The extent of values cohesion between the community and school results in increased support of social justice	
24 Item SJ Support Scale Cronbach's Alpha = .965	

Table 4. Social Justice Barriers Scale

Lack of communication with stakeholders is a barrier to social justice leadership. Principal isolation in advocacy work is a barrier to social justice leadership. Principal's vision can be a barrier to social justice leadership. Value systems can be a barrier to social justice leadership. School's hierarchical structure is a barrier to social justice leadership.	School Culture (Cronbach's Alpha = .863)
Lack of financial resources is a barrier to social justice leadership. Limited time during the workday is a barrier to social justice leadership. Limited access to current research is a barrier to social justice leadership. Lack of input on policy is a barrier to social justice leadership. Inconsistent policy implementation is a barrier to social justice leadership. Bureaucracy is a barrier to social justice leadership.	Resources and Policy (Cronbach's Alpha = .875)
Focus on achievement outcomes is a barrier to social justice leadership. Societal expectations of schooling are a barrier to social justice leadership. Societal bias against marginalized groups of students in my school is a barrier to social justice leadership. Parental resistance to school initiatives is a barrier to social justice leadership. Staff perceptions of students' socioeconomic circumstances are a barrier to social justice leadership.	Perceptions (Cronbach's Alpha = .862)
Students' socioeconomic circumstances are a barrier to social justice leadership. Income inequality between students is a barrier to social justice leadership. The home environments of my students are barriers to social justice leadership.	Students' Family Situations (Cronbach's Alpha = .888)
19 Item SJ Barrier Scale Cronbach's Alpha = .923	

Table 5. SJ-BAS Response Options and Associated Values

Value	Response Option
1	Strongly Disagree
2	Disagree
3	Moderately Disagree
4	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
5	Moderately Agree
6	Agree
7	Strongly Agree

Opportunities

School leaders and their daily agency are in the public eye, both from their school stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and most importantly, students, as well as the eyes of the larger community. As student populations continue to increase in diversity, the public nature of the work of school leaders will persist to ensure that schools are welcoming and safe places for all children.

The student population in the United States is changing. In the past decade, Hispanic students in public schools increased from 22% to 28% while the population of White students decreased from 54% to 46%. Black student population in public schools also decreased from 17% to 15% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). To put this in perspective, public schools enrolled 49.4 million students in fall 2020. Of these 22.6 million students were white while 13.8 million were Hispanic. Schools enrolled 7.4 million Black students and 2.7 million Asian students. In every US state, the population of white public school students was lower in fall 2020 than in fall 2009 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020).

Given these demographics as well as the public nature of school leadership, understanding behaviors demonstrated by school leaders that lead to socially just schools and the extent to which these behaviors are evident to school stakeholders becomes even more important. The SJBS and the SJ-BAS can offer schools and district leaders the tools with which to gain this information.

For example, district-level administrators can utilize the SJBS as a baseline measure to increase their understanding of the extent to which school leaders engage in behaviors indicative of social justice leadership. Moreover, the domains in the instrument can inform district administrators about the areas where school levels focus in their social justice work and those areas where leaders spend little time. This may encourage dialogue with the school leader regarding areas that are not addressed. Given the intense workload of principals and their limited time, the district leaders

may use the instrument to see where support and/or professional development may be warranted.

The SJ-BAS may be useful for both school and district leaders as well as policymakers and program evaluators in understanding the contextual environment of today's US schools. The environmental conditions that engender support or act as barriers can inform all stakeholders about school needs for addressing social justice issues, needs which may include resources, training, or potentially, intervention.

Both instruments are useful tools for those researchers who study school improvement and the organizational constructs that situate social justice at the forefront of their work. Moreover, these tools may be helpful for program evaluators at the state level who work to improve schools under their purview. Professional development and coaching consultants can use the SJBS and the SJ-BAS as equity audit tools to offer recommendations for increasing equity and diversity.

Conclusion

Given the growing diversity and needs of children in today's schools, we must continue to work for socially just places of safety and learning. Principals must be the catalysts for ensuring that marginalized children are treated with respect, knowing that school is a place where they can be recognized and a place of learning. School leaders demonstrate this through their values, decision-making, practices, and behaviors. We offer two instruments to help district and school leaders to measure the extent to which these constructs hold true in schools. As Chunoo et al. (2019) remind us, "Working toward a more equitable democratic society starts with explicitly naming the seemingly intractable social issues that require leadership. By doing this, we can move from leadership for social justice toward leadership as social justice" (p. 91).

References

Angelle, P. S., & Flood, L. D. (2021). Measuring the barriers and supports to socially just leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 49*(3), 122-143.

Arar, K. (2019). Understanding and implementing social justice leadership in Arab schools in Israel. *Planning & Changing, 48*(3/4), 195-214.

Arieli, Sl, Sagiv, Lilach, & Roccas, S. (2020). Values at work: The impact of personal values in organizations. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 69*(2), 230-275.

Bardi, A. & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(10), 1207-1220.

Bishop, H., & McClellan, R. (2016). Resisting social justice: Rural school

principals' perceptions of LGBTQ students. *Journal of School Leadership*, *26*(1), 124.

Blackmore, J. (2013). Social justice in education. In B.J. Irby, G. Brown, R. Lara-Alecio, & S. Jackson, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Theories* (pp.1001-1056). Information Age Publishing.

Burke, J. L. (2022). A networked approach for curricula implementation in support of inclusive educational reform. *The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University*, *280*. Retrieved from https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/oip/280

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56*(2), 81.

Chiu, M. M., & Walker, A. (2007). Leadership for social justice in Hong Kong schools: Addressing mechanisms of inequality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *45*(6), 724–739.

Chunoo, V., Beatty, C., & Gruver, M. (2019). Leadership educator as social justice educator. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, *164*, 87-103. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20360

Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(5), 694-724.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of just practices: An analysis of plural conceptions of justice. In C. Vincent (Ed.), *Social Justice, Education and Identity* (15-30). Routledge.

DeMatthews, D.E. (2018). Social justice dilemmas: Evidence on the successes and shortcomings of three principals trying to make a difference. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *21*(5), 545-559, DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2016.1206972

DeMatthews, D.E., & Mawhinney, H. (2014). Social justice leadership and inclusion: Exploring challenges in an urban district struggling to address inequities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(5), 844-881.

DeMatthews, D.E., Mungal, and Carrola, P. A.. (2015). Despite best intentions: A critical analysis of social justice leadership and decision making. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*, *5*(2), 17-37.

Dempster, N., Carter, L., Freakley, M., & Parry, L. (2004). Contextual influences on school leaders in Australia: Some data from a recent study of principals' ethical decision-making. *School Leadership & Management*, *24*(2), 163-174.

Fietzer, A.W., & Ponterotto, J. (2015). A psychometric review of instruments for social justice and advocacy attitudes. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology*, *7*(1), 19-40.

Flood, L.D. (2019). A new way forward for social justice researchers:

Development and alidation of the Social Justice Behavior Scale. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, *4*(2), 303-346.

Gibson, B. L. (2021). *An investigation of principals' social justice leadership and black male academic achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, Praire View A&M University). Digital Commons at PVAMU.

Grant, C.A. & Sleeter, C.E. (2007). *Doing multicultural education for achievement and equity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hatfield, E., Salmon, M., and Rapson, R.L. (2011). Equity theory and social justice. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, and Religion*, *8*(2), 101-121.

Hayes, S. D., & Angelle, P. S. (2020). Relational mentoring for supporting school principals in social justice leadership. In C. Mullins (Ed.) *Handbook of Social Justice Interventions in Education*. Springer Nature. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29553-0_98-1

Holton III, E. F., Bates, R. A., Bookter, A. I., & Yamkovenko, V. B. (2007). Convergent and divergent validity of the learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *18*(3), 385-419.

Howley, C., Howley, A., Farley, A., Dudek, M., Gilday, C., (2021). Fairness, voice, dialogue: Measuring collective social justice practice in schools. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *33*(3), 196-229.

Jean-Marie, G. (2008). Leadership for social justice: An agenda for 21st century schools. *The Educational Forum*, *72*(4), 340-54.

Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *4*(1), 1-31.

Khan, N. E. (2021). *Beyond access: A principal's behaviors displayed in the implementation of a district-wide initiative focused on students with disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University). Scholar Works at Georgia State University.

Kose, B. W. (2009). The principal's role in professional development for social justice: An empirically-based transformative framework. *Urban Education*, *44*(6), 628-663.

Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*(11), 1171-1178.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools. *Condition of Education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cge.

Normore, A. H., & Blanco, R. I. (2008). Leadership for social justice and morality: Collaborative partnerships, school-linked services and the plight of the poor. In A. H. Normore (Ed.) *Leadership for social justice: Promoting equity and excellence through inquiry and reflective practice* (215-240). Information Age Publishing.

Oldham, A. N., Flood, L. D., & Angelle, P. S. (2020). Support for marginalized children: Influences of micro and meso contexts on socially just principal practices. *NASSP Bulletin*, *104*(4), 292-313.

Pappas, J. B., & Pappas, E. C. (2015). The sustainable personality: Values and behaviors in individual sustainability. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *4*(1), 12-21.

Phillips, A. D. (2023). *The hyper-discipling of black students in one southeastern state*. (Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University). Johns Hopkins University.

Rivera-McCutchen, R. L. (2014). The moral imperative of social justice leadership: A critical component of effective practice. *The Urban Review, 46*(4), 747-763.

Ross, J. A., & Berger, M. J. (2009). Equity and leadership: Research based strategies for school leaders. *Journal of School Leadership and Management, 29*(5), 463-476.

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(4), 558-589.

Shields, C. M. (2023). 13. Transactional, transformational, transformative leadership: a journey towards equity and emancipation. In Woods, P.A., Roberts, A., Tian, M., & Youngs, H. (Eds.), *Handbook on Leadership in Education* (171-185). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Smith, D. (2022). *From allies to abolitionists: Developing an abolitionist consciousness and anti-racist practices in white teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola Marymount University). ProQuest.

Tackett, A. (2021). Social justice leadership of educational leaders in Appalachia Kentucky: Why context matters. *ICPEL Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research, 9*, 1-18.

Taysum, A., & Gunter, H. (2008). A critical approach to researching social justice and school leadership in England. E*ducation, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *3*(2), 183-199.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(2), 221-258.95

Theoharis, G. (2009). The school leaders our children deserve: Seven keys to equity, social justice, and school reform. Teachers College Press.

Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English Language Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(4), 646-688.

Verplanken, B., & Holland, R. W. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(3), 434-447.

Wasonga, T. A. (2010). Leadership practices for social justice, democratic community, and learning: School principals' perspectives. J*ournal of School Leadership*, *19*(2), 200-224.

White, R., & Cooper, K. (2012) Critical leadership and social justice: Research, policy and educational practice. *US-China Education Review*, *5*, 517–532. Retrieved from http://iles.eric. ed.gov/fulltext/ED534295.pdf

Zhang, Y., Goddard, J. T., & Jakubiec, B. A. (2018). Social justice leadership in education: A suggested questionnaire. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, *3*(1), 53-86.

Lee D. Flood is the Assistant Dean of Assessment, Evaluation, and Quality Improvement at the Burnett School of Medicine at Texas Christian University.

Pamela Angelle is a professor and director of graduate studies at the University of Tennessee.

Jesse Wood is an Assistant Professor of Education and Coordinator of the PhD Program in Strategic Leadership in Education at Belmont University.